

Piet VAN STERKENBURG⁽¹⁾ and Roland WILLEMYS⁽²⁾

1. The identity of Dutch

1.1. The name of Dutch

There is often some confusion as to the name of the Dutch language. One of the first names ever used for the non-Roman languages of Western Europe derives from *theudisk*, which meant 'the language of the people, as opposed to Latin'. *Diets* and *Duits* (in Dutch) as well as *Deutsch* (in German) are its modern cognate forms. The fact that in English the language of the Low Countries is called *Dutch* is prove enough of how confusing this could be. In Dutch, the name of the language is *Nederlands*. It was used for the first time in 1482, but it took until the end of the 19th or the beginning of the 20th century for the name to become really popular (Van der Sijs: 2004, 102-103; Willemys: 2003, 16-17). Yet, in colloquial speech inhabitants of the Netherlands often refer to it as *Hollands* (Hollandic), whereas in Flanders its colloquial name is *Vlaams* (Flemish). This makes it all the more complicated and confusing for foreigners who are often led to the erroneous interpretation that two different languages are meant. Yet, in spite of regional differences as they occur in all pluricentric languages, we are in the presence of only one single language. A discussion of the English terminology with respect to regional varieties of Dutch is to be found in Donaldson (1983).

(1) Piet van Sterkenburg (Breda, 1942) obtained his doctorate in 1975 with a dissertation on the medieval glossary tradition in the Low Countries. In 1976 Van Sterkenburg became Acting Chief Editor of *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (WNT, Dictionary of the Dutch Language on historical Principles) and in 1977 to Director of the Institute for Dutch Lexicology in Leyden. Since 1985 he is Professor of Lexicology at the University of Leyden. He has been the Secretary-General of the Permanent International Committee of Linguists (CIPL) since 1992.

(2) Roland Willemys is a professor of Dutch Linguistics at the Vrije Universiteit in Brussels. He teaches post graduate courses and seminars on historical linguistics, sociolinguistics, dialectology, Middle Dutch and the history of the Dutch language. He has published extensively in all these fields, as well as on language contact, language planning, and language policy. During the past decade his research focused mainly on historical sociolinguistics.

1.2. The family affiliation of Dutch

Dutch is a West Germanic language as are English, Low German, High German, Frisian, as well as Afrikaans and Yiddish (Deumert & Vandenbussche 2003).

1.3. The distinctive features of Dutch

1.3.1. Phonology

In what follows below, spoken word forms are given in a rather approximate phonetic notation without specifying phonetic detail.

(a) VOWELS

The basic inventory consists of five short vowels: a [α] (*bak*), e [ε] (*pet*), i [I] (*pit*), o

[ɔ] (*pot*), u [Y] (*put*); six long vowels aa (*maat*), ee (*beek*), ie (*dief*), oo (*boot*), oe [u] (*boek*) and uu [y] (*fuut*); and five diphthongs eu [ø] (*beuk*), ei/ij [ɛI] (*leid*, *lijd*), ou/au (*bout*, *rauw*) and ui [œy] (*muis*).

In weak (always unstressed) syllables there occurs a reduced vowel, the so-called schwa [ə]: *etən*.

(b) CONSONANT

Dutch has the voiceless fricatives f, s, ch [X] (*chaos*) and the voiceless occlusives p, t, k. In addition it has the voiced fricatives v, z, g (*gas*) and the voiced occlusives b and d. There are also the nasals m, n and ng [ŋ] (*ring*, *bang*) and the liquids l and r. The r is generally articulated at the back of the mouth but sometimes at the front. Finally there are the semivowels j and w, which are articulated with unrounded and somewhat rounded lips respectively. At the end of a word a voiced fricative or occlusive is unvoiced. The final sound of *hond* is unvoiced (pronounced as a t), as is the final sound of *web* (pronounced as p). The phenomenon of terminal devoicing is also seen in the morphology of the verb: *ik word* (pronounced as a t) with *wij worden* etc. We see this phenomenon too in the conjugation of verbs: *ik leef* (from the verb *leven*, but not spelt with a v) with *wij leven*, and *ik verhuis* (from the verb *verhuizen*, but not spelt with a z) with *wij verhuizen*.

(c) PROSODY

Stress (or accent) in Dutch depends on intensity (coupled with length) of pronunciation. The old native words original to Dutch have their first syllable stressed, e.g. *appel*, *tafel*, *kamer*, *visboer*, *timmerman*. Only initial syllables centred on a schwa are not stressed, e.g. *verleiden*, *beschouwen*. Occasionally words are distinguished on the basis of their accentuation, e.g. *dóórlopen* versus *doorlópen*. Sometimes the stress jumps in derivatives, e.g. *kóning* versus *koningín*, *áfstand* versus *afstándelijk*.

1.3.2. Morphology

Derivation creating new words happens frequently like in other Germanic languages. Compounding is an extremely productive morphological device in Dutch. Modern Dutch has two numbers (singular and plural). Endings are used to inflect for number (most plural forms ending in *-en*, *-s* or *-eren*). Some nouns have their plurals ending in *-en* and *-s*, e.g. *koloniën* and *kolonies*. The substantive has a limited form ending in *-s* and *-en* to form the genitive case, e.g. *vaders hoed*, *'s winters*). In set expressions the substantive sometimes has a form ending in *-e* that we name dative, e.g. *van harte*, *bij monde van*. Most adjectives have two forms, one with *-e* and one without. All material adjectives (e.g. *zilveren horloge*) and adjectives derived from geographical forms ending in *-er* (e.g. *Edammer kaas*) – among others – have no inflected form.

There is also inflection for comparison: comparative in general by means of *-er*, superlative with *-st*. Verbs are conjugated in tense and mode. The copulative verbs, particularly *zijn* and *worden* are used to form the passive. Verbs fall into two classes: strong verbs (with no ending for past tense but mostly with vowel change, ablaut, between the tenses) and weak verbs (with *-te* or *-de* forming the past tense). The system of inflections has been largely eroded and is limited to fossilised forms and a few pronouns. For instance, the personal pronouns *ik*, *mij* (I, me); *jij*, *jou* (you singular, nominative and accusative); *hij*, *hem* (he, him), *zij*, *hun/hen* (they, them). The pronouns *gij*, *uwe* en *jelui* (forms of “you”) have fallen into disuse and have been replaced by *u* and *jullie*. The reflexive *zich* can also be regarded as forming part of the Dutch typology. And finally there is the adverb *er*.

1.3.3. Syntax

The language is characterised by a fixed word order. It is an SVO language. In terms of gender, Standard Dutch has three genders± masculine, feminine and neuter. The great majority of nouns are either only *de*-words or are combined only with *het*. The *de*-words are referred to by the relative pronouns *hij*, *zij*, *deze* en *die*; they are combined with the adjectival pronouns *onze* and *welke*. The *het*-words are referred to – for example – by the relative pronouns *het*, *dit*, *dat*; they are combined with the adjectival pronouns *ons* and *welk*. There are three articles: *de* and *het* (both definite) and *een* (indefinite). There is a personal pronoun (*je*) to express solidarity or familiarity and one to express politeness or distance (*u*). Dutch has a periphrastic passive using the auxiliary verbs *zijn* and *worden*. As far as spoken Dutch is concerned, there are the following additional characteristics: the use, at the beginning of each main sentence, of certain types of conjunctions such as the copulative *en*, the situational *nou*, the motivational *want*, the consecutive *dus* and the contrasting *maar*; the use of shortened forms of the third person personal pronoun: *ie*, *'m*, *d'r*, *da's*, *m'n*, *'r* and the use of the repetitive *ja* and *nee*.

1.3.4. Vocabulary

A large part of the Dutch lexicon is of Indo-European and Germanic provenance (*een, geit, hond, koe, vee*) but loan words have entered the language in considerable numbers. Dutch has borrowed by far the greatest number from the Romance languages, followed – a long way behind – by the Germanic, and the number of loan words from other languages equals something more than half of those borrowed from the Germanic languages. Of the total key words found in the *Etymologisch Woordenboek van Van Dale* (30,524) 25% are native words and 74% loan words. Acronyms are on the increase, as also are artificial words formed with morpheme blends (*hamburger, halvamel*) and with neo-classical elements (*geo-, nefro-, -troop*).

1.3.5. Alphabet and spelling

The Dutch alphabet is based on the Latin alphabet, with the addition of the letters v and w. The Dutch orthography is a historical product. Dutch spelling is based on three important principles:

1. A word is spelt using the sounds heard in the standard pronunciation of that word.
2. The same word, root, prefix or suffix is written in the same way (uniformity) in so far as possible.
3. When words are written down, the historical development (etymology) is taken into account.

2. The history of written Dutch

2.1. Periodization

We usually differentiate between Old, Middle and New Dutch. Low Franconian is the basic component of Old Dutch (Quak 1997) and it is generally agreed upon that Ingvaenic elements played an important part as well, but there is no certainty as to its amount or real impact.

Unfortunately, there are not many written records of Dutch prior to the 12th century. Some words have been recorded in the *Lex Salica* and the *Malmbergse Glossen* (Schoonheim 2003). One of the best known and largest texts is a psalm translation called *De Wachtendonckse Psalmen* (De Grauwe 1979). It is supposed to have been written in the 9-10th century in the Rhine-Meuse region in an easterly flavored variety of Old Dutch. Although we have some other texts as well (Gysseling 1977ff is an annotated edition of all texts written prior to 1300), the amount of Old Dutch texts handed down to us is considerably smaller than in the case of Old Saxon, Anglo Saxon or Old High German. We have to wait until the second half of the 13th century to see the beginning of a continuous written tradition. Traditionally this is deemed to be the commencement of Middle Dutch.

Although the earliest preserved Dutch documents originate from the eastern part of the language territory, it is definitely Flanders - with important cities as Brugge (Bruges), Gent (Ghent) and Ieper (Ypres) - that emerges as the cradle of Dutch: of the almost 2,100 documents written before 1300, 70% are from Flanders (Willemyns 2003, p. 68). The two most successful authors during the initial period of Middle Dutch literature, viz. Jacob van Maerlant and Willem, the author of *Reynard the Fox*, were both Flemings. In the 13th century Brugge was the paramount center of written Dutch as far as the administrative as well as the literary variety of the language was concerned.

In 1384 Flanders was the first part of the Netherlands to politically merge with the Duchy of Burgundy (the Duke had married the daughter of the Count of Flanders) and thus to create one of the most powerful and culturally outstanding countries in the late Middle Ages. During the course of the 15th century Brugge was the most flourishing trade capital of that empire and by far the most important and trendsetting city of the Netherlands. Brugge's language variety, therefore, has contributed decisively to the development of Dutch. On the other hand, Burgundian rule also marked the increase of administrative bilingualism in the Netherlands (Armstrong, 1965) and thus of the kind of Dutch-French language contact that was going to characterize the linguistic situation in the Low Countries for centuries to come.

From the very beginning of the Middle Dutch writing tradition a linguistic contrast between an easternly and a westerly shaped variety can be witnessed. The main feature of the east-west opposition was the presence (east) or absence (west) of the secondary umlaut and the completely different inflectional systems that resulted from it (Goossens 1989). In the 16th century, though, the economic and political center of gravity shifted to Brabant: Antwerp, Mechelen and Brussels developed into the more important centers. It is during this period that a standard variety of the written language was slowly taking shape. In the language territory at large the early 17th century marks the start of the New Dutch period.

The standardization process, though, would very soon change its course dramatically as a result of the revolt of the Netherlands against Roman Catholic Spanish rule, starting in the sixties of the 16th century. The political split of the language area, which occurred as a consequence of that war, had a dramatic impact on the evolution of Dutch. From 1585 onward The Netherlands were divided into two separate parts (more or less present-day Holland and Belgium), each with its specific political, cultural, religious, and social development. Holland's 17th century is known as its Golden Age, reflecting both economic and cultural prosperity. Influential writers such as Vondel, Hooft, Bredero, Cats, and Huygens coined the writing standard for ages to come in a Republic that had developed into one of the super powers of that time. The southern regions, on the contrary, stagnated culturally, economically, and intellectually. In the north, the standardization of Dutch, although still strongly influenced by the southern tradition, gathered momentum in a specifically Hollandic flavored way. In the south the Dutch language gradually lost a number of its functions mainly to French and its contribution to the elaboration of the Dutch standard language decreased and eventually stopped. Gradually, the former west-east opposition was supplemented by a north-south contrast.

2.2. *Language development prior to the 19th century*

Apart from some occasional observations on the mutual intelligibility of the Middle Dutch writing dialects, purposeful attempts in the direction of language planning aimed at unifying written Dutch prior to the 16th century are not known.

The shift of the center of gravity from Flanders to Brabant which draw attention to linguistic diversity and variation may have been one of the main triggers of standardization, the need, mainly created by the Reformation sweeping over the Low Countries, to produce texts supposed to be understood by an as large as possible audience in various parts of the language territory, certainly was another one. In general, the awareness which is the necessary preliminary condition for standardization attempts to start, may be said to have been present from the early 16th century onward. It was supported - if not initiated - by major societal changes caused by the invention of the art of printing, the reformation, renaissance and humanism.

In the course of the 16th century Dutch has, as De Vries, Willemys and Burger (2003, p.59) put it “come of age: a language to speak and to write, to praise God, to pursue science, alongside with being the language of poets and administrators it had been for centuries already”. The lingua franca at the European level though, continued to be Latin and one of the most famous Netherlanders ever, Desiderius Erasmus (who died in 1536), wrote his books in that language. Yet, more and more people in Europe overall and in the Low Countries in particular, urged the use of the mother tongue in as many domains as possible. Jan Gymnich from Antwerp is the first we know of (in 1541), and many others are soon to follow suit. Yet, broadening the domains of the vernacular also led to the awareness that it needed some “refinement and uniformity” in order to be able to assume the kind of functions performed by the classical languages who were thought by many to be “intrinsically better” than the vernaculars. The *Naembouck*, a dictionary published by the Ghent printer Joos Lambrecht (1551) was one of the very first corpus planning instruments. Status planning was provided by famous scientists writing their treatises in the vernacular. By far and large the most productive linguistic innovator of his age was Simon Stevin from Brugge, a mathematician, musicologist, engineer, astronomer, in short an all round scientist. Having fled to the North during the war with Spain, he was the first professor to teach in his mother tongue at the university of Leiden and it was in Dutch as well that he published almost all of his scientific books. He invented a lot of Dutch words for scientific terminology The name of his science itself *wiskunde* has replaced *mathematics* (Hagen, 1999).

Creating some kind of “general” Dutch, a variety understood by as many people as possible, was not only a dream of book printers. It was shared by those propagating Luther’s and Calvin’s religious reforms. None of them was very successful, though (De Vries, Willemys and Burger 2003, p. 60-62). It took until 1637 for the *Statenbijbel* not only to create, but also to implement and spread a standardized language which influenced modern standard Dutch more than anything else (see infra).

The 16th century is also a period in which scores of ‘*spraakkonstenaars*’ are struggling with spelling and grammar, considered by most to be one

and the same thing. Joos Lambrecht was also the author of the first spelling treatise (*Nederlandsche Spellijnghe*; 1550). The most important 16th century grammar is the *Twe-spraack vande Nederduitsche Letterkunst*, by Spiegel in 1584 (Hagen 1999, p. 14-16). Although the author does not try to hide his Amsterdam origins, he emphasizes that his norm, is not that of the common Hollander, but the idiolect of the cultivated and educated classes. This marks the beginning of a new approach in the standardization debate: as far as the elaboration and implementation of the norm are concerned, the social variable grows ever more important, to the detriment of the regional variable.

Scientific lexicology in the 16th century prospered even more than grammar. The Antwerp master printer Christoffel Plantijn wrote as well as commissioned very important and innovating dictionaries. Cornelis Kiliaan was the author of one of the most famous dictionaries in the Low Countries ever, the *Etymologicum Teutonicae linguae sive Dictionarium Teutonico-Latinum*, first published in 1574, but best known in the revised third edition of 1599. Kiliaan not only described the vocabulary of Dutch, he also included etymological comments and indicated in which regional dialects the listed words were used. Finally he added the translation in both High German and Latin. He definitely produced the first scientific dictionary of a vernacular, second to none in Europe. Obviously, this is also the paramount status planning instrument of the Dutch language in the field of lexicology (Van Sterkenburg 2006).

In the summer of 1585 the Spanish recaptured Antwerp, the last of the important cities of The Netherlands to fall into Spanish hands. The split of the country was a fact now. The massive exodus of southern Netherlanders toward England, Germany, but mostly the northern Netherlands reached its climax. Antwerp emptied. Holland became the economic and cultural center of Europe, but for a substantial part, the glory of Holland's Golden Age was paid for by money coming from Flanders and Brabant.

The massive exodus was also a brain drain, emptying the Southern Netherlands of its influential philosophers, scientists and artists. Many of them were 'men of words': theologians, preachers, professors, teachers, authors, and printers. The spoken word in Holland was heavily accented with a southern flavor and a lot of that Flemish and Brabantic influence was there to stay in Standard Dutch forever, be it mostly in the more formal written variety.

The 17th century is Holland's Golden Age and Holland magnificently displays its interest in all aspects of its own civilization, including its language. We witness the appearance of a large number of treatises on grammar and spelling. The most influential one is Christiaen van Heule's *De Nederduytsche spraec-konst ofte tael-beschrijvinghe* (1633). The main objective of those grammars is to prescribe a norm and change the language accordingly. The acclaimed writers are, of course, influential in their own right, both by the way they write and by what they have to say on language usage. According to Vondel, the most prestigious poet, the norm of the language was to be found in the idiolect of the upper classes of both Amsterdam and The Hague. Once again we see how the social variable supercedes the regional one and until deep in the 19th century having a regional accent will be deemed less of a problem than having the wrong social accent. Up to a certain point this is still the case as of today.

The most influential language planning instrument by far, though, was the *Statenbijbel* (Bible of the States, 1637). The Northern protestant state was badly in need of an appropriate translation of the Bible and at the request of the executive body (called *Staten-Generaal*), the Synod of Dordrecht (1618-19) appointed a commission that was very carefully composed of members representing all dialect regions of The Low Countries, from the South as well as from the North. As a result, the language of the *Statenbijbel*, actually created for the purpose, carefully combined northern and southern characteristics and became the basis of the northern written language and writing tradition, thus preventing northern and southern varieties of the language of growing too far apart.

It is generally thought that the impact of 18th century grammarians on the evolution and standardization of northern Dutch was rather limited. Yet, there are quite a few influential grammarians to be mentioned, e.g. Arnold Moonen (*Nederduitsche spraakkunst*; 1706) and Willem Sewel (*Nederduytsche Spraekkonst*; 1708) (De Bonth et.al. 1997, 367).

We also witness the breakthrough of a new and inspiring grammatical principle, viz. that grammarians ought not to invent rules, but only propagate those which can be derived from real language usage. This point of view was formulated for the first time by Lambert ten Kate in his internationally famous *Aenleiding tot de kennisse van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche sprake* (1723).

Meanwhile, and as a result of the Spanish War of Succession (1702-1713), the southern Netherlands were passed on from the Spanish to the Austrian Habsburgs, both of which used to rule their Dutch speaking lands and citizens in French. Consequently, Dutch was gradually losing more functions to French and less and less people were interested in the quality of the mother tongue anymore. Although Dutch was still spoken and written by the large majority of the population and used for administrative purposes, it lost prestige and, for lacking contact with the North, did no longer participate in the language standardization process that took place over there. That is probably why most southern grammarians (and strangely enough, there still were many of them) advised their readers to conform to the northern norm. This, of course, was hardly practical advice, since the southerners had no way of knowing how language was developing in the northern parts. The same, evidently, applied to the grammarians themselves who prescribed rules of their own, mostly based on their personal regional dialect. One of the most popular grammarians appears to have been Andries Steven (*Nieuwen Nederlandschen Voorschriftenboek*, New Dutch Grammar; 1711). More influential still was Jan des Roches. This former teacher from The Hague was the secretary of the 'Imperial' Academy of Sciences in Brussels and the most important counselor to the Austrian rulers in the fields of language and education. He published both a grammar *De nieuwe Nederduytsche Spraekkonst* ([New Dutch Grammar], 1761) and a dictionary *Fransch-Nederduytsch woordenboek* ([French-Dutch dictionary], 1782). His spelling system was the first ever to be officially promulgated by a government in The Netherlands, viz. in 1777 (De Groof 2003).

2.3. Language Planning in the 19th century

2.3.1. The Northern Netherlands

In the Northern Netherlands, the early 19th century saw the real beginning of ‘Netherlandistics’ as a scientific, academic discipline and its two pioneers were Matthijs Siegenbeek (1774-1854) and Petrus Weiland (1754-1842), the authors of the official and authoritative spelling and grammar: Weiland’s grammar (*Nederduitsche spraakkunst*) was published in 1805, Siegenbeek’s orthographic treatise (*Verhandeling over de spelling der Nederduitsche taal en bevordering van eenparigheid in derzelve*) in 1804 (De Bonth 1997, 380 ff.).

In mid 19th century the normative tradition gives way, as far as scientific linguistics is concerned, to historic-comparative linguistics which was going to dominate the European scene for the rest of that century. Although the every day usage of the language continues to be affected by norms and rules, the standardization process is influenced by historic linguistics as well. One of its most prominent representatives, Matthias de Vries (1820-1892), was to be the initiator and the first author of the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (WNT). It were two students of his, Jacob Verdam and Eelco Verwijs who were the authors of the 10 volume *Middelnerlandsch Woordenboek* (‘Middle Dutch Dictionary’), the first volume of which appeared in 1885.

Hulshof (1997, p. 455) labels the outgoing 19th century in Holland as ‘a period of transition from an unnatural written language to a civilized spoken language’. In his Dutch text Hulshof uses the very familiar abbreviation ABN (*Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands* ‘General Civilized Dutch’) which has been used for decades to designate, both in Holland and in Belgium, the normative standard language. It has now been replaced by AN (*Algemeen Nederlands* ‘General Dutch’).

Anyway, as Hulshof (1997, p. 477) rightly observes, at the end of the 19th century, the linguistic picture in The Netherlands is still firmly characterized by a regionally flavored spoken variety on the one side and a normative, slightly old-fashioned written language variety on the other.

And here again, the social variable was the paramount one. In spite of the apparently democratic slogan ‘write as you speak’, it was actually and paradoxically a rather elitist affair, since the only spoken language deemed fit to imitate in writing was the so-called ‘civilized language’ of the social and intellectual elite. At that very moment, Hulshof (1997, p. 458) says, competence in this ‘general spoken language’ was limited to a ‘small upper layer of society’. Even half a century later, the famous Dutch linguist G.G. Kloeke estimated that competence in ‘ABN’ was limited to some 3% of the population of the Netherlands (Kloeke, 1951). Obviously propagating this variety was also seen as a way of perpetuating social distinctions by way of language.

2.3.2. Flanders

Due to a very different political development and a continuing history of language contact and language conflict with French, the fate of Dutch in Flanders was a completely different one.

In 1795 the Southern Netherlands were annexed by France and for the first time in history there was a massive official attempt to legally suppress the use of the Dutch language.

The short-lived reunification of Belgium and Holland as one 'United Kingdom of the Netherlands' (1814-1830) was of the utmost importance to the Flemings, who suddenly rediscovered their language for administration, politics, the courts, and higher education, areas where it had been neglected for almost two centuries. A small group of cultural leaders and intellectuals were strongly influenced by both the Dutch standard language and the new linguistic opportunities. In this way the short period of reunification was also decisive for the success of the Flemish Movement which would gradually succeed in turning the linguistic make-up of Flanders and Belgium upside down.

By 1830 Belgium had become an independent constitutional monarchy with a parliamentary system dominated by the bourgeois elite, which secured its position by adopting a poll-tax system (out of 3.5 million people, only 46,000 had the right to vote). For this bourgeoisie, French was a natural choice as the language of the state. The government appointed only French-speaking civil servants and the discrimination of Dutch throughout the 19th century was general and very deliberate (Willemys 2003b, pp. 102-108).

To the first leaders of the Flemish Movement it appeared very soon that to obtain linguistic rights for Dutch-speakers was only possible by the means of a linguistic legislation which in its turn could only be brought about by enhancing the prestige of the language. At the same time increased linguistic rights for Dutch speakers was a necessary condition to influence language development.

Consequently, several problems emerged simultaneously, one of them being that the Dutch language in Belgium needed standardization, needed to be transformed into a tool fit to perform all the functions a language has to perform in a modern, industrialized state.

Two factions may be discerned: those advocating a domestic standardization, based on the local, regional varieties, called *particularists*, and those insisting that basically the northern model should be followed and that, in other words, the Flemings should take over as much as possible the standard language as it already existed in the North. They were called the *integrationists* and after a few decades it clearly appeared that the integrationist solution had prevailed and that their victory was never more to be seriously challenged afterwards.

It has also been the integrationist intellectual elite that organized an *Algemeen Nederlandsch Congres* ('Pan Dutch Congress') in 1849. This North-South reunion was to serve a double purpose: establishing contact with 'men of letters' from the Northern Netherlands would not only favor 'the advancement of the Dutch language and literature' but would also strengthen the Flemish Movement (Willemys, 1993).

One of the most important practical results of the congress was the decision to commission an extensive dictionary, viz. the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (Dictionary of the Dutch Language; see chapter 7). From the very beginning financial support was provided by both the Dutch

and the Belgian governments. The *WNT* was a major instrument in both the elaboration and the implementation of the integrationist norm.

The so-called ‘language struggle’ which was going to dominate Belgian political life started in 1830 as well. Although the constitution provided for ‘linguistic freedom’, it was obvious that this ‘freedom’ was only profitable to the rich and the powerful, i.e. the bourgeoisie from Wallonia and Flanders, most of whom were French speakers. Hence, despite the fact that Dutch speakers constituted the majority of the population, no legal means was provided for their language. The Flemish Movement had to fight a long lasting battle for cultural and linguistic rights for Dutch speakers. It took until 1898 for the *Gelijkheidswet* to declare Dutch and French the two official languages of the country. It took a complete century to finally obtain that Dutch speaking university students were taught in their own language (in 1930). Afterwards things developed considerably faster: two sets of laws in 1932 and 1963 guaranteed what had been the ultimate goal of the Flemish Movement i.e. the official and complete ‘Dutchification’ of Flanders. The Walloons having been opposed to widespread bilingualism throughout the country, Belgium gradually turned to the territoriality principle model to accommodate the various linguistic groups. It turned the language frontier into a domestic administrative border, made it virtually unchangeable and accomplished the linguistic homogeneity of the language groups and regions. Revisions of the constitution in 1970 and 1980 provided for cultural autonomy and a considerable amount of self-determination for the linguistically divided parts of the country. Subsequent constitutional changes in 1988 and 1993 finally turned Belgium into the federal country it is now (Alen and Suetens, 1993).

2.4. The Twentieth Century

2.4.1. Elaboration and Implementation of the Standard Language in the Northern Netherlands

The Netherlands, prior to WW II was, as Van den Toorn (1997, 479) reminds us, a conservative country and ‘that applies to the Dutch language as well: there were no substantial changes until long after 1940’. Between 1920 and 1940 the main language planning focus is on ‘the longing for and the pursuit of a standardized language’. As far as linguistic characteristics is concerned, the basis of that emerging ‘ABN’ is the language used by the better situated classes in the larger western cities (the *Randstad*) and this Hollandic variety has won acceptance and has subsequently been implemented through the educational system and through the influence of the media. Gradually, Van den Toorn says, the western flavor grew more important than the ‘general’ characteristic.

2.4.2. Elaboration and Implementation of the Standard Language in Flanders

During the whole 19th and part of the 20th century the lack of direct and frequent contact with the Netherlands made the implementation of the norm

in Belgium a precarious and difficult problem. The popularization of radio and, afterwards, television was undoubtedly the first major means helping to overcome practical problems. Yet another was the massive ‘entrance into battle’ of the core of Flemish linguists. All radio and television channels and almost every newspaper had a daily column, respectively prime time program to help Flemings to gain proficiency in the northern flavored standard language which was, as was constantly repeated, *their own*. As opposed to Holland, during the larger part of the 20th century the focus was on eliminating regional accents, rather than on stressing the social component. Yet in Flanders too, the ‘civilized’ component of ABN (General *Civilized* Dutch) used to be heavily stressed.

2.4.3. *The Norm*

Dutch being a pluricentric language it is not only normal that the actual realization of the norm may vary slightly according to region, but even that the very notion of the norm itself is not necessarily identical in all parts of the language territory. Although nowadays the consensus on the norm is much larger than it used to be, different views still exist. Yet, most people indulging in it, be it professional linguists or amateurs, explicitly or implicitly accept the norm to be a changing notion, i.e. a device which may change in time or from region to region. They also accept a certain amount of variation being inherent to it.

As far as the norm instruments are concerned, there is a general consensus on where they are to be found: *Van Dale’s* dictionary (*Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandse taal*) and the *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst* (ANS; ‘General Dutch Grammar’) are undoubtedly the generally accepted referees in norm discussions and function as prescriptive instruments, in Belgium as well as in The Netherlands. The so-called *Groene Boekje* (officially *Woordenlijst der Nederlandse Taal*) is the official spelling norm and is published under the authority of the ‘Nederlandse Taalunie’. As far as pronunciation is concerned it is less easy to pinpoint a norm source. None of the few existing pronunciation dictionaries has ever succeeded in acquiring the norm status of the publications mentioned above for other aspects of the language. As far as a detailed, yet concise discussion of the phonology, morphology and syntax of Dutch is concerned we refer to De Schutter (2002) and Kooij (1987).

3. The geography of Dutch

3.1. *The expansion of Dutch*

The fact that almost half of the population of The Netherlands lives in the so-called *Randstad* (the large urban agglomerations in the west of the country such as Amsterdam, Den Haag, Haarlem, Leiden, Rotterdam) is very revealing, not only for the social but also for the linguistic make-up of the country (Van Bree & De Vries, 1996). From the *Randstad*, where the modern Dutch standard language took shape from the 17th century onward,

it spread geographically as well as socially over the rest of the territory, at first only within the confines of the Netherlands but afterwards also in Belgium. Dialect use and mastery increase the further one moves away from the Randstad. Yet, more recent studies (all discussed in Willemyns, 1997) demonstrate that very often matters are much less straightforward. Both the acceptance of and the attitudes toward linguistic varieties are determined by the fact that the western standard language is not only the supra regional means of communication but also the sociolect of the 'better situated' classes in the country at large. Negative attitudes mainly derive from social resentment against this particular sociolect-function of the standard language. Yet, socially determined linguistic attitudes are the strongest in the Randstad itself: the 'urban dialects' of the popular classes in this highly urbanized region mostly provoke negative attitudes. Despite the fact that, from a purely linguistic point of view, the peripheral, so-called *regiolects* differ more widely from the standard than the urban dialects do, the attitudes toward them are generally more favorable, mainly because they mostly (still) lack the social stigma.

The linguistic situation in Flanders used to be characterized by the use of several codes from dialect on the one side of the linguistic continuum to standard Dutch on the other, with several codes in between. The decisive criterion is dialect interference: the more one goes into the direction of the standard, the less interference can be noticed. Dialect loss and dialect leveling, having gained momentum after WW II, are responsible for the disappearance of the former diglossic situation in Flanders at large. The use made of the various codes increasingly depends on societal and situational factors. During the last few decades the mastery and the use of regional dialects have declined dramatically and, at the same time, the use of and the proficiency in the standard variety has considerably increased (Willemyns 1997).

The conflict which used to exist between French and Dutch in Belgium also entailed consequences for the standardization process of Dutch itself, in that it favored language uniformity with Holland.

3.2. *Dutch in contact*

Expeditions in the 17th century brought the Dutch to the "East" and to the "West". The situation in the West, i.e. the Dutch Antilles, is described above. From 1609 to 1664 Dutch was the *lingua franca* in New Amsterdam, today's New York. Dutch was introduced into Surinam in 1667 when the English ceded the colony to the Netherlands in exchange for New Netherland. From 1619 to 1949 Dutch was the language of administration in the Dutch East Indies, today's Republic of Indonesia. As a consequence of the United East Indian Company having provision posts in Southern Africa since 1652, Dutch has become an official language in the four Republics of what is now South Africa. Afterwards it has been replaced by the domestic variety of Dutch, called Afrikaans. This daughter language of Dutch still is one of the official languages of South Africa (Ponelis, 1993, 2005).

In the Congo Belgian administrators have used almost exclusively French. Although there used to be many Dutch schools and even a university during

the final decades of Belgian rule, Dutch almost completely disappeared from the Congo after its independence in 1960.

3.2.1. *The languages of the insiders (dialects, minority languages, immigration languages)*

Up into the early twentieth century the rural communities in the Low Countries were largely dialect-speaking, whereas varieties of Standard Dutch prevailed in the major townships. The traditional dialect differences, which can be traced back to Old Dutch, are manifested both in pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary, and are so great that speakers of traditional dialects from geographical fringe areas have severe difficulties understanding each other. Over the last eighty years or so the dialects have undergone an ever accelerating dilution or extinction, however, so that the Standard Dutch is now spoken nation-wide in both The Netherlands and Flanders.

A considerable amount of foreign languages are spoken by immigrant groups in The Netherlands. According to Van Bree and De Vries (1996, p. 1144) the largest ethnic minorities are (1) Turks, Kurds, Moroccans and other Mediterranean groups (2) Surinamese (3) Antilleans from Aruba, Bonaire and Curacao (4) Moluccans, and (5) Chinese. Also, there is the special group of the 'Indo-Dutch', the descendants of marriages between the Dutch and the indigenous people of the former Dutch East Indies (Indonesia). All groups, with the exception of the first and (partly) the fifth speak Dutch, alongside with (sometimes even without) their languages of origin. Often special educational provisions are made not only to help them acquire mastery of Dutch but also to keep or gain proficiency in their native tongues.

3.2.2. *The languages of the outsiders*

(a) THE NETHERLANDS

The only autochthonous minority language in The Netherlands is *Frisian* which has regional official status in the province of Friesland (•••• 4% of the total population). It is in limited official use as a language of provincial and city administrations, of education, of the media and of the courts. For more information see www.univie.ac.at.

In the Dutch Antilles and on Aruba the Dutch language is under great pressure, especially from *Papiamento* (spoken by something like 300,000 people). *Papiamento* is mostly considered to be a Creole language and its origins are said to be Iberian (Spanish, Portuguese or Afro-Portuguese). The language came into use in the course of the 17th and 18th centuries in order to facilitate communication between slaves and masters and among slaves themselves.

(b) BELGIUM

For French and German speaking Belgium see the chapters on 'French' and 'German' in this volume.

3.3. *The Dutch speakers*

3.3.1. *Dutch as a “de jure” language*

In Europe Dutch is the official language of 6 million Belgians and 16 million Dutch. The *Low Countries* is the name which is often used in English to refer to the Dutch language territory in Europe. The Kingdom of the Netherlands is a de facto monolingual Dutch speaking country, with a small Frisian minority in its north-western province of Friesland. Belgium (\pm 10.5 million inhabitants) is a trilingual and federal country, consisting of 4 different entities constituted on the basis of language: the Dutch speaking community, called Flanders (58% of the population), the French speaking one, called Wallonia (32%), the small German speaking community (0.6%) and, the bilingual community of Brussels (9.5%). The language borders are defined in the constitution.

In the North of France Dutch dialects are still spoken by an ever increasing number of inhabitants of *French Flanders*, formerly part of the County of Flanders and annexed by the French in the course of the 17th century. There is no official status for Dutch in France though (Ryckeboer, 1997).

In America, Dutch is the (sole) official language of Surinam, a former Dutch colony (having become independent in 1975) situated in the north eastern part of South America. Also, Dutch is one of the official languages of the Dutch Antilles (Aruba, Bonaire, Curacao, and three smaller islands in the Carribean viz. Saba, St.Eustacius and St.Maarten). All enjoy an autonomous status since 1954, yet are still part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

The 22 million Dutch speakers occupy the 10th position in the 76-strong league of European languages. Among the appr. 6,000 languages of the world Dutch is on place 48 (*Ethnologue*, 1998). The Dutch language is under no threat whatsoever.

3.3.2. *Dutch as a “de facto” language*

The great majority of both and Flemish Dutch citizens have Dutch as their first language and use it for all purposes and at all levels except for certain commercial, technical and scientific applications of English. For Dutch citizens from a non-Dutch ethnic background mastery of the Dutch language is a key to employment and to integration in mainstream society.

Some recently published studies allow to elaborate on the future development of Dutch as well. In the northern Netherlands Stroop (1997) is currently detecting what he believes to be an increasing variation away from the conventional norm of Standard Dutch labeled *Poldernederlands*. A similar centrifugal evolution seems to be occurring in the South, where we witness the development of a linguistic variety often referred to as *Verkavelingsvlaams* (Van Istendael, 1993), *Schoon Vlaams* (Goossens, 2000) or *Tussentaal* (substandard; Taeldeman 1993).

The most prominent characteristic of *Poldernederlands* is the pronunciation *aai* for the diphthong [ei]: *tijd* ‘*taaid*, *klein* ‘*klaain*, as well as some other minor vowel changes (Stroop 1997, pp. 25-26). According to Stroop’s

sociolinguistic comments, the real origin of Poldernederlands is socially and not geographically determined. The group of speakers responsible for both the origin and the very fast spread of Poldernederlands are young, highly educated females (Stroop 1997, pp. 16-22).

The southern centrifugal tendency is the development of a substandard variety, based on essentially Brabantic characteristics. This is a variety which is neither standard language nor dialect, is almost exclusively used orally, displays a lot of Brabantic characteristics both in the lexicon and morphosyntactically, and is characterized by a large amount of dialect interference and gallicisms. Those characteristics are anything but new and they have always been present in former informal varieties. It has not been emphasized strongly enough that the genesis of this variety has to be related to the current process of dialect loss and that one is indeed a direct, and probably also an inevitable consequence of the other. Anyway, it is hard to predict whether this *Schoon Vlaams* is really going to become a 'new' language variety or whether it is merely an amount of features differing on the basis of age, gender, region or maybe even from person to person (Willemys, 2005).

3.4. Dutch and pluricentrism

Language development in general and standardization in particular proceed in a specific way in the case of pluricentric languages, i.e. languages used in more than one country (Clyne (2005). A common characteristic is that language usage and variety distribution in the periphery diverge from the center to a certain extent (Bister-Broosen & Willemys, 1988). In the Dutch language area Flanders is the external periphery and, consequently, language standardization there can never proceed along exactly the same lines as in the center of gravity, the northern "Randstad". Consequently, we will, whenever necessary, diversify the story of the development of Dutch according to what is relevant for which country.

4. The auxiliaries of Dutch

4.1. Institutions and language planning

The 'Nederlandse Taalunie' ('Dutch Linguistic Union') was installed under a treaty passed by the Dutch and Belgian governments in 1980, transferring to this international body their prerogatives in all matters concerning language and literature. The 'Taalunie' is composed of 4 institutions: a *Committee of Ministers*, comprising ministers of both countries; an *Interparliamentary Commission*, comprising MP's of both countries; a *Secretary General* and a *Council for Dutch Language and Literature*. Aiming at 'integrating as far as possible the Netherlands and the Dutch Speaking Community of Belgium in the field of the Dutch language and literature in the broadest sense' (art. 2), the *Nederlandse Taalunie* is undoubtedly a remarkable piece of work and a very unusual occurrence in international linguistic relations, since no

national government has so far conceded to a supra-national institution what is generally considered to be its own prerogative, i.e. to decide autonomously on linguistic and cultural affairs. Almost immediately after the ratification of the Treaty the Flemish government has replaced the Belgian government, which was no longer competent for cultural affairs. The activities of the *Nederlandse Taalunie* lie both in the fields of corpus and of status planning.

On December 12, 2003 it has adhered that Surinam would adhere to the 'Nederlandse Taalunie' as well (Jaspaert, 2004). This will obviously have some repercussions on the internal structure mentioned above.

4.2. Linguistic resources

4.2.1. Conventional resources

(a) ORTHOGRAPHY

In October 1945 a Dutch-Belgian Committee for the Advancement of the Dutch Language (*Nederlands-Belgische Commissie tot bevordering van de Nederlandse taal*) was established. As early as 1946 the Committee published a report with recommendations on spelling reform. In the same year the recommendations were declared binding by Royal Decree in Belgium. The same applied to the Netherlands in 1947. In 1946 and 1947 a so-called 'Vocabulary Committee' drew up a new list of words (*Woordenlijst voor de spelling der Nederlandsche taal*), to replace that of De Vries and Te Winkel, the last edition of which dated from 1914. After official approval the *Woordenlijst van de Nederlandse taal* was published in 1954 and constituted a new spelling legal in both countries. This particular spelling system was often and heavily attacked, for reasons too long to elaborate on here. Yet it took until 1995 before the present system (the so-called *Taalunie-system*) came into force. This new spelling has, once again, been visualized in a new official 'Woordenlijst' ('Word list'). In the meanwhile the authority to change the spelling had passed from the Belgian and Dutch governments respectively to the "Nederlandse Taalunie" and, therefore, the spelling unity in existence since 1864 can never be challenged or lost again. An introduction to the characteristic features of the Dutch spelling is provided in *Leidraad Woordenlijst Nederlandse taal* (2005).

(b) GRAMMARS

A detailed history of Dutch grammars can be found in Bakker and Dibbets (1977) and Smedts and Paardekooper (1999). Here we only list the scientific grammars of the twentieth century excluding the school grammars. We distinguish between three types of approach: traditional, structural and transformational-generative grammar.

(1) The traditional, logical-semantic description of grammar is to be found in:

(a) E. Rijpma and F.G. Schuringa: *Beknopte Nederlandsche Spraakkunst* (Concise Dutch Grammar), 1928 first edition, 1978 25th edition and (b) G.S. Overdiep, *Stilistische grammatica van het moderne Nederlandsch* (Stylistic Grammar of Modern Dutch), 1937 first edition, 1949 second one in cooperation

with Van Es. Rijpma and Schuringa designed deviations from the “normal” pattern, but are non-judgemental; the “normal” standard language is taken as the basis of the description. Overdiep takes the individual expression of language, the style of speaker or writer, as the central point.

(2) A.W. de Groot’s major concern is the systematics or structure of syntax in his *Structurele Syntaxis* (Structural Syntax), emphasising on the phrase and the classification of different groups as co-ordinating and subordinating particles. Mention should also be made here of the work of P.C. Paardenkooper who, in his *Beknopte ABN-syntaxis* (Brief Syntax of Standard Dutch) displays great interest in the science of phrases and syntax. His attitude to language can best be characterised as distributionalist, i.e. he regards the sentence parts as categories of place, that can be described by investigating the extent to which they have a fixed place, their exchangeability and the extent to which they can be omitted. His own idiolect is the starting point for his description of the language.

(3) The first transformational-generative grammar in the Netherlands, showing that an infinite number of sentences can be produced or generated in Dutch using a limited series of rules, has been written by A. Kraak and W.G. Klooster. Their *Syntaxis* (Syntax) appeared in 1968, to be followed in 1969 by the *Inleiding* (Introduction) to syntax by W.G. Klooster, H.J. Verkuyl and H.J. Luif. In 1972 *De taal van de mens* (Human Language) by F. Daems was published in Belgium, as was G. de Schutter’s *De Nederlandse zin. Poging tot beschrijving van zijn structuur* (The Dutch Sentence. An attempt to describe its structure) in 1974. This work mainly concentrates on generative semantics.

(4) Finally and foremost, there is the *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst* (General Dutch Grammar – ANS) (second edition 1997) by W. Haeseryn, K. Romijn, G. Geerts, J. de Rooij and M.C. van den Toorn. The ANS is concerned with “what is important in language use” and, has the ambition to be accessible to non-specialists. It is not prescriptive but simply notes and discusses the forms and constructions that occur in language.

(c) DICTIONARIES

A detailed description of the history of Dutch lexicography is to be found in Van Sterkenburg (2003 and 2007). Here we stick to a short characterization of the scientific dictionaries of the 19th and 20th centuries:

(1) *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (‘The Dictionary of the Dutch Language’). The WNT is a monolingual, alphabetical, historical-descriptive and scientific dictionary that belongs in the tradition of such works the *New English Dictionary* (James Murray) and the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (Grimm brothers). It contains information on the period from 1500 to 1921 (in some cases even up to 1977). The WNT is world’s largest dictionary: it takes up three meters of bookshelf space and boasts 39 volumes plus a supplement. A total of 3 million quotations are cited, 1,600,000 of them printed in the work itself. The number of words covered is around 350,000 to 400,000 (more information in Van Sterkenburg 2007).

(2) *The MNW: Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* (‘Middle Dutch Dictionary’). The MNW is so designed that it records the vocabulary used in literature in the narrower sense of the term. There are 10 volumes.

(3) The VMNW: *Vroegmiddelnederlands Woordenboek* ('Early Middle Dutch Dictionary') is an alphabetical, scientific dictionary describing the Dutch language from approximately 1200 to 1300. The limited corpus used for the VMNW is mainly constituted by the *Corpus van Middelnederlandse teksten* (Corpus of Middle Dutch Texts; Gysseling 1977-1988) .

(4) *Concise dictionaries*. The authoritative dictionaries of modern Dutch include the *Groot woordenboek der Nederlandse taal* ('Comprehensive Dictionary of the Dutch Language') published by Van Dale. It contains approximately 140,000 headwords, describes modern Dutch and also provides a retrospective of the development of the Dutch vocabulary from approximately 1850 to 2005. The 14th edition appeared in 2005. It is a descriptive dictionary, but since it is limited to the standard language, it is also implicitly normative.

4.2.2. Electronic resources

(a) AUXILIARIES ON WRITTEN DUTCH

Anyone who, in the context of this present book, wishes to tell interested Europeans from another linguistic region something about important literary works originating in the Dutch linguistic area from the start of the written tradition to the present day has little more to offer than a modest **canon – somewhat** resembling a list of works assumed to be part of the intellectual baggage of secondary school pupils in the relevant language region. See www.dbnl.nl, www.literatuurgeschiedenis.nl/ and www.infoplease.com/ce6/ent/A0816444.html>.

The updated edition of the official Dutch spelling guide, *Woordenlijst Nederlandse Taal.*, is available on the net via Taaluniversum NTU and in the form of a CD-rom.

The most dynamic corpora in the Dutch language area (older corpora, dating from the 1970s and 1980s, are not included, nor are corpora related to individual authors or related to a particular type of research): The INL <www.inl.nl/> currently has four corpora available that can be accessed via the Internet: The 5-million word Corpus 1994 and the 27-million word "Krantencorpus" (Newspaper Corpus) 1995. *The 38 Million Words Corpus 1996* consists of three main components: a component with varied composition (1970-1989), a newspaper component (*Meppeler Courant*, 1992-1995) and a legal component (1814-1989). The user has the opportunity to define subcorpora, either on the basis of the parameters (1) corpuscomponent, (2) topic, (3) publication medium/text type, and (4) period, or on the basis of selections from text surveys presented at the screen. The user can ask for the size of each defined subcorpus. The texts have automatically been annotated with lemma (head word) and two types of part of speech (POS). *The PAROLE Corpus 2004*. PAROLE is an acronym of Preparatory Action for Linguistic Resources Organisation for Language Engineering and it is the name of a project initiated and subsidized by the EC to meet the growing demand for contemporary electronic language sources, particularly in the field of

language technology. The PAROLE corpus is a collection of modern Dutch texts amounting to c. 20 million tokens, for the greater part originating from newspaper or magazine articles. The texts are annotated for typographical and text-structural features. Each form has been automatically assigned a detailed part-of-speech code and a lemma. All encoding is TEI conformant (see <http://www.tei-c.org/>). Annotated texts offer more advanced retrieval facilities than non-annotated texts (see the application possibilities). Like the other three corpora that the INL made available via Internet (see <http://www.inl.nl/corp/corp.htm>), the PAROLE corpus is accessible free of charge through a retrieval system. The corpus is primarily meant for researchers of morphological, lexicological and - to a lesser extent - syntactical aspects of contemporary usage of the Dutch language, and for all teachers in the field of corpus linguistics. For the *Early Middle Dutch period* there is also the Gysseling Corpus (1977-1985), available in both book and CD-ROM format. The corpus of neologisms can be consulted via the INL website. The WNT is available in the form of a cd-rom. In January 2007 it will be free available via INL's homepage <www.inl.nl>. This also applies to the VMNW, which is available on CD-ROM only.

(b) AUXILIARIES ON SPOKEN DUTCH

The Spoken Dutch Corpus 2004. The Spoken Dutch Corpus (CGN) is a database of contemporary Dutch as spoken by adults in the Netherlands and Flanders. It contains some 9 million words, two thirds of which are recorded in the Netherlands and one third in Flanders. The corpus comprises a large variety of speech types, it contains about 800 hours (8,900,000 words) of speech recordings made up of spontaneous face-to-face conversations, telephone dialogues, interviews, debates, meetings, reports, lectures and seminars, read books etc. The CGN contains the following annotations for all of the words: (1) an orthographic transcription; (b) a manually verified part-of-speech tagging and lemmatisation; (c) references to the lexicon and identification of multi word units; and (d) an automatic time alignment at word level (incl. an automatic phonetic transcription).

Dutch dialectology has produced many impressive corpora, including the following: (1) The *Taalatlas van Noord en Zuid Nederland* (Linguistic Atlas of the North and South Netherlands). This atlas is currently being digitized in a collaborative project between the INL and Brill publishing house. (2) The series of Dutch Dialect Atlases (RNDA) published between 1925 and 1982 under the leadership of Blancquaert and W. Pée. (3) See www.meertens.knaw.nl for the Phonological, Morphological and Syntactic atlases: FAND, MAND and SAND. (4) See <fuzzy.arts.kuleuven.ac.be/rewo> (5) *Sprachatlas des Nördlichen Rheinlands und des Südöstlichen Niederlands* 'Frankischer Sprachatlas' (Speech Atlas of the Northern Rhineland and Southeastern Netherlands 'Frankish Speech Atlas' by Jan Goossens (1988-...)). (6) *Taalatlas van Noord en Oost Nederland en aangrenzende gebieden* (Linguistic Atlas of the Northern and Eastern Netherlands and adjacent regions) (Assen 1957).

4.3. Culture

4.3.1. Books, series and periodicals

Dutch culture has been continually fed from three sources, namely Christianity that taught us brotherly love and the notion of guilt, the rise of an urban citizenry with its high point in the 17th century, and the Enlightenment that brought with it social awareness and individual freedom for the citizen. Excellent overviews of Dutch Cultural History are to be found in: (a) Willem Frijhoff and Marijke Spies, 1650: *Bevochten eenheid* (1999); (b) J. Kloek en W. Mijnhardt, 1800: *Blauwdrukken van een samenleving* (2001); (c) J. Bank en M. van Buuren, 1900: *Hoogtij van burgerlijke cultuur* (2000); Kees Schuyt en Ed Taverne, 1950: *Welvaart in zwart-wit* (2001).

4.3.2. Other media

News is mediated primarily via newspapers, radio and TV, all in Dutch. Television is, however, less used for mass education than might be expected, the current programmes consisting for a large part of popular entertainment, typically with a concept that imitates American mass culture.

5. Present and future role of Dutch

5.1. In countries where Dutch is an official language

Dutch is the strongest official language in the geographical region of the Netherlands and Belgium. Dutch is still widely learned by children as their first language and this situation shows no signs of changing. Dutch is still widely used on different levels and is employed daily by the media as *lingua franca*. There is a written version of the Dutch language with an extensive corpus of literature. But despite all of this, English is rapidly and increasingly replacing Dutch in scientific publications written by native Dutch speakers. Bilingualism is on the increase: in the Netherlands represented mainly by simultaneous mastery of English and Dutch: in Belgium by Dutch and French. Both in international companies and in scientific contacts knowledge of at least English and/or French and German is becoming indispensable. And finally, the borrowing of English words and expressions is on the increase. More than 200 foreign universities offer Dutch as a main or subsidiary subject. The NTU subsidises these courses.

5.2. In other countries

Although Dutch is the official language of Aruba and the Dutch Antilles, as far as communication is concerned it is replaced by Papiamentu. The situation in Surinam is comparable, where the common language is Sranan Tongo. In the former Dutch colony of Indonesia the Dutch language is confined to the

older generation. And in South Africa it was replaced officially in the constitution by the related Afrikaans language as far back as 1927.

5.3. *In international circles and institutions*

Dutch is the largest of the small and the smallest of the large languages within the European Union. Thanks to the established linguistic pluralism in the EU Dutch continues to play a role in a European context. In addition there are xx universities world-wide where Dutch is taught as L2, and there are Dutch Institutes and cultural centres in various cities abroad.

6. Bibliographic Orientation

6. 1. *Books and articles*

- ALLEN (A.) en SUETENS (L.P.), red. *Het federale België na de vierde staatshervorming.* (Brugge : Die Keure, 1993).
- ARMSTRONG (C.A.J.), "The Language Question in the Low Countries; The Use of French and Dutch by the Dukes of Burgundy and Their Administration", in: HALE (J.R.), HIGHFIELD (J.) and SMALLEY (B.), eds. *Europe in the Late Middle Ages* (London : Faber & Faber, 1965), pp. 386-409.
- BAKKER (Dik) en DIBBETS (Geert), *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taalkunde* (Den Bosch : Malmberg, 1977).
- BISTER-BROOSEN (Helga) en WILLEMYNS (Roland), "Perifere woordenschat in woordenboeken van het Duitse, Franse en Nederlandse taalgebied", *De nieuwe Taalgids* 81 (1988), pp. 417-429.
- BISTER-BROOSEN (Helga), Hrsg. *Niederländisch am Niederrhein* (Frankfurt : P. Lang Verlag, 1998).
- BLANCQUAERT (Edgard), *Praktische uitspraakleer van de Nederlandsche taal.* (Antwerpen : De Sikkel, 1934).
- CLYNE (M.), "Pluricentric Language / Plurizentrische Sprache", in AMMON (U.), DITTMAR (N.), MATTHEIER (K.) and TRUDGILL (P.), eds. *Sociolinguistics / Soziolinguistik* (Berlin-New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 2005), pp. 296-300.
- DE BONTH (R.J.G.) et.al., "Nieuwnederlands (circa 1650-1880)", in (van den Toorn et al. : 1997), pp. 361-453.
- DE GRAUWE (Luc) *De Wachtendonckse Psalmen en Glossen* (Gent : Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde, 1979).
- DE GROOF (Jetje), "Mit gezücktem Schwert die Sprache ausbauen? Die Rechtschreibereform in Belgien 1836-1844", *Sociolinguistica*, 17 (2003), pp. 71-87.
- DE GROOF (Jetje), *Nederlandse taalpolitiek en taalplanning in Vlaanderen in de "lange negentiende eeuw" (1795-1914): een linguïstische analyse met speciale aandacht voor de wisselwerking tussen status- en corpusplanning.* (Gent : Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde. [forthcoming]).
- DE SCHUTTER (Georges), "Dutch", in KÖNIG (Ekkehard) and VAN DER AUWERA (Johan), eds. *The Germanic Language* (London-New York : Routledge, 2002), pp. 439-477.
- DENECKERE (Marcel), *Histoire de la langue française dans les Flandres (1770-1823)* (Gent : Rijksuniversiteit, «Romanica Gandensia, II-III», 1954).
- DEUMERT (Anna) and VANDENBUSSCHE (Wim), *Germanic Standardizations, past to present* (Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2003).

- DE VRIES (Jan W.), WILLEMYNS Roland) en BURGER (Peter), *Het verhaal van een taal. Negen eeuwen Nederlands*, 6de ed. (Amsterdam : Prometheus, 2003).
- DEYGERS (Katrien) en VAN DEN HEEDE (Vicky), "Belgisch-Nederlandse 'klassiekers' als variabelen voor lexicaal variatie-onderzoek: een evaluatie", *Taal en Tongval*, 52 (2000), pp. 308-328.
- DONALDSON (B.), *Dutch. A Linguistic History of Holland and Belgium* (Leiden : Nijhoff, 1983).
- ETHNOLOGUE : www.ethnologue.com/show_country.asp?name=Netherlands [1998].
- GOEBL (Hans), NELDE (Peter), ZDENEK (Stary) u. WÖLCK (Wolfgang), Hrsg. *Kontaktlinguistik. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* (Berlin-New York : De Gruyter, 1996).
- GOOSSENS (Jan), "Primaire en secundaireumlaut in het Nederlandse taalgebied", *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik*, 29 (1989), pp. 61-65.
- GOOSSENS (Jan), "De toekomst van het Nederlands in Vlaanderen", *Ons Erfdeel*, 43 (2000), pp. 3-13.
- GORTER (Dirk), "Dutch West-Frisian", in (Goebel et al. : 1996), pp. 1152-1157.
- GYSELING (Maurits) et coll., *Corpus van Middelnederlandse teksten (tot en met het jaar 1300)*, I, *Ambtelijke bescheiden* en II, *Litteraire handschriften* (Den Haag : Martinus Nijhoff, 1977 en 1987).
- HULSHOF (H.), "Nieuwnederlands (circa 1880-1920)", in (van den Toorn et al. : 1997), pp. 455-477.
- JASPAERT (Koen), "Suriname en de Nederlandse Taalunie", *Ons Erfdeel*, 47 (2004), pp. 153-154.
- KLOEKE (G.G.), *Gezag en norm bij het gebruik van verzorgd Nederlands* (Amsterdam : Meulenhoff, 1951)
- Leidraad Woordenlijst Nederlandse Taal* (Tielt, Den Haag: Lannoo Uitgeverij en Sdu Uitgevers 2005)
- PONELIS (Frits), *The Development of Afrikaans* (Frankfurt : P. Lang, 1993).
- PONELIS (Frits), "Nederlands in Afrika: het Afrikaans", in VAN DER SIJS (Nicoline), red. *Wereld Nederlands. Oude en jonge variëteiten van het Nederlands* (Den Haag Sdu uitgevers, 2005), pp. 15-30.
- QUAK (Aad), "Oudnederlands (tot circa 1200)", in (van den Toorn et al. : 1997), pp. 37-68
- RYCKEBOER (Hugo), *Het Nederlands in Noord-Frankrijk. Sociolinguïstische, dialectologische en contactlinguïstische elementen* (Gent : Rijksuniversiteit, 1997).
- SMEDTS (Willy) en PAARDEKOOPEP (Piet), *De Nederlandse taalkunde in kaart* (Leuven : Amersfoort: Acco, 1999).
- SCHOONHEIM (Tanneke), "Von alvi bis wurm. Die Rolle der Namenforschung bei der Rekonstruktion des Altniederländischen Wortschatzes", *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur Germanistik*, 57 (2003), pp. 113-139.
- STROOP (Jan), *Poldernederlands. Waardoor het ABN verdwijnt* (Amsterdam : Bert Bakker, 1997).
- TAELDEMAN (Johan), "Welk Nederlands voor Vlamingen?", in DE GRAUWE (Luc) en DE VOS (Jaak), red. *Van sneeuwpoppen tot tasmuurtje, aspecten van de Nederlandse taal- en literatuurstudie 'Spiegel Historiael'*, 33 (1993), pp. 9-28.
- TIERSMA (Pieter), *Frisian Reference Grammar* (Dordrecht : Foris, 1985).
- VAN BREE (Cor) and DE VRIES (Jan W.), "Netherlands", in (Goebel et al. : 1996), pp. 143-152.
- VANDEBUSSCHE (Wim), "Nederlands als prestigetaal voor de Brugse upper class in de 19de eeuw?", *Verslagen en Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde*, 111 (2001), pp. 323-340.
- VAN DEN TOORN (M.C.), "Nieuwnederlands (1920 tot nu)", in (van den Toorn et al. : 1997), pp. 479-562.

- VAN DEN TOORN (M.C.), PIJNENBURG (W.J.J.), VAN LEUVENSTEIJN (J.A.), VAN DER HORST (J.M.), red. *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taal* (Amsterdam : Amsterdam University Press, 1997).
- VAN DER SIJS (N.), *Taal als mensenwerk: het ontstaan van het ABN* (Den Haag : Sdu Uitgevers, 2004).
- VAN DE VELDE (H.), “Uitspraakdivergentie in klank en beeld”, *Taal en Tongval*, Themanummer, 10 (1997), pp. 49-62.
- VAN ISTENDAEL (Geert), *Het Belgisch labyrint. Wakker worden in een ander land*, 14th, “totally revised” edition (Amsterdam : De Arbeiderspers, 2001 [1st ed. ; 1993]).
- VAN LOEY (A.), *Middel nederlandse spraakkunst, I en II* (Groningen : Wolters, 1976 en 1977).
- VAN STERKENBURG (Piet), *Geschiedenis van de lexicografie van het Nederlands* (Leiden: Brill, 2006 [1st ed. 1984]).
- VAN STERKENBURG (Piet), ed. *A Practical Guide to Lexicography* (Amsterdam-Philadelphia : John Benjamins, 2003).
- WEIJEN (Antoon), *Nederlandse dialectkunde* (Assen : Van Gorcum, 1966).
- WILLEMYNS (Roland), “Integration vs. particularism. The undeclared issue at the first ‘Dutch Congress’ in 1849”, in FISHMAN (Joshua), ed. *The Earliest Stage of Language Planning* (Berlin-New York : Mouton de Gruyter, 1993), pp. 69-83.
- WILLEMYNS (Roland), “Dialektverlust im niederländischen Sprachraum”, *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik*, 64 (1997), pp. 129-154.
- WILLEMYNS (R[oland]), “Laatmiddelnederlands (circa 1350-1550)”, in (van den Toorn et al. : 1997), pp. 147-219.
- WILLEMYNS (Roland), *Het verhaal van het Vlaams. De historische ontwikkeling van het Nederlands in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden* (Antwerpen-Utrecht : De Standaard Uitgeverij-Het Spectrum, 2003).
- WILLEMYNS (Roland), “Der Einfluß von Dialektresistenz auf die flämischen Substandardvarietäten”, in LENZ (A.) u. MATTHEIER (K.), Hrsg. *Varietäten-Theorie und Empirie* (Frankfurt : P. Lang, 2005), pp. 163-176.

6.2. Useful links

www.taalunieversum.org
 Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie: www.inl.nl/
 Corpus Gesproken Nederlands: www.inl.nl
 www.flwi.ugent.be/nederlandsetaalkunde/Links_eletriek.html
 www.ned.univie.ac.at/publicaties/taalgeschiedenis/nl/
 Van Dale Lexicografie www.vandale.nl/
 BL Online. The bibliographical database of linguistics www.kb.nl/blonline
 neerlandistiek.startpagina.be
 www.ned.univie.at
 www.dbnl.nl
 www.meertens.nl
 www.huygensinstituut.knaw.nl
 www.mpi.nl
 www.fa.knaw.nl
 www.bntl.nl
 maatschappijdernederlandseletterkunde.nl/tntl
 www.neerlandistiek.nl
 www.neder-1.nl