

# Historical language planning in nineteenth-century Flanders: standardisation as a means of language survival

WIM VANDENBUSSCHE

*Vrije Universiteit Brussel & Research Foundation-Flanders*

Flanders and the Netherlands are the northern and southern part of the Dutch language area. They have a different political and sociolinguistic history. In the independent Netherlands a Dutch standard language started to develop during the sixteenth century. Foreign rulers dominated Flanders until 1814; they preferred French as their prestige language and blocked a comparable standardisation process of Dutch. Until ca. 1900, all important domains in Flemish society were governed in French. When Flanders became part of Belgium in 1830, the 'Flemish Movement' wanted to standardise Dutch in Flanders to raise the social status of the language. There was a serious dispute on the linguistic selection and codification phase, however. The 'integrationists' wanted to copy the established northern Dutch norm; the 'particularists' wanted to develop a new southern norm. This article discusses this dispute and the implementation of the proposed norms in texts of lower, middle and upper class writers, in newspapers and in official administration documents.

## 1 Introduction

Flanders and The Netherlands constitute the northern and southern part of the Dutch language area, sharing one and the same standard language. Although there are clear differences between the northern and southern pronunciation of Standard Dutch, there is one single standard for Dutch orthography and grammar and both accents are mutually intelligible.

Little more than a century ago, hardly anyone would have dared to predict the present prosperous state of Standard Dutch in Flanders. All authoritative academic 'histories of Dutch' teach us that this language was down at heel in the southern Low Countries up until the end of the nineteenth century. The onset for this declined status is usually put another 300 years back in time, around 1580, when the Low Countries rebelled against its Spanish invaders. The so-called 'fall of Antwerp' in 1585 – during which the Spanish gained

control over this harbour town – was the catalysing factor for the split-up of the Low Countries. The southern provinces (including the territory of present-day Flanders) came under Spanish rule, whereas the northern provinces gained independence and entered their ‘golden’ 17<sup>th</sup> century.

Incidentally, the late sixteenth century was also the time at which a Dutch standard language slowly began to develop (Willemyns 2003). In the independent Netherlands, this process gained momentum and continued throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Although little is known about the social variability of the language during that period, it becomes clear from literary and administrative sources that there was in effect a relatively uniform written standard variety of Dutch around 1800 in the Netherlands (whether and to what extent this variety was wide-spread in Dutch society is another matter, however).

Because of the political separation and the Spaniards’ preference for French as their prestige language, the standardisation process of Dutch was seriously disturbed in the south after 1585. Contrary to popular opinion, the standardisation process was not entirely cut off: both individuals and philological societies continuously produced – often conflicting – models for the codification of Dutch in Flanders. However, contrary to the Netherlands there was no official support from the government whatsoever for the development of a standard variety in Flanders. The Austrian Habsburgers who succeeded the Spanish occupiers also preferred French for matters of state, and so did the Austrians who ruled Flanders from 1714 until 1794. The revolutionary French government from 1794 to 1814 even imposed a radical ‘one state - one language policy’ aimed at the total Frenchification of all crucial sectors of social, political and administrative life in Flanders. With no governmental support for corpus planning and even less for status planning of Dutch in Flanders over more than two centuries, it is easy to understand the divide around 1800 between the well advanced standardisation-in-progress in the north and the sorry sociolinguistic situation in the south.<sup>1)</sup>

Flanders was reunited with the Netherlands in 1814 in the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. Reversing the ‘one state – one language’ credo in favour of Dutch, King Willem I imposed a radical Dutchification of public life in Flanders. Although this policy was successful, the King’s adversaries attacked his language planning agenda with the argument that northern and southern Dutch were mutually unintelligible.<sup>2)</sup> In reality, high administration civil servants all over Flanders had no problem whatsoever with the composition of

official town council documents in Dutch from 1814 onwards (Vanhecke (2007)).

The argument of impotent dialectal Dutch was once again pushed to the fore as soon as Flanders became part of the new independent (and multilingual) state of Belgium in 1830, however. Willemyns (2003) calls this «the perversity of the purposeful official discrimination of Dutch by the first ‘Belgian’ rulers» and quotes «a decree issued in 1830 by the provisional government to justify why only French could function as the official administrative language of Belgium, and why the majority language apparently could not:»

Since both Dutch and German, languages used by the inhabitants of certain places may vary from province to province and even from county to county, it is impossible to draft the text of laws and decrees in either Dutch or German (quoted in Peeters 1930:xiv)

As a consequence, all important domains of Belgian society were governed in French, both in Flanders and in French-speaking Wallonia. The absence of generally accepted norms and standardisation tools for Dutch in Flanders was one of the pillars of the diglossic and discriminatory relation between French and Dutch in Belgian politics.

The dire need to standardise Dutch in Flanders was not only crucial to the plain survival of the language in Belgium. It was also the key to raise the social status of Dutch as well as to stimulate the social emancipation of the Flemish population. These challenges would determine the agenda for a century of language struggle, led by the many individuals and associations involved in the so-called ‘Flemish Movement’ (NEVB 1998).

## **2 Selecting and codifying a standard – integrationism versus particularism**

Although all factions of the Flemish Movement agreed on the vital importance of language standardisation, two fundamentally opposed options on the direction of this process were put forward. The ‘integrationists’ aimed at the fastest strategy to upgrade the status of Dutch in Flanders. Considering the established prestige of Dutch in the Netherlands, they proposed to copy and spread the northern Dutch norm in Flanders. The first official codification ever of Dutch orthography (the so-called ‘Siegenbeek norm’) had been decreed in the Netherlands in 1804; all Flanders had to do was to adopt and impose this spelling norm. This system could then replace the Brabantian Des Roches spelling norm that was widely used in Flanders although it never enjoyed any

official status. The ‘particularists’, however, disapproved of this option and stressed the link between language and identity instead. After centuries of foreign dominance and, most recently, fifteen years of Dutch ‘oppression’, the time had finally come to affirm Flanders’ liberated identity through its language. Surrendering to the language norms of the former occupier was claimed to be incompatible with this goal. Only a Flemish norm in its own right, flavoured with southern dialectal elements could do justice to the Fleming’s identity and needs.

Given that this fundamental discussion on norm selection and codification (and the accompanying virulent press tirades) remained very much confined to the issue of orthography, this polemic became known as the ‘spelling war’ (Couvreur & Willemyns 1998). Northern Dutch orthography was not only associated with the former political rulers but also with their Protestantism. In a Flemish society that was Catholic to the bone, branding a spelling system as a heathen symbol became a significant discourse strategy. In a stream of letters, articles, brochures and other publications, both parties passionately defended their views for a full decade on end, all the while feeding the pro-French argument that it was impossible to promote Dutch as a language of state affairs when even the speakers of that language could not agree on a single norm for its orthography.

To solve the problem a formal spelling rule contest was organised in 1836. When none of the entries proved satisfactory, the president of the jury (philologist Jan-Frans Willems) produced a system of his own that was adopted by law in 1844. Belgium finally had its official norm for Dutch orthography.

The fact that Willems’ standard closely resembled the Siegenbeek norm can be considered as one of the first major consecrations of the integrationists’ victory.<sup>3)</sup> The particularists saw the writing on the wall and although their activities continued, their spelling proposals were no longer considered as a serious alternative. Their role was restricted to that of critical hecklers, especially after the final step towards full spelling unity in 1864 with the adoption of the De Vries-Te Winkel orthography norm.<sup>4)</sup> In retrospect, the particularist opposition never really made clear what Flemish spelling should have looked like. Apart from their wish to preserve certain iconic word images to reflect southern pronunciation (<peerd> ‘horse’ instead of <paard>, for example), their actual writing practice may not have been that different from the integrationists’.

Because language is more than mere orthography, the integrationists also looked for northern guidance on the level of style, lexis and grammar. They

hoped to accomplish this through the organisation of an annual ‘General Dutch Congress’ from 1849 onwards. These conferences were intended as meeting fora for ‘language professionals’ (writers, philologists, historians, playwrights) from north and south, with the ultimate intention to intensify and reinforce contacts between both parts of the Dutch language territory. Once again, the Flemish delegation wanted to use the prestige of the northern Dutch presence for its own status planning agenda. The Dutch participants were more interested in corpus planning, however – the *Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal* (‘Dictionary of the Dutch Language’, the largest dictionary in the world) is probably the most spectacular spin-off project from these conferences (Van Sterkenburg 1992). The Flemings vigorously continued to angle for the power of a common norm – note that there was no particularist delegation to speak of – and systematically put the pronunciation and lexis of southern Dutch on the agenda. Much of this effort was in vain, however: hardly any effective norm measure or decision was implemented.

While the ongoing association with representatives of northern Standard Dutch proved to be a powerful and necessary strategy for image building and attitudinal changes in Flanders, the integrationists were largely on their own when it came to the hard work of spreading a standard in all layers of Flemish society. An impressive upsurge of purist publications and ‘language policing’ supported this goal, especially towards the last quarter of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. These texts consistently condemned the allegedly ubiquitous Gallicisms and dialectal phrases in Flemish Dutch, drawing on metaphors from the horticultural and psychiatric domain: ‘Thistles’, ‘Weeds amidst the wheat’, ‘Language phantasms’, ‘Idiotismophobia’ (Vandenbussche e.a. 2005).

The final decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century were also the time when the Flemish Movement managed to consolidate its status planning demands in a series of language laws. After securing increased rights for the use of Dutch in law courts (1873), central administration<sup>5)</sup> (1878) and secondary education (1883), the so-called ‘Equality Law’ of 1898 finally recognised Dutch as equal to French in all official matters. Dutch was now one of the two official languages of Belgium with a solid – theoretical – base as far as norms and rights were concerned. Whether (and to which extent) the Flemings embraced and/or mastered their standard language is another matter, however.

### 3 Spreading the standard

In his authoritative article on the standardisation of Swedish, Ulf Teleman (2003:422) states «[t]he effect of language cultivation upon actual usage is

difficult to assess. Only its failures can be verified with certainty.» Any attempt to weigh the impact of corpus and status planning efforts on a language at a specific moment in time, however, requires at least both a clear insight in the overall quality of that written language as it appeared in original documents from that time, as well as a sound description of the actual social stratification of that language on the basis of original archive sources. Teleman's statement applies perfectly to the case of Dutch in nineteenth-century Flanders, precisely because this corpus-based description of 'Dutch in action' at the time is fundamentally lacking in many of the leading reference works on the history of Dutch.

Scholars of Dutch language history are well informed about the theoretical language norms for orthography and style in nineteenth-century Belgium, as summarised in the preceding paragraphs. As far as language stratification is concerned, the commonly accepted opinion is that the lower classes in Flanders were massively illiterate at the time, with a dialect-based linguistic competence at best. It is further assumed that Dutch was treated as a second-hand underdog language, unfit for any official function, resulting in a serious Frenchification of the higher social classes in Flanders. Many studies on the social history of Belgium reflect this opinion, which is slavishly echoed in many of the 'Histories of Dutch' referring to these historical studies. Language historians apparently did not feel the need to check these 'obvious truths'. Given that a number of Flemish archivists claim (up until the present day!) that it is a waste of time to try and find Dutch documents pertaining to high-prestige domains or lower class writers from nineteenth-century Flanders, it is easy to understand that nobody bothered (Vanhecke 2007:63).

As a consequence, up until recently nobody was able to answer the simple question: how did the man in the street, the middle class citizen and the upper class writer actually write Dutch in nineteenth-century Flanders? Did they use the language in everyday writing at all? And, if so, what was the quality of their output like? How standardised was this written Dutch?

Much of the research that was conducted within our research unit over the past fifteen years has dealt with these fundamental but unanswered questions. While there was an enormous amount of detailed extra-linguistic information on the 'language struggle' mentioned above, no systematic and broad corpus-based sociolinguistic analysis of nineteenth-century Dutch had ever been undertaken before the mid-nineties of the previous century. We have attempted to remedy this situation by 'going back to the sources' and describing the actual

status and nature of Dutch in nineteenth-century Flanders as it appears in original archive documents.

The ever-recurring bottom line of the team's research results was a justified mistrust for many of the 'communis opinio' statements on the sociolinguistic situation in nineteenth-century Flanders. Over and over again, these assumptions proved to be incomplete, incorrect or painfully wrong: in many cases lower class scribes did write Dutch texts, for example, upper class scribes knew and mastered Dutch and the majority of the official local administrations in Flanders never succumbed to the alleged total Frenchification. A recent overview of these 'unmasking' results is given in Vandenbussche e.a. (2004). In the remainder of this article I limit myself to a brief discussion of three of these case studies which are directly linked to aspects of the diffusion phase of Standard Dutch in Flanders.

### **3.1 Spreading the standard among different social classes?**

One of the most salient ideals of the Flemish Movement was the idea that «the language struggle was also a social struggle» (Boeva 1994). Promoting Standard Dutch and trying to raise its prestige was a tool in the Movement's campaign for the social rehabilitation of Flanders. One can rightfully question, however, whether anything of the linguistic corpus planning activities ever reached the majority of the Flemish population. In a case study focused on the town of Bruges (Vandenbussche 1999), we looked at original handwritten documents (from 1800-1900) written in lower and middle class trade guilds and upper class recreational societies (archers' guild). We checked these documents for spelling and style and compared them with the 'official' norms for Standard Dutch mentioned above.

Official census figures show that 55% of the overall population in Bruges was illiterate during the first third of the nineteenth century; for the working classes this percentage even rose to somewhere between 75 and 84% (Callewaert 1963:214). The meeting reports we analysed from shoemaker's, wool weaver's and tailor's apprentices illustrate, however, that some lower class members did write and that there was a continuous writing tradition within their professional organisations throughout the nineteenth century (cf. Vandenbussche 2007). The language in which these texts were written is Dutch, not the local dialect; dialect interferences do occur but they do not dominate the scribes' output. These paupers took no note of the Flemish Movement's standardisation battles and spelling wars: none of the 27 lower class writers in our corpus ever adopted any of the various official spelling

norms. What we find instead are 27 highly personal, idiosyncratic but stable spelling systems with a limited number of possible spelling variants for the same phoneme. Despite the fact that spelling variability is an essential characteristic of pauper writing at the time, there is no ‘spelling chaos’ and it is actually possible to describe the constraints on this variability. Many of the lower class scribes, however, have severe problems with the stylistic properties of the text type they produce: while the first lines of the report (list of present members, day order, etc.) meet the expected report style, the writers lose control over the sentence and text structure in the ‘body’ of the report. Unfinished sentences, dislocated constituents and lack of internal text cohesion are just some of the recurring features that characterise these documents.

As far as spelling is concerned, exactly the same conclusion applies to the texts by the 11 middle class writers in our corpus: just like their ‘subordinate’ trade servants, all of the trade masters had their own idiosyncratic spelling system with limited variation, without any reference to an official orthography norm. The problems with text structure also occur in the middle class corpus but disappear around the middle of the nineteenth century, however. From then onwards, the middle class scribes produce coherent reports.

The upper class corpus shows that the social elite from Bruges also wrote Dutch throughout the whole nineteenth century, both for private and prestigious public functions. The quality of their orthography (including norm adherence) remains to be analysed but spot checks already indicate that they also used a ‘variable’ spelling system during the first decades of the nineteenth century, be it without the incoherent text structures of the lower and middle class scribes.

These case studies provide evidence supporting the view that writing skills gradually spread from the highest to the lowest social ranks in nineteenth-century Bruges. As far as text composition and genre conventions are concerned, the upper classes already ‘mastered’ the skills of report writing around 1800, whereas the middle classes continued to struggle with text cohesion and sentence structures until 1850. The lower classes only caught up with the higher social groups in the early twentieth century. Interestingly, none of three analysed social groups seemed to have been concerned with official orthography norms: they all used a ‘variable spelling system’ instead. This may indicate that ‘correct’ spelling behaviour (i.e. conforming to the official norm) was not considered as a vital token of an ‘educated identity’ by our corpus scribes, not even by those belonging to the elite group. As such, our findings are in line with Jim Milroy’s (1999:34) claim that «the idea that a spelling system should be invariant is a post-eighteenth-century notion.»



### 3.2 Spreading the standard in newspapers?

Comments from contemporaries frequently referred to the detrimental influence of the written press on the spread of Standard Dutch in nineteenth-century Flanders. «Newspaper, chronicle and other Gallic dishcloths» (quoted in Willemyns and Haeseryn 1998:2937) were said to ‘infect’ their reading audience with Gallicisms, thus greatly damaging all integrationist efforts. While Haest’s (1982) analysis of a number of «Gallicist» structures in newspapers from the town of Antwerp between 1700 and 1900 showed quite the opposite, this cliché thought continued to find its way into reference works on Dutch language history.

In order to get a databased impression of journalists’ norm adherence (and integrationist or particularist practices) in the domain of spelling, we set up and supervised a series of detailed spot checks in nineteenth-century newspaper archives. Van de Gucht (2007) looked into the spelling choices in (Dutch) newspapers from the capital of Brussels whereas Vandueren (2006) did the same for the smaller (but also Brabantic) town of Diest.

For Brussels Van de Gucht first selected the 1844 and 1845 edition of two different newspapers – *Vlaemisch België* and *De Vlaemsche Belgen* – i.e. right after the introduction of the (integrationist) ‘Commission spelling norm’ of 1844. All journalists in all newspapers almost completely conformed to the Commission spelling from the first of January 1844 onwards. There was, in other words, an immediate full adoption of the norm. The analyses of orthography choices in a third newspaper – *De Vlaemsche Stem* from 1851 and 1852 – led to the same conclusion: journalists knew and implemented the integrationist norms. As said above, these analyses were random sample tests; the results should be interpreted with great caution and cannot be generalised without further research. Still, they show that there is reason to doubt the over-repeated claims about the negative press influence on Dutch in nineteenth-century Flanders. An even greater question, however, remains how the journalists learnt the new norm and how they were able to adopt the new spelling rules from day one onwards.

The research results from Diest were less straightforward and indicate that there may have been great differences between individual towns and newspapers as far as spelling choices were concerned. In the corpus sample from around 1844 (from *Den Demerbode*), the Commission spelling is not used at all, contrary to what we saw in Brussels. Journalists used an idiosyncratic spelling system instead, combining elements from the Des Roches system with others from the Commission spelling. It is important to stress, however, that

this was a consistent system: in the various editions of the newspaper, Vandueren (2006) always found exactly the same graphemes for a specific phoneme or phoneme cluster. There was, in other words, no ‘spelling chaos’, whether or not the journalist conformed to imposed norms.

In a second batch of newspapers from Diest, now from 1864, the Commission spelling had fully percolated: both in the *Dijle- en Demerbode* and in the *Gazette van Diest* journalists mastered this norm perfectly. Contrary to the situation in Brussels, however, the press in Diest did apparently not feel the urge to adopt a new orthography norm as soon as it had been officially decreed: we found no trace of the De Vries-Te Winkel orthography norm (imposed in 1864) in the corpus and all writers in the aforementioned newspapers consistently used the Commission norm up until 1878. The ‘new’ norm was only implemented towards the end of the nineteenth century, it appears: Vandueren (2006) analysed various editions of three newspapers from 1890-1893 (*De Werkmansvriend*, *De Wekker – Le Réveil* and *Gazette van Diest*), all of which were written according to the De Vries-Te Winkel norm.

### 3.3 Spreading the standard in the official administration?

Neither private associations nor newspapers were under the obligation to implement an official orthography norm. Local and national official administrations, on the contrary, were expected by law to implement and spread each of the new spelling systems discussed above. In order to check how ‘official’ Flanders reacted to (and coped with) the rapid succession of spelling rules in the nineteenth century, Vanhecke (2007) analysed the orthography choices in the official minutes of 6 Flemish town councils between 1814 and 1900. Next to meeting minutes from the bigger towns of Bruges and Antwerp, she consulted the council archives from the smaller communes of Willebroek and Geel (both in the province of Antwerp), Grembergen (East-Flanders) and Jette (Brabant).

The stunning conclusion of her analyses is that the town scribes had the remarkable ability and competence to switch between spelling systems from one day to another. When administrations were expected to use the Siegenbeek system from the first of January 1823 onwards, the council clerk from Antwerp made the switch from day one onwards without any problem. The town hall in Grembergen even anticipated this change (announced in 1819) and used the Siegenbeek system from 1820 onwards. The other towns all followed flawlessly within the next three or four years. It is important to stress that we find the same ‘writing hands’ in the documents before and after a spelling

switch. When Belgium became independent in October 1830 (and the Siegenbeek norm was no longer obligatory) certain communes dropped the Siegenbeek spelling they had faithfully used up until September 1830 and returned to the (unofficial, but widely-used) Des Roches system. This was the case from November 1830 onwards in Geel, Willebroek and Grembergen for example. Once again, this perfect switch testifies to writing competence of the town clerks. When the ‘Commission spelling’ was officially imposed from 1844 onwards, the town scribes from Willebroek and Grembergen immediately switched to the new norm for the composition of the town council records, soon to be followed by their colleague from Geel. The final transition to the De Vries-Te Winkel norm in 1864 was implemented in a similar abrupt fashion in Willebroek, Geel, Jette and Grembergen; Antwerp followed suit in 1866.<sup>6)</sup>

Judging from the scribes’ competence and agility when it came to adopting new spelling rules, one is inclined to call the integrationist endeavour a full success in the domain of public administration. Explaining how and where these scribes learnt the new norms, and how they were able to implement them so smoothly and perfectly, is a more difficult task. Although our knowledge of educational practices and language teaching in Flanders before 1850 is fragmentary, we do know that the education system in Flanders was dominated by French from the secondary school onwards, especially in the earlier decades of the nineteenth century. It is not evident in other words that the scribes acquired their remarkable spelling skills through regular schooling, especially considering that the available primary education in Dutch was of poor quality.

#### **4 Conclusion**

One of the crucial conclusions of the Flemish case study appears to be that lower, middle and upper class writers alike were not concerned about the passionate academic discussions on orthography norms. Writing practice and the exact direction of the standardisation process were trivial and far less important than physical skills when it came to surviving and social promotion for manual labourers. This hard economic fact was a bottleneck that seriously delayed the standardisers’ social aims for the lower and middle social classes in Bruges for the larger part of the nineteenth century. The upper classes in Bruges did write Dutch, on the other hand, but consistent orthography appears to have been less important than stylistic fluency when it came to writing ‘educated Dutch’.

Journalists in Diest and Brussels apparently had access to knowledge about new official orthography norms and also had the ability to adopt and implement

these spelling systems. In some cases this was done immediately after the official adoption by the state, in others newspapers used an older standard norm or a personal, consistent and invariable spelling system instead.

Most surprisingly, administration clerks in the early nineteenth century had no problems whatsoever to switch between official spelling systems from one day to another. We are at loss when it comes to explaining this skill at a time when lower education in Dutch was poor and higher education virtually not existing.

In each of these cases the details and the nature of diffusion phase remain fundamentally unclear, especially regarding the educational context. The lion's share of scholarly attention on nineteenth-century Dutch, so far, has focused on the selection and codification phases of the language. We are in dire need of a solid description of the important elements in that third phase, especially concerning language teaching. We need clear insight in the mechanisms that furthered the knowledge of writing skills and spelling systems. We also need a better understanding of the link between social change and identity formation, on the one hand, and the spread of written Standard Dutch among *all* social classes, on the other.

The third stage of Haugen's standardisation model (implementation and educational spread) may be the crux for a genuinely new understanding and interpretation of Dutch language history. Any attempt to solve this problem will require a strong focus on the interdisciplinary aspects of historical sociolinguistics. Insights and analyses from the domains of historical pedagogy and historical sociology – in combination with supranational collaboration<sup>7)</sup> between historical sociolinguists – may open the necessary perspectives that cannot be reached in the splendid isolation of language history proper.

## Notes

- <sup>1)</sup> Stating that the Dutch spoken and written in Flanders at the time was nothing but a collection of local traditional dialects may be too harsh, however. Previous research in the town of Bruges has shown that members of all social classes wrote Dutch around 1800, be it in various degrees of uniformity and with a lot of idiosyncratic variation (Vandenbussche 2002).
- <sup>2)</sup> A comparative analysis between the quality of written Dutch in Flanders and the Netherlands at the time remains one of the many desiderata in historical sociolinguistic research in the Dutch language area.
- <sup>3)</sup> The main differences between Siegenbeek and Willems concerned the spelling of long [a:] and [ei]; the latter preferred <ae> over <aa> and <y> over <ij>, respectively.
- <sup>4)</sup> While the De Vries – Te Winkel system was already used in schools in the Netherlands at the time, the Dutch parliament only decreed it as the official norm in 1883.
- <sup>5)</sup> Note that this only affected the higher supra-regional administration: local town administrations in Flanders could function in French up until 1932.

- <sup>6)</sup> Bruges does not appear in the overview because the town council used French from 1830 to 1897. The Dutch fragments that did reappear in the council records from 1889 onwards were all written according to the De Vries – Te Winkel norm.
- <sup>7)</sup> The University of Agder and its former rector, Ernst Håkon Jahr, have been amongst the front-runners enabling and stimulating this collaboration for years now. As one of the founding members of the Historical Sociolinguistics Network HiSoN, I am truly grateful for this continued support and sincerely happy to be able to contribute the present article to a University of Agder book project.

## Bibliography

- Boeva, Luc. 1994. *Pour les Flamands la même chose. Hoe de taalgrens ook een sociale grens was*. Gent: Provinciebestuur Oost-Vlaanderen.
- Callewaert, H. 1963. *Bijdrage tot de studie van het analfabetisme en het lager onderwijs te Brugge*. Unpublished Master's thesis. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
- Couvreur, Walter & Willemyns, Roland. 1998. Spellingoorlog. In: *Nieuwe Encyclopedie van de Vlaamse Beweging*, 2802–2805. Tiel: Lannoo.
- Haest, R. 1982. *Galicismen in het Zuidnederlands. Een onderzoek naar interferentievervalsingen in Antwerpse krantentaal van 1700 tot 1900*. Rijksuniversiteit Gent. Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Milroy, James. 1999. The consequences of standardisation in descriptive linguistics. In Tony Bex & Richard Watts (eds): *Standard English. The widening debate*, 16–39. London: Routledge.
- NEVB. 1998. *Nieuwe Encyclopedie van de Vlaamse Beweging*. Tiel: Lannoo
- Peeters, Constant. 1930. *Nederlandsche taalgids. Woordenboek van Belgicismen*. Antwerpen: De Sikkel.
- Teleman, Ulf. 2003. Swedish. In Ana Deumert & Wim Vandenbussche (eds): *Standard Germanic, past to present*, 405–429. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van de Gucht, Hilke. 2007. *Verkennd onderzoek naar de spelling in Brusselse kranten uit de 19de eeuw*. Vrije Universiteit Brussel. Master's thesis.
- Vandenbussche, Wim. 1999. *Een bijdrage tot de studie van het taalgebruik van de lagere klassen in het 19de-eeuwse Brugge*. Vrije Universiteit Brussel. Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Vandenbussche, Wim. 2002. Dutch orthography in lower, middle and upper class texts in 19<sup>th</sup> century Flanders. In Andrew Linn & Nicola McLelland (eds.): *Standardization. Studies from the Germanic languages*, 29–42. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vandenbussche, Wim. 2007. 'Lower class language' in 19th century Flanders. *Multilingua* 26/2-3, 279–290.
- Vandenbussche, Wim, De Groof, Jetje, Vanhecke, Eline & Willemyns, Roland. 2004. Historical sociolinguistics in Flanders: Rediscovering the 19th century. In Helen Christen (ed.): *Varietäten und Varianten im sozialen und zeitlichen Raum*, 49–80. Wien: Edition Praesens Verlag.
- Vandenbussche, Wim, Willemyns, Roland, De Groof, Jetje & Vanhecke, Eline. 2005. Taming thistles and weed amidst the wheat: language gardening in 19th century Flanders. In Winifred Davies & Nils Langer (eds.): *Linguistic purism in the Germanic languages*, 46–61. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.
- Vandueren, Sara. 2006. *Het taalgebruik in de Dieste kranten in de 19de eeuw*. Vrije Universiteit Brussel. Master's thesis.

- Vanhecke, Eline. 2007. *Stedelijke kanselarijtaal in Vlaanderen in de 19<sup>de</sup> eeuw*. Vrije Universiteit Brussel. Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Van Sterkenburg, Piet. 1992. *Het Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal. Portret van een Taalmonument*. 's-Gravenhage, Sdu Uitgeverij.
- Willemyns, Roland. 2003. Dutch. In Ana Deumert & Wim Vandenbussche (eds.): *Standard Germanic, past to present*, 93–125. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Willemyns, Roland & Haeseryn, René. 1998. Taal. In *Nieuwe Encyclopedie van de Vlaamse Beweging*, 2931–2946. Tielt: Lannoo.

Wim Vandenbussche  
Vrije Universiteit Brussel  
Centre for Linguistics  
Pleinlaan 2  
1050 Brussels  
BELGIUM  
Wim.Vandenbussche@vub.ac.be