

History of the  
Language Sciences  
Geschichte der  
Sprachwissenschaften  
Histoire des sciences du  
langage

An International Handbook on the Evolution of the  
Study of Language from the Beginnings to the Present  
Ein internationales Handbuch zur Entwicklung der  
Sprachforschung von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart  
Manuel international sur l'évolution de l'étude  
du langage des origines à nos jours

Edited by / Herausgegeben von / Edité par  
Sylvain Auroux · E. F. K. Koerner  
Hans-Josef Niederehe · Kees Versteegh

Volume 2 / 2. Teilband / Tome 2

**Offprint / Sonderdruck / Tirage à part**

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York  
2001

## 183. The dialectology of Dutch

1. Introduction
2. Forerunners of Dutch dialectology
3. The Romantic period (1830–1879)
4. Dialectgeography in the Aufbau phase (1879–1920)
5. Institutionalization and outstanding dialectologists (1920–1960)
6. Expansion and decline of dialectology (1960–present)
7. Bibliography

### 1. Introduction

Dutch dialectology can be defined as the research of the dialects that are spoken in the Dutch-speaking language area. This area covers the part of Belgium north of the French-Flemish language boundary and the Netherlands with the exception of Friesland, where Frisian is spoken. Frisian is considered a separate language since it has its own grammar and spelling system. The history of the status of Dutch in the Netherlands is quite different from the one in Belgium. In the Netherlands, Dutch has the official function of the standard language since human memory, whereas in Belgium it has a comparable status only from the very end of the 19th century. Before that time French was the official language. Since 1898 there are, at least on paper, two official languages in Belgium: Dutch and French. In real terms, however, French remained the language of the administration until 1932–1935. From then on it was possible to complete a Dutch education up to the university level.

It goes without saying that when dialects of the same language are spoken in different countries with a different linguistic past, the history of the dialectology in those countries also differs. Therefore, we will deal with the history of Dutch dialectology in the Netherlands and in Belgium separately. The history of dialectology of Dutch will be treated chronologically as much as possible. For each period, we will first deal with the dialectological history in the Netherlands and subsequently with the one in Belgium. We have chosen this order since the evolution of dialectology in the Netherlands proceeds – especially in the beginning – somewhat faster than in Belgium. Five periods in the evolution of Dutch dialectology are distinguished. In Section 2 we deal briefly with the predecessors of dialectological research. Section 3

treats dialectology during the romantic movement (1830–1879). Section 4 shows the beginning of the third period, marked by the first dialect questionnaire that was sent out in the Netherlands (1879), and ending after World War I (1920). Section 5 covers the period 1920–1960, a period in which dialectology becomes institutionalized in both countries and in which several important dialectologists played a leading role. The last section of this article is devoted to the period from 1960 to the present. Until the seventies there was considerable financial support contributing to the launching of many dialect projects. In the eighties funding has, however, become a scarce commodity. Nowadays there is hardly any money available left for dialectological research.

It is not possible to write a history of a scientific discipline without relying heavily on those who did so before. This survey is based largely on the histories of Dutch dialectology written by Van Ginneken (1943), Weijnen (1966: 1–18), Goossens (1977a: 106–160; 1977b), Noordegraaf (1979), Van der Horst (1979), Hagen (1992), and Foolen & Noordegraaf (1996).

### 2. Forerunners of Dutch dialectology

The interest in dialect phenomena did not appear out of the blue. Dialect variation in the Dutch-speaking language area did not escape notice of many Dutch linguists. We already find remarks on dialect variation in the first orthographies, dictionaries and grammars of Dutch (16th century). Dialect variants do not, however, play a major role in those publications. The authors mention them in relation to the standardization of Dutch. They explicitly point out that those dialect variants do not belong to the standard language (cf. Hagen 1992: 330–331). In the literary production of the 16th and the 17th-century dialect variation is dealt with correspondingly: it is used to characterize simple, funny, or mean persons. Just as elsewhere in Europe, the systematic study of dialects in the Dutch-speaking language area was inspired by Romanticism, a movement that can be seen as a reaction to the hard and fast rules of Classicism. During the Romantic period writers became interested in the unspoiled, the natural, even the miraculous, and dialects were one of



the things that could be qualified as such. The first publications on Dutch dialects are, however, a direct outcome of the movement that preceded Romanticism: Classicism. The *Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde* (Society of Netherlandic Literature), or the *Maatschappij* for short, was founded in Leiden (the Netherlands) in 1766. The society followed the example of the objectives of the Académie Française and other such academies in Europe. The eleven members were especially intrigued by the academies' contributions to the standardization of spoken languages. In 1773 the Society therefore decided to leave no stone unturned in order to compile a dictionary of the Dutch language. The design was prepared and the members of the Society were called upon to hand over their notes on the vocabulary of Dutch and to collect more words (Van Sterkenburg 1992: 11–12). Unfortunately, this undertaking was soon stranded. Only some word-lists were published, but no dictionary. These lists, however, mark the – humble – beginning of the systematic study of dialects in the Dutch-speaking language area, since they contain words of the dialect of Groningen (Halsema 1776; Van Bolhuis 1783).

### 3. The Romantic period (1830–1875)

#### 3.1. Word-lists

It took more than another half a century before other dialectological studies appeared. At first the dialects were not studied by linguistically skilled persons, but by painstaking laymen, to put it in the words of Goossens (1977a: 106). They studied the linguistic level that seemed to express most clearly a national character and that seemed to them rather easy to describe: the lexicon. Dictionaries of dialects written by laymen began to appear from the end of the 1830s, especially in the Netherlands. Goossens (1977a: 107) gives a survey. The first periodical devoted to the study of dialects, *Taalkundig Magazijn* (1837–1842), appears in the same period. Initially, the purpose of the journal was to collect data for a dictionary of the Dutch language, but again only lists of dialect words were published.

The modest interest for dialects in the last quarter of the 18th century and in the first of the 19th was primarily a Dutch affair. In that period, Dutch-speaking Belgium was totally involved in the struggle against French domi-

nation. After the French revolution, French had gained a firm foothold in the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium. Reaction against this influence culminated in the *Vlaamse Beweging* (Flemish Movement). When Dutch became one of the two official languages of Belgium (1830), the *Vlaamse Beweging* tried to make the Belgian speakers of Dutch aware of the important contribution Belgium had made to Dutch language and literature. The founder of the *Vlaamse Beweging*, Jan Frans Willems (1793–1846), started his examples of Belgian Dutch dialects in the first volume of the journal *Belgisch Museum*, in 1837.

The quality of these early dialect word-lists was not very high neither in Belgium or in the Netherlands. In both countries the authors were inspired by romantic sentiments, much more than linguistic accuracy. As a consequence, the collections of dialect words were no more than an array of curiosities. They do not give much insight into the dialect, since the pronunciation was not indicated; forms were adapted to Standard Dutch and doubtful etymologies were given. For that matter, the Belgians were not only inspired by romanticism, but they also had the secret desire to have the Flemish words accepted in the national lexicon. When proposals were made in the Netherlands to produce a comprehensive general Dutch dictionary, the Belgians feared that the dictionary would turn out to be too 'Hollandic' and therefore started collecting their own regional words for a general Flemish dictionary. Their particularistic attitude was strengthened by the foundation in 1870 of the *Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij van Taalkunde* (South Netherlandic Society of Linguistics), which firmly fostered the compilation of regional Flemish dictionaries.

#### 3.2. Dialect grammars

The first dialect grammars appear in the Netherlands in the second quarter of the 19th century. J. Sonius Swaagman (1827) writes an essay in Latin (!) about the dialect of Groningen. The study of Behrns (1840) about the dialect of Twente is of a higher scientific value. The author applies the methodology of comparative linguistics to the vowels of the dialect, and he joins in the work of important German Indo-Europeanists like Grimm and Bopp. However, the majority of the dialect grammars appears much later: from 1880 onwards. This is not surprising since writing a dialect grammar requires considerable lin-



guistic training and experience. (In Section 4 we will come back to the production of dialect grammars.)

### 3.3. Dialect texts

The Romantic interest for dialects not only resulted in dictionaries and at least one dialect grammar, but also in the collection of texts written in dialect. We find such collections in the Netherlands from the 1830s. The impulses to collect those data came from Germany and France. In Germany, J. M. Firmenich (1808–1889) was looking for Dutch dialect texts for his collection *Germaniens Völkerstimmen* (1843–1867). In France Jacques Le Brigant (1720–1804) had already started in 1779 to collect translations of the Parable of the Prodigal Son in Celtic. The French scholar Charles-Etienne Coquebert de Montbret used the same text in 1807 for a dialect survey in the whole French Empire, to which the Netherlands belonged in 1810. Unfortunately, only the translation into Frisian has come down to us. The collecting of translations of the Parable of the Prodigal Son also appeared later on in countries outside the French empire: Germany (Radlof 1817), Switzerland (Stalder 1819; Schott 1840), Italy, Bulgaria, Transylvania (Biondelli 1853), and again in Belgium and the Netherlands: Jan Frans Willems published the Parable in 16 Northern and Southern Dutch dialects in the first four volumes of his *Belgisch Museum* (1837–1840). Johan Winkler (1840–1926) published a collection of translations of the Parable in 186 Northern and Southern Dutch dialects (1874). The latter publication is the most comprehensive in the Dutch-speaking language area and it is considered to be an important help in defining and characterizing Dutch dialects.

### 3.4. A linguistic map of the Netherlands

The translations of one and the same text into different dialects of a standard language are also an important means in dialect geographical research. A first attempt at a dialect geographical description of the Netherlands was made in the middle of the 19th century. The general assembly of the *Maatschappij der Nederlandse letterkunde* held a competition in 1852 for making the best linguistic map of the Netherlands indicating dialect boundaries. The competition was highly inspired by the publication of the second edition of Karl Bernhardi's (1803–1883) *Sprachkarte von Deutschland* (1849). Unfortunately, the *Maatschappij*

had to record in 1857 that the competition had fallen through: not a single contribution was received by then. Thereupon the *Maatschappij* decided to enclose in the minutes of their meeting a dialect questionnaire asking members to complete it. Again, the response was apathetic, as only a few forms were returned. Yet another attempt of making a dialect geographical description of the Netherlands proved unsuccessful. Serious dialect geographical research got off the ground in the Netherlands and in Belgium only in the last quarter of the 19th century, just as elsewhere in Europe.

## 4. Dialect geography in the Aufbau phase (1879–1920)

### 4.1. The birth of dialect geography

The first large-scale dialect survey in the Dutch-speaking language area was held in 1879 by the *Aardrijkskundig Genootschap* (Dutch Geographical Society). Johan Hendrik Kern (1833–1917), professor of Sanskrit in the University of Leiden, was the driving force behind this dialect survey. In 1866 he had become a member of the committee of the *Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde* that had held the unsuccessful dialect competition (cf. 3.4.), and he revived the old dialect enterprise. Kern was a polyglot, an Indo-Europeanist who had also published articles about Dutch and Dutch dialects. At the 13th *Nederlandsch Taal en Letterkundig Congres* held in 1873, he made a plea for the compilation of word-lists and grammars of all Dutch, Franconian and Saxon dialects. He justified his proposal by saying that the study of the dialects of a language is of general importance for a country, especially for its folklore. He was convinced that tribe and dialect borders would coincide and he was eager to demonstrate this to be so. His last argument for conducting a large-scale dialect survey precisely in the 1870s is that typical dialect characteristics were disappearing due to the development of important new means of transport such as steamers, steam trams and trains, which led to increasing contacts with speakers of other dialects and speakers of Standard Dutch. During the meeting a committee was put together in order to start the project. The committee consisted of Belgian and Dutch members, and was to survey the dialects of the whole Dutch speaking language area.



At the meeting of the congress in 1875, Kern had to confess that the project had not made any progress. It is unclear what happened precisely, but it is noteworthy that when Kern requested the *Aardrijkskundig Genootschap* to participate in the dialect survey he only spoke about the Netherlands. In 1878 Kern addressed this Geographical Society and argued that dialect geography was a part of geographical science and that therefore geographers should play a role in mapping dialects in the Netherlands. The *Aardrijkskundig Genootschap* had been founded only in 1873, and the ideas about what did and did not belong to geography were not yet clearly defined: geography described the whole earth with everything in and on it. To geographers of that time it was no problem that they should accept the task of studying dialects. By contrast, later dialectologists had serious problems with the fact that the first large-scale dialect survey was performed by geographers and not by dialectologists. Kloeke (1926: 16) for example writes that this attitude is typical, but depressing and shameful (cf. 5.3.). In 1879 the Society distributed a dialect questionnaire among its members, all living in the Netherlands, and asked them to answer the questions in the dialect of their place of residence (Gerritsen 1979: 14–18).

Although this Dutch survey was held only three years after the first dialect survey ever, Georg Wenkers' (1852–1911) 1876 survey of dialects in the Rhineland, the driving force behind the Dutch survey was quite a different one. Wenkers' undertaking was highly inspired by the linguistic theory of his time. He wanted to prove the neogrammarian theory that sound change is exceptionless, the so-called *Ausnahmslosigkeit der Lautgesetze*. The Dutch survey, however, was hardly theoretically inspired. Kern was acquainted with the theory of the Neogrammarians, but according to Uhlenbeck (1918: 36), he regarded it as narrow-minded and soul-less. Due to his knowledge of many languages Kern realized that countless factors could affect language change and therefore he considered it vain to base a theory of sound change on one language family only and to capture the whole process of sound change on the basis of merely two mechanisms: sound laws and analogical leveling.

280 questionnaires of the 1879 survey were returned. The analysis of the data was, however, a long time coming. In 1892 Jan te Win-

kel (1847–1927) was appointed in the University of Amsterdam for Dutch philology, and the *Aardrijkskundig Genootschap* asked him to draw a linguistic map of the Netherlands on the basis of the answers to the 1879 questionnaires. Te Winkel accepted the invitation, but the enterprise failed for several reasons. The answers were not written down clearly, the completed lists had not been evenly distributed over the Netherlands, and Te Winkel believed that the wrong questions had been posed, at least for testing the theories of the Neogrammarians. Although that theory had been criticized vehemently in the last quarter of the 19th century, Te Winkel still was in favor of this theory and wanted to do his research within the framework of this theory. The *Aardrijkskundig Genootschap* allowed him to send out a new questionnaire in 1895. On the basis of the 209 returned lists, Te Winkel's *Noordnederlandse tongvallen* (1899–1901) was published. This book included two linguistic maps with commentary, one of the reflexes of the west-Germanic *âe*, the other of *î*. Inspired by his belief in sound laws, Te Winkel intended to publish a map with commentary for each west-Germanic vowel. Only two maps appeared, however. Goossens (1977: 128) ascribes this failure to the fact that Te Winkel did not realize that he could only make a map of the reflexes of a west-Germanic vowel after having drawn maps for a number of single words with that vowel. According to Goossens this faulty approach to the data is the reason Te Winkel's undertaking was less fruitful than similar approaches in Germany (Wenker) and France (Gilliéron).

Te Winkel (1899–1901) had a definite neogrammarian slant, but nods in the direction of other theories were made too. For example, he indicated tribe borders on his maps. In his later work he seemed to be less faithful to the neogrammarian theory. In Te Winkel (1904), for example, he stressed the fact that language change needs a description that goes further than laws, that considers also such mechanisms as analogy, economy and aesthetics. There was certainly a discrepancy between Te Winkel's theoretical insights and the practice of his dialect research (Hagen 1992: 334).

Dialect geographical surveys were held somewhat later in Dutch-speaking Belgium. In 1886 Pieter Willems (1840–1898), professor of Latin Philology at Leuven University, organized a dialect survey in 337 localities in



order to collect the data for his intended study of the phonetics and morphology of the 'Franconian'. His questionnaire contained more than 2000 items. Willems' study was not successful, but the data of his survey proved to be very useful for later research.

The surveys of the *Aardrijkskundig Genootschap* and of Willems marked the beginnings of the scientific dialect geographic study of Dutch dialects.

#### 4.2. A favourable climate for the study of spoken language

The interest in dialects at the end of the 19th century was driven not only by romantic feelings and the testing of linguistic theories, but also a consequence of the increasing interest in the spoken language at the time. The spoken word did not only fascinate linguists; writers from the second half of the 19th century complained of the distortion of the written language and advocated the use of 'normal' language. Multatuli (pseudonym of Eduard Douwes Dekker [1820–1887], one of the most famous Dutch writers of the 19th century) wrote, for example, "I try to write living Dutch, but I went to school". The *Tachtigers*, Dutch writers who were active around 1880, strove to reflect the spoken language as much as possible in their writings. Albert Verweij's (1865–1937) highest ambition was, for example, "to write in such a way that my readers have the feeling that I am speaking".

The discussion about spelling reforms in the Netherlands, but also elsewhere in Europe, that took place in the same period cannot be seen apart from this literary interest in the spoken word. One aimed at reflecting the spoken language in the spelling. Those who taught English as a second language also aimed at reflecting spoken English exactly. As a result, The International Phonetic Association was founded in 1886. At Otto Jespersen's request, this association devised in 1889 a phonetic alphabet which should be applicable to all languages. The International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), used world-wide today, resulted from this effort.

The interest in spoken languages arose during a period in which a number of technical innovations brought the spoken word into completely new roles in society. Alexander Graham Bell (1847–1922) invented the telephone in 1876. From then on it was – at least for some people – possible to communicate orally over long distances. Another in-

novation that offered a new way of recording the human voice, was the microphone. Emil Berliner (1851–1929) succeeded in 1877 and David Edward Hughes (1831–1900) in 1878, to amplify the human voice by means of a microphone. From then onwards it became easier to convey information with the human voice to mass audiences. At the same time, still other inventions made it possible to capture spoken language. In 1877 Thomas Edison (1847–1931) launched the phonograph, a machine which could record and then reproduce sound. These inventions made it possible to analyze spoken language in greater detail. In the Dutch-speaking language area, however, it was not until the 1950s that dialect studies used these new technologies on a large scale (cf. 5.5.). Although dialects were not studied with the help of all these technical innovations available, they were studied intensively as will be shown in the following sections.

#### 4.3. Dictionaries

From 1875 onwards a number of dialect lexicons were published (cf. Goossens 1977: 113). In this period we also find the first specialist dialect dictionaries, dictionaries about the dialect used in a special trade, the dialect of the black smith, the carpenter, the bricklayer. These dictionaries were published especially in Dutch-speaking Belgium. The *Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Taal- en Letterkunde* (Royal Flemish Academy for Language and Literature), called on its members in 1890 to submit word-lists of the various professions. The Academy feared that due to the fact that French was the language of education in Dutch-speaking Belgium, new professions would not acquire a Dutch terminology and traditional professions would lose their indigenous words. At first, it was not the purpose of the Vlaamse Academie to collect and publish lists with dialect words, but it happened to go in that direction, thanks to the growing recognition that it was not necessary to produce a Standard Dutch specialist terminology since the Netherlands did already have one.

Such specialist dictionaries appear in the Netherlands at the end of the 1950s. The regional dictionaries (cf. 6.1.) are to some extent also specialist dictionaries.

#### 4.4. Dialect monographs

The stream of dialect monographs began to flow from about 1880 in both the Netherlands and Belgium. Goossens (1977: 117–



126) gives an extensive list. The majority of the monographs were written under the auspices of two schools, the Amsterdam school of Jan te Winkel (see end of 4.1. above) and the Louvainian of Philemon Colinet (1833–1917). There are two important differences between the two. The Belgian Dutch grammars describe dialects of cities and towns, while the Netherlandic grammars describe village dialects. This difference is a result of the fact that dialects were spoken much less in the Netherlands than in Belgium. In Belgian cities dialects were still spoken, but not so in the Netherlands. This is due to the fact that a kind of Standard Dutch has always been the only official language in the Netherlands. In Dutch cities the members of the upper class who spoke Standard Dutch played an important role in the leveling out and even the disappearance of dialects. In Dutch-speaking Belgium there were, however, two official languages and the upper class spoke French. As a consequence, the dialects spoken by the lower classes, were not affected by Standard Dutch. A second difference between the Netherlandic and the Belgian monographs is that the former were designed in line with the German model, tracing the developments from early Western Germanic to modern dialect variants according to sound laws. The Belgian Dutch grammars are designed after the French model, directed first of all to precise synchronic descriptions. The dialect monographs of this period mainly deal with phonetics and phonology and very little with morphology and syntax.

#### 4.5. Dialect texts

The most important collection of Dutch dialect texts of this period is the work by Johan A. and L. Leopold (1882), which also contains texts of the North-German and Frisian dialects. The most scientific publication of Dutch dialect texts of this period however, is Frings & Vandenheuvel (1921), in which we find among other things the 40 sentences that Wenker used for the first dialect survey in the world. They are translated and phonetically described in 56 southern Dutch dialects (cf. 5.4. below).

#### 4.6. Classification maps

At the end of the 19th century dialectologists had acquired so much insight into the Dutch dialects that they dared to draw a map on which the dialects were delineated. The first was drawn by Hermann Jellinghaus (1892).

He discussed his classification and gave a short comparative phonological and phonetic description, mainly based on the dialect texts that were published until then.

Te Winkel (1898) published a second classification map in his contribution to the second enlarged edition of Hermann Paul's *Grundriss* (1896–1909). The maps were also published in later works of Te Winkel (1899–1901, 1904). Both te Winkel and Jellinghaus took the traditional standpoint that dialect borders reflect tribe borders (cf. 4.1.).

The innovations in classification of dialects that Wenker and, later, Wrede had introduced in Germany from the 1880s onwards were picked up by the Dutch Indo-Europeanist Jozef Schrijnen (1869–1938). He draws the course of Wenker's Bernrather line (the italicized phonemes in the following examples: *machen*–*maken*, *lassen*–*laten*, *schatz*–*schat*, *apfel*–*appel*, *schaf*–*schaap*) and Ürdinger line (only the following two words: *ich*–*ik* and *auch*–*ook*) through the Netherlands and Belgium (Schrijnen 1902). Schrijnen was the first in the Netherlands who investigated the path of isoglosses.

The third important dialect classification map of the Netherlands appeared in 1913 in Jacques van Ginneken's (1877–1945) handbook of the Dutch language and its sociological structure (1913–1914). The work consists of two volumes of more than one thousand pages. For its time this *magnum opus* undoubtedly represented, also by international standards, a quite exceptional documentation of the regional and social variation in Dutch (Hagen 1992: 337). It contains a description of the varieties of Dutch along three 'language circles', i.e., 'local language circles' (differentiation in dialects), 'familial language circles' (differentiation according to family, sex and age), and 'social language circles' (differentiation in terms of social class, profession, political party, and religion) (cf. 5.1.). More than 200 pages are devoted to the dialects in the Netherlands and Belgium. Van Ginneken discusses these dialects with a dialect classification map as point of departure. His map is a compromise between the classification according to tribes, by Jellinghaus and Te Winkel, and the one according to isoglosses by Schrijnen. Goossens (1977: 131) states that Van Ginneken's map shows an enormous erudition, but that it also shows that he did not realize the importance of the developments in dialectology such as the theories about expansions (cf. 5.3.) that occurred



in Germany and in the Netherlands precisely in the period in which he wrote his handbook. These new developments were still not even incorporated into the second edition of the handbook published in 1928.

##### 5. Institutionalization and outstanding dialectologists (1920–1960)

We have seen in Section 4 that the dialectology of Dutch was flourishing at the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th. Dialectology was, however, not yet institutionalized. Those who contributed to Dutch dialectology were mostly more prominent in other disciplines. Philemon Colinet for example was an important phonetician and Jan te Winkel enjoyed great fame with the five volumes that he wrote about the development of Dutch literature (Te Winkel 1908–1919).

The institutionalization of dialectology came about in the Netherlands and Belgium after World War I. Four linguists play an important part in this: Van Ginneken and Kloeke in the Netherlands and Blancquaert and Grootaers in Belgium. These four scholars lived and worked at about the same time. Jacques van Ginneken and Edgar Blancquaert (1894–1964) pleaded for an approach to dialectology modelled after French dialectology, and Gesinus Kloeke (1887–1963) and Ludovic Grootaers (1885–1965) for one modelled in accord with German dialectology. In order to give some insight into the role that those linguists played in the development of Dutch dialectology, we will offer a sketch on their dialectological work. We will first deal with those who worked in the line of French dialectology, Van Ginneken (5.1.) and Blancquaert (5.2.), and subsequently with those who promoted the German approach: Kloeke (5.3.) and Grootaers (5.4.).

###### 5.1. Jacques Van Ginneken

We have shown in 4.5. that a great part of Van Ginneken's main work (1913–1914) was devoted to dialects. But he represented himself as a dialectologist in other matters as well. He organized together with Schrijnen and J. J. Verbeeten a dialect survey in North-Brabant and Netherlandic-Limburg. On the basis of 170 returned questionnaires, Schrijnen wrote, among other things, his publication about the isoglosses of Ramisch (Schrijnen 1920) and, earlier Schrijnen (1917) in

which he published the first lexical map in the Dutch-speaking language area: *vlinder* (butterfly). Theodor Frings (1886–1968) had used the data of this survey, together with data collected during World War I with the help of Flemish prisoners of war, in Frings & Van Ginneken (1919). Frings demonstrated in this article that the areal spread of a number of dialect phenomena in Belgium and the Netherlands can be explained by expansion from Cologne. This publication has had an important impact to the use of the concept of 'expansions' as an explanatory device for the spread of dialect phenomena (cf. 5.3.).

In 1918 Van Ginneken qualified for succeeding Jan te Winkel, who was 70 by then and had retired, as professor of Dutch philology in the University of Amsterdam. But van Ginneken did not get the chair for several reasons. An important political point was that he was blamed for antisemitism on the basis of the chapter devoted to the language of the Jews in his handbook (Van Ginneken 1913–1914). A second reason was that he was clearly opposed to the regularity principle held by Te Winkel and therefore would not have carried on in the dialectological tradition adhered to by Te Winkel. Van Ginneken was convinced that the fresh and new spirit in linguistics was blowing from France and not from Germany (Hagen 1992: 340). Just like the French-oriented linguists, he adhered to the Romanist Hugo Schuchardt's (1885) the criticism of the Neogrammarians. Van Ginneken was not only French-oriented in his attitude towards the Neogrammarians, but he had also great interest in the development of Romance linguistics, especially in the French sociological school of linguistics. His idea to write a handbook on the sociological structure of the Dutch language (Van Ginneken 1913–1914) was probably inspired by Antoine Meillet. Yet Van Ginneken did not entirely disapprove of the German approach, as appears from the fact that he published a study together with Frings (Frings & van Ginneken 1919). Van Ginneken, however, did receive a professorship in 1923. He was appointed to the chair in Dutch Philology, Indo-European and Sanskrit at the newly founded University of Nijmegen.

Van Ginneken took the view that language was a complex phenomenon which could only be understood through an interdisciplinary approach. He opted for a combination of social, psychological and biological methods.



We can find this opinion clearly in his dialectological work, especially in the investigations he did together with Louise Kaiser in and around the Zuiderzee, the area that was impoldered in the 1930s (cf. 5.5.). He held the view that the spread of linguistic phenomena could be explained by biological factors. He states for example in Van Ginneken (1943: 40–79) that phonetic differences between dialects are a results of differences in what he calls 'articulatiebasis' (articulatory setting), whether one speaks with an open or a closed mouth and whether one has full or thin lips. Such theories encountered much resistance among his colleagues since it tended toward racial typing of speakers.

Van Ginneken can be considered a linguistic jack-of-all-trades, with a creative, well-rounded approach. He studied far more aspects of linguistics than dialectology alone, including language psychology, child-language acquisition, and spelling. He also played an important role in the internationalization of linguistics in the Netherlands. Thus, he took part in the organization of the First International Conference of Linguists (The Hague, 1928) and the First International Phonetic Congress (Amsterdam, 1932). Thanks to him, Dutch linguists became acquainted with linguistic surveys elsewhere in the world, and the rest of the world had the opportunity to learn about Dutch linguistics. Where his merits for dialectology are concerned, the opinions diverge. According to almost everyone (Hagen 1992: 337) he is not always very accurate in his work. Nevertheless, Hagen (1992: 337–340) attributes to him almost as much importance as to Kloeke (cf. 5.3.). Goossens (1977: 133) appreciation is much less favourable. He states that Van Ginneken did not open new vistas for dialectology, but that by popularizing dialectological research he made it an attractive discipline for both philologists and lay persons. His great personality attracted doctoral students who wrote dissertations about dialect geographical phenomena. Through his work the University of Nijmegen became one of the most authoritative dialectological institutes in the Netherlands.

According to Jo Daan (1964), Van Ginneken claimed to be the leading man in Dutch dialectology. For that matter, Kloeke had the same opinion about his own position. There was always a certain tension between these two rivals. Some of the dissertations (e. g., Janssen 1941) written under the super-

vision of Van Ginneken were straight attacks on the theory that Kloeke (1927) advocated (cf. 5.3.).

## 5.2. Edgar Blancquaert

Edgar Blancquaert (1894–1964) studied in Gent, Brussels and Paris. At the latter he followed the courses of Jules Gilliéron (1854–1926) and Albert Dauzat (1877–1955). Those courses had an important influence on his dialectological work, which was clearly French-oriented. As grammar school teacher from 1922–1925 he made recordings for a regional dialect atlas, the *Dialectatlas of Klein-Brabant* (Blancquaert 1925). This atlas was highly inspired by Gilliéron's *Atlas linguistique de la France* with regard to both the presentation of the results and the method of the fieldwork. Blancquaert had collected his data by direct oral elicitation procedures and documented in narrow phonetic transcriptions. The atlas consists of a text with maps. For each place the text gives a translation of all the 141 sentences in a narrow phonetic transcription. The maps show the areal spread of a number of the items occurring in the questions. They are drawn in a way similar to the maps of the French atlas: next to each place a word or a phrase is written down phonetically, and dialect areas are not delimited by isoglosses.

Blancquaert became assistant professor in Gent in 1925, and full professor in 1930. At that moment he saw the opportunity to implement a plan that he had always dreamed of: to publish a series of areal atlases following the model of his *Dialectatlas of Klein-Brabant* which would cover the whole Dutch speaking language area (Blancquaert 1925). Although many linguists were rather sceptical about his enterprise, Blancquaert succeeded in inspiring enough colleagues to realize the whole ambitious project. His successor in Gent, Willem Pée (1903–1986), in particular made great efforts to complete the project. The atlas was published under the name of both Blancquaert and Pée. When Blancquaert died in 1964, 10 of the planned 16 volumes had been published and the data collection for the other 6 volumes was nearly finished. The project was completed in 1982 in the Series "Nederlandse Dialectatlassen" (1930–1982). The atlases contain a phonetic reflection of the transcription of 141 sentences in the dialect of more than 2500 places in the Netherlands and Belgium. They have proved to be a real treasure for phonetic, morphological, lexical, and syntactic studies.



### 5.3. Gesinus Gerardus Kloeke

Gesinus Kloeke (1881–1963) studied German philology. He received his doctoral degree from the University of Leipzig and his *habilitation* from the University of Hamburg. During his study in Germany he became acquainted with the methodology of the Marburgian school of Wenker and Wrede. In 1914, he returned to the Netherlands as a grammar school teacher. During school holidays he did dialectological fieldwork, publishing the results. In this period he met Grootaers (cf. 5.4.). Together they made a plea for a dialect atlas of the whole Dutch-speaking language area, following the model of Wenker's German atlas. They designed a basic map with indexes (Grootaers & Kloeke 1926). In 1934, Kloeke was appointed professor in Dutch Linguistics at the University of Leiden. Grootaers was appointed to the same position in Louvain in 1935. They continued their good teamwork and published a mainly lexical geographic Atlas of Northern and Southern Netherlands (Kloeke & Grootaers 1939–1972; cf. 5.5., 6.1.).

In addition to the basic map and the atlas, Kloeke's special contribution to dialectology was that of theoretical enrichment. In his research, he brings together several disciplines: dialect geography, sociolinguistics – *avant la lettre* – and theories on language change. We already find keen sociolinguistic analyses in his early publications, such as his studies on forms of address (Kloeke 1920) and of hypercorrections (Kloeke 1924). Since those publications were written in Dutch and never translated into another language, they had no influence upon linguistics elsewhere in the world. However, thanks to Bloomfield's (1935 [1933]: 328–331) discussion on Kloeke's (1927) master piece in Dutch dialectology, devoting an entire section in the former's *Language*, Kloeke did achieve an important influence on international dialectology. According to Bloomfield, Kloeke's book about the Hollandic expansion in the 16th and 17th century and its reflection in 20th-century Dutch dialects, *Expansie* for short, contains good examples of theory-building and hypothesis-testing in dialectology. Kloeke's study described the geographical distribution of the west-Germanic *û* in the words *huis* (house) and *muis* (mouse) in the Dutch-speaking language area. The study's emphasis was on the change from [u:] to [y:], showing that the change probably originated in Flanders and spread during the Middle Ages over a large part of the country,

including the central district, which today pronounces a diphthong [oey]. He demonstrated that new variants 'jumped' from town to town before spreading out to the countryside. Since the geographical distribution of the change coincided with the boundaries of the Republic of the United Low Countries in 1589, Kloeke attributed the spread to influence from Holland, the most powerful province in the Republic. He showed that the change took place by a process of borrowing from the upper classes, and that therefore social prestige was the motivating factor in the diffusion. He makes this explanation more plausible by indicating that he could observe the same mechanism at work in the year 1920: people in the [u]-area used [y] in words like *huis* and *muis* in situations in which they tried to speak Standard Dutch. De facto Kloeke applied in this argument Labov's (1972: 274) Uniformitarian Principle, stating that language change in the past can be explained by language patterns in the present. By using social factors as a motivation for language change and by applying the uniformitarian principle in his explanations, he proves himself to be a true sociolinguist *avant la lettre* (cf. Hagen 1988: 273; Koerner 1995: 124).

Kloeke made a contribution to a theory of language change through his explanation of the fact that the change from [u] to [y] proceeds quicker in *huis* than in *muis*. According to him, this lexical diffusion is a result of a difference in frequency of occurrence between the words: it occurs faster in *huis*, a word that was frequently used in everyday communication with the people from Holland, the most powerful district of the republic, than in *muis*, a word that was seldom used. Kloeke demonstrated that sound change does not occur at the same time in all words. However, he was not adherent of Schuchardt's or other scholars' argument (first stated by Jacob Grimm in 1819) according to which each word has a history of its own, as Bloomfield (1933: 328) suggests. Kloeke took the view that the pressure of the sound laws plays the principal part in the diffusion of sound change (Kloeke 1921: 42), but that there are exceptions and restrictions too. Nevertheless, Kloeke did feel attracted to the idea of every word having its own history. This is evident from both the fact that the motto of the introduction to Kloeke (1927) originated from Schuchardt and that Schuchardt is described in the introduction as he "who more than anyone else influenced the ideas of younger linguists" (Kloeke 1927: 3).



We should point out here, however, that the idea of the spread of linguistic phenomena caused by expansion of a prestige form was not invented by Kloeke, but by his friend Theodor Frings (1886–1968) (see 5.1.). In the 1920s Frings worked at the University of Bonn. This job gave him plenty of time to do research but due to strong inflation not enough money to support his family. In the same period, Kloeke worked as teacher of German at the Leiden gymnasium, spending long hours, but making lots of money. Being a bachelor at that time Kloeke could afford to wish more time for research than money. In light of their respective circumstances, the two arranged to switch places during 1921–1922. In his new situation in Bonn period Kloeke became well acquainted with the concept of ‘expansion’ as an explanatory device (W. U. S. Kloeke, p. c.). The German masterpiece of this approach, Frings (1926) appeared one year before Kloeke’s *Expansie*.

In Kloeke’s second important publication, on the origin and evolution of *Afrikaans* (Kloeke 1950), we find sociolinguistic ideas similar to those as in his *Expansie*. He shows, on the basis of a detailed study of the dialects of Holland and Zeeland, that *Afrikaans* is based on *Zuidhollands*, the dialects spoken in the area south of Amsterdam and north of Rotterdam. Kloeke became interested in the origin of *Afrikaans* during a tour of South African universities at the end of the 1930s, but only during World War II did he get the opportunity to investigate this problem. Kloeke was one of the first professors at the University of Leiden to resign from his post when Jewish colleagues were dismissed. Since Kloeke had lived quite a long time in Germany and knew many Germanists, among others Jan van Dam, the head of the *Kulturkammer*, it was of great importance to him to demonstrate that he stood on the side of the Dutch and not with the Germans. Following his resignation Kloeke went underground for nine months, got arrested, was put first into prison, and then into a kind of concentration camp. Half-way during the war he was set free, but the occupying force prohibited him to enter the western part of the Netherlands. He stayed, therefore, until 1945 with a friend who had lived a long time in South-Africa and had a library with an extensive collection of publications on *Afrikaans*. There, in exile, he wrote his study on the origin and evolution of *Afrikaans* (W. U. S. Kloeke, p. c.).

Besides Kloeke’s important theoretical contributions to Dutch dialectology, he also made a practical contribution. He wanted to found a dialect centre in the Netherlands similar to the *Zuidnederlandse dialectencentrale* (Southern Netherlandic Dialect Centre) founded by Grootaers in Belgium (see 5.4.). He managed to convince the literary section of the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen of the importance of financing the centralization of Netherlandic dialect activities, and thus the *Dialectenbureau* was founded in 1930. Kloeke intended to become the director of the *Dialectenbureau*. He could not accept the job, however, as the salary was too low for supporting a family. Rumour has it that Van Ginneken (cf. 5.1.), a member of the committee supervising the *Dialectenbureau*, had deliberately arranged to set the salary for the post lower than Kloeke could possibly accept, thus effectively depriving him of such an important position in the organization of Dutch dialectology (Jo Daan, p. c.). Instead, the Netherlands specialist, Pieter Jacobus Meertens (1899–1985), was appointed. As has been said, Kloeke was appointed somewhat later (1934) to a professorship of Dutch linguistics at Leiden University. He brought with him the *Taalatlas van Noord- en Zuidnederland* (Kloeke & Grootaers 1939–1972). The *Dialectenbureau* took charge of the atlas only after the sixth fascicle had appeared in 1956 (cf. 5.5., 6.1.).

#### 5.4. Ludovic Grootaers

Ludovic Grootaers (1885–1956) studied German philology in Louvain and received his doctorate in 1907 on account of a dissertation about the dialect of Tongeren (Belgium). From 1924 on he was assistant professor in Louvain. He became acquainted with experimental phonetics in the phonetic laboratory of his teacher Philemon Colinet and he applied those experimental phonetic methods to the analysis of dialects. Like Kloeke (cf. 5.3.), he was a proponent of the German approach to dialectology. He became interested in this approach since the innovative German dialect publications were largely devoted to the Lower Rhinish and Riparian dialects, and those dialects were related to the Limburgian dialects which he investigated (Tongeren, Hasselt). We have already mentioned in 5.3. that he made a plea for an atlas analogous to the German one and that, together with Kloeke, he drew a basic map with indexes (Grootaers & Kloeke 1926) and pub-

