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183. The dialectology of Dutch

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 by Van Ginneken (1943), Weijnen (1966: 1–18), Goossens (1977: 106–160; 1977b), Noordegraaf (1979), Van der Horst (1979), Hagen (1992), and Foonlen & 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 Netherlands 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 lexic. 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 *Zuidnederlandsche Maatschappij van Taalkunde* (South Netherlands 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 Behns (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 appear 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 Fri- sian 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 (Radolf 1817), Switzerland (Staider 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. Kloeké (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 neogrammarians' theory that sound change is exceptionless, the so-called Ausnahmlosigkeit 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 Winkel (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 Noordnederlands tongvallen (1899–1901) was published. This book included two linguistic maps with commentary, one of the reflexes of the west-Germanic de, the other of i. 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 Taechtigers, 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 innovation 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 blacksmith, 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 Schrijnem (1869–1938). He draws the course of Wenker’s Bernart line (the italicized phonemes in the following examples: machen—maken, lassen—laten, schatz—schat, spigel—appel, schaaf—schaap) and Urdinger line (only the following two words: ich—ik and aucb—oek) through the Netherlands and Belgium (Schrijnem 1902). Schrijnem 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 among 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 Schrijnem. 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. Philomen 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 Kloek in the Netherlands and Blanquart and Grootaers in Belgium. These four scholars lived and worked at about the same time. Jacques van Ginneken and Edgar Blanquart (1894–1964) pleaded for an approach to dialectology modelled after French dialectology, and Gesinus Kloek (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 Blanquart (5.2.), and subsequently with those who promoted the German approach: Kloek (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 anti-Semitism 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 (1942: 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 Kloke (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, Kloke 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 supervision of Van Ginneken were straight attacks on the theory that Kloke (1927) advocated (cf. 5.3.).

5.2. Edgar Blancoquart

Edgar Blancoquart (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 (Blancoquart 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. Blancoquart 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.

Blancoquart 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 (Blancoquart 1925). Although many linguists were rather sceptical about his enterprise, Blancoquart succeeded in inspiring enough colleagues to realize the whole ambitious project. His successor in Gent, Willem Péé (1903–1986), in particular made great efforts to complete the project. The atlas was published under the name of both Blancoquart and Péé. When Blancoquart 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 Kloeeke

Gesinus Kloeeke (1881–1963) studied German philology. He received his doctoral degree from the University of Leipzig and his "Habilitat" 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 & Kloeeke 1926). In 1934, Kloeeke 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 (Kloeeke & Grootaers 1939–1972; cf. 5.5., 6.1.).

In addition to the basic map and the atlas, Kloeeke'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 (Kloeeke 1920) and of hypercorrections (Kloeeke 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 Kloeeke's (1927) master piece in Dutch dialectology, devoting an entire section in the former's *Language*, Kloeeke did achieve an important influence on international dialectology. According to Bloomfield, Kloeeke'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. Kloeeke's study described the geographical distribution of the west-Germanic *u* in the words *huis* (house) and *muis* (mouse) in the Dutch-speaking language area. The study's emphasis was on the change from [ų:] to [ų], 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 [oe]. 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, Kloeeke 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 [ų]-area used [ų] in words like *huis* and *muis* in situations in which they tried to speak Standard Dutch. De facto Kloeeke 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).

Kloeeke made a contribution to a theory of language change through his explanation of the fact that the change from [ų] to [ų] proceeds quicker in the word *huis* than in the word *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. Kloeeke 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. Kloeeke took the view that the pressure of the sound laws plays the principal part in the diffusion of sound change (Kloeeke 1921: 42), but that there are exceptions and restrictions too. Nevertheless, Kloeeke 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 Kloeeke (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" (Kloeeke 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 Klooeke, 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, Klooeke worked as teacher of German at the Leiden gymnasium, spending long hours, but making lots of money. Being a bachelor at that time Klooeke 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 Klooeke became well acquainted with the concept of ‘expansion’ as an explanatory device (W. U. S. Klooeke, p. c.). The German masterpiece of this approach, Frings (1926) appeared one year before Klooeke’s *Expansie*.

In Klooeke’s second important publication, on the origin and evolution of Afrikaans (Klooeke 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. Klooeke 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. Klooeke was one of the first professors at the University of Leiden to resign from his post when Jewish colleagues were dismissed. Since Klooeke 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 Klooeke 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. Klooeke, p. c.).

Besides Klooeke’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 dialectcentrale* (Southern Netherlands 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. Klooeke 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 Klooeke 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, Klooeke was appointed somewhat later (1934) to a professorship of Dutch linguistics at Leiden University. He brought with him the *Taalatlas van Noord- en Zuidnederland* (Kloeeke & 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 Philémon Colinet and he applied those experimental phonetic methods to the analysis of dialects. Like Klooeke (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 Ripuarian 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 Kloeeke, he drew a basic map with indexes (Grootaers & Klooeke 1926) and pub-
lished the word atlas of Northern and Southern Netherlands (Kloeke & Grootaers 1939–1972).

In 1935, Grootaers was appointed to a professorship at the University of Louvain. In addition to the Atlas, he gave other important stimulations to dialectology of Dutch. He had tried in 1920 to make an atlas on the basis of the Dutch dialect translations of the Wenker sentences (cf. 4.5.). The enterprise failed however. He decided thereupon to send out his own questionnaires and to found his own Flemish dialectological institute, de Zuidnederlandse Dialectencentrale. The centre distributed dialect questionnaires throughout the whole Dutch-speaking part of Belgium. Data from these questionnaires served as important material for Kloeke & Grootaers (1939–1972) and for a projected large-scale Flemish dialect dictionary; but it took until the 1960s for this type of lexicographic dialect project to materialize (cf. 6.1.).

Grootaers stimulated dialectology in still quite another way: under his supervision an enormous number of dissertations were written in which dialectological problems were approached in the framework of the Marburg school.

5.5. Other developments

In the 1930s the Dutch were reclaiming land from the sea called de Zuiderzee. Scholars from different disciplines, including linguists, realized that this was an unique laboratory-like situation for investigating processes of assimilation between the autochthonous population of the rather isolated islands and the new inhabitants of the newly reclaimed land (called *polder*), who were recruited from all over the Netherlands. The *Stichting voor het Bevolkingsonderzoek in de drooggelegde Zuiderzeepolders* (Society for Research into the Population of the reclaimed Zuiderzeepolders) was founded in order to investigate this assimilation process in a number of ways, including dialects. It is remarkable that all the dialect surveys performed within the scope of the land reclamation are innovative. Louise Kaiser (1891–1973) performed not only quantitative investigations into phonetic aspects of the dialects (1940–1949), but she also took into consideration biological aspects like stature, hair and eye colour (cf. 5.1.). Meertens & Kaiser (1942), Daan (1950) and Van Ginneken (1954) give a complete picture of the dialects, but they also describe everyday life on the islands on the basis of the dialect lexicon. As with the word-field theory of the German linguist Jost Trier (1894–1970), the lexicon is structured on the basis of semantic word fields, and the meaning of the words are organized according to the context in which they are introduced. Word concordances are added in order to make these systematic dialect dictionaries better accessible. Van de Ven (1969) is the first sociolinguistic study in the Netherlands in the narrower Labovian sense. Only this type of dialect study is continued later on in the Dutch-speaking language area.

Compared with the often vehement theoretically-oriented discussions between the proponents of the French and the German methods of dialect research, dialectology was on the theoretical sidelines around World War II. Theories were discussed, especially the expansion theory of Kloeke, violently attacked by Hellenga (1938), but more time was devoted to data collection, establishing journals, such as *Onze Taalwet* (1932–1942), *Taal en Tongval* (1949--) and *Driemaandelijks bladen* (1949--) and preparing Atlases (cf. 5.2.) and the atlas of Kloeke and Grootaers (cf. 5.3. and 5.4.). During World War II two insightful dialectological handbooks were written: Weijnen (1941) and Van Ginneken (1943).

At the same time a number of young dialectologists, later appointed to important linguistic positions in the Netherlands and Belgium, published their dissertations. Paauwels (1933), Heeroma (1935), Poe (1936–1938), Weijnen (1937), Van den Berg (1938) and Hellenga (1938) wrote dialect geographical studies, while Overdiep (1940), Sassen (1953) and Vanacker (1948) wrote dialect monographs. The latter paid especially attention to syntax, a subject that was rather neglected until then. Around 1960 almost all university chairs in Dutch linguistics were held by professors with qualifications in dialectology.

The *Dialectenbureau* acquired more than one thousand respondents all over the Netherlands who filled in at least one questionnaire yearly. After Grootaers’ death (1956) the *Dialectenbureau* also took care of the respondents of his centre (cf. 5.4.) and continued sending questionnaires all over Dutch-speaking Belgium. Furthermore the *Dialectenbureau* started collecting tape recordings of dialects. As of 1996 they have recordings with transcriptions of more than 1000 local dialects.
Along with the official central dialect institutes in the Netherlands and Belgium, research centers for dialectology were also founded at the universities of Groningen, Nijmegen, Leuven, and Gent. That does not imply that dialect research has not been performed elsewhere. On the contrary, dialectology held a dominant position in Dutch linguistics during the period 1930–1960.


This section traces developments in Dutch dialectology in the period from 1960 to the present. The first section (6.1) deals with the large-scale projects that were set up or completed in this period. 6.2. discusses the relationship between linguistic theory and dialectology in this period, and the last section is devoted to speculations about the future of dialectology (6.3).

6.1. Generous funding and large-scale projects

Dutch universities flourished in the 1960s. This was partly due to the great number of children born just after World War II, which necessitated an expansion of the post-secondary education system. These so-called baby boomers entered into higher education in the sixties. The flourishing of the universities in the Netherlands was also a result of the discovery of enormous natural gas reserves in the country which appeared to sustain this system. Therefore there seemed to be oceans of money. The universities and the dialect centres appointed many dialectologists and large-scale projects were started or completed. And in the first place, the production of atlases.

The linguistic atlas of Northern and Southern Netherlands (Kloeke & Grootaers, 1939–1972) (cf. 5.3., 5.4, and 5.5.) continued and was completed as was the series of Dutch dialectatlases ten years later (Blancquaert & Pé, 1930–1982) (cf. 5.2.). A number of new atlases were started. Klaas Heeroma set up a linguistic atlas of the eastern part of the Netherlands, including the neighbouring areas (Heeroma, 1965). The purpose of this atlas was to demonstrate the so-called ‘Westphalan expansion’, the spread of Westphalan words all over the northeastern part of the Netherlands. Daan & Franssen (1972–1977) made an atlas of the evolution of sounds in the Dutch-speaking language area and Gerritsen (1991) about the spread of syntactic phenomena. Goossens (1981) published an atlas about lexical, morphological, and phonological aspects of the northern Rhineeland and the south-eastern part of the Netherlands. Atlases of Dutch dialects of the past were also published, such as Berteloot (1984), on phonetic and phonological aspects of 13th-century Dutch dialects, and Mooijaart (1992), on morphological and lexical aspects of these dialects. Ten Goeman, Johan Taeldeman, Piet van Reenen and Jan Goossens set up a project for collecting, transcribing and computerizing data for a large-scale morphological and phonological atlas.

Hagen (1992: 344) stated that by its position in the delta of Europe, the Netherlands, situated between the powerful languages and cultures of France, Germany and England, seemed predestined to play an important role in interlingual dialectology. Indeed we find already pleas for a European dialectology in Kloeke (1927), and later on Van Ginneken and Heeroma too point in this direction. It is therefore not surprising that the later Atlas Linguarum Europae was initiated in the Netherlands in the 1960s (Weijnen et al. 1975).

Other large-scale projects begun in this period were the areal dictionaries. We have seen in 5.4. that Grootaers had the intention of writing a dictionary of Flemish, but for want of help, he did not succeed. The data Grootaers collected however, are being published together with more recently collected data, in three areal dictionaries initiated and supervised in the Netherlands by Weijnen of Nijmegen University, and by Willem Pé, of the University of Gent and later on, by Vaalre Frits Vanacker (b. 1921) of the same university: Woordenboek van de Brabantse dialecten (1967–), Woordenboek van de Limburgse dialecten (1983–), Woordenboek van de Vlaamse dialecten (1979–). The first two dictionaries cover an area in The Netherlands and in Belgium, the latter covers only Belgium. The three dictionaries are so-called systematic onomasiological dictionaries. They are set up according to the same principles and the same design. The first volume always deals with the agricultural lexicon, the second with non-agricultural specialist terminology, and the third with the general lexicon. The places where the dialect words are found are carefully documented. Each volume contains numerous lexical maps. These three dictionaries will be completed at the beginning of
the next millenium. One dictionary already completed along these modern lines of dialect lexicography is the dictionary of the Zeeland dialects (Ghijsen 1959–1964).

In this period two important handbooks on dialectology were published. Weijnen (1966) is a comprehensive reference book. Goossens (1977a) is a convenient, clearly written book often used for courses in Dutch dialectology. Jo Duan drew an important new dialect classification map (Duan & Blok 1968) based not only on isoglosses but also on which dialects dialect speakers experience as similar to their own dialect and which is different. Today this map is considered the most insightful dialect classification map of the Dutch-speaking language area (cf. 3.4. and 4.6.).

6.2. Linguistic theory and dialectology
We have seen in 4.1. (above) that the regularist theory of the neogrammarians gave an important impulse to dialect geography. Theories were tested and refined on the basis of dialect data. The expansion theory was an important driving force of dialect research in the 1920s. The spread of linguistic phenomena was explained by means of external linguistic factors such as social, cultural and historical aspects (cf. 5.3., 6.1.). The connection with linguistic theories became, however, somewhat looser later on (cf. 5.5.). Dialectologists no longer used dialect data to test and refine linguistic theories, but they concentrated on collecting data: atlases, dictionaries and dialect centres distributing and evaluating dialect questionnaires. Many dialectologists got bogged down in gathering data. The collectors' mania was especially stimulated by the idea that dialects were dying out (Weijnen 1958) and that as much dialect data as possible had to be collected before dialects had been wiped out completely. Only some dialectologists tried to approach dialects from a theoretical point of view. It is remarkable that those theories were more linguistically than sociologically oriented in the 1960s. Already Weijnen (1951), the most prominent dialectological successor of Van Ginneken in Nijmegen, for example, made a plea for the explanation of the spread of dialect phenomena using internal linguistic factors—similar to Gilliéron’s gallus-catus map. Jan Goossens (b. 1930), professor of Dutch philology in Louvain, and since 1969 in Münster, demonstrated that a similar structural approach to dialect phenomena could also be very fruitful in the Dutch-speaking language area. His dissertation (Goossens 1963) is an example of this program on the lexical level. Goossens (1969) shows the possibilities of applying structural theory to dialect geography, especially phonological data.

Generative linguistics has not strongly influenced Dutch dialectology. The generative mechanisms of description are used, but the theories are rarely tested. There are, however, some exceptions: Hoppenbrouwers (1982) and Taeldeman (1985). It is striking that the generative approach to Dutch dialects is seldom used in dialect syntax, but more often in phonology. Gerritsen (1991) tries to explain the spread of syntactic phenomena with the help of generative theories, but she did not succeed since the data she collected proved too complex. Only one or two generative linguists studied isolated dialect phenomena, but a systematic generative analysis of Dutch dialects has never been made. Nevertheless, generative linguistics has had some influence on Dutch dialectology. First, it stimulated research into dialect syntax. As a result, dialectologists became interested in syntactic characteristics of dialects. The investigations into the areal spread of syntactic phenomena by Cor van Bee (1981) of Leiden University, inspired by generative linguistics, has been an important impulse for dialect geographical surveys into syntax (Gerritsen 1991) and for the study of syntactic phenomena in a certain area (Cornips 1994; Voortman 1994). Generative linguistics also stimulated dialectology not only because it was very expansive, but also because, for many younger linguists, it was the only legitimate approach to linguistics. However, the increasing distance between real language use and the more and more abstract generative descriptions caused a reaction. The actual language use, in this case the dialects, was investigated in order to demonstrate that speech performance was not as heterogenous as the generativists suggested.

This reaction to abstract theorizing led to an intense growth of sociolinguistics. Van Ginneken (cf. 4.6. and 5.1.), and Kloekke (cf. 5.3.) had already emphasized the importance of the study of social aspects of language use. Jo Daan in Daan & Weijnen (1967) translated the Labovian approach for the Dutch-speaking language area. Weijnen, in the same publication (1967), offered a sociological analysis of dialect use in Limburg. Some years earlier Nuytens (1962) had made a big
plash with his study of the bilinguals in Borne (a village in the north-east of the Netherlands).

Sociolinguistics attracted especially the younger generation of linguists in the 1970s and the 1980s. It seemed to come to a break between dialectologists and sociolinguists in the 1970s. Had there been sufficient financial means it would probably not have come that far, but there were financial problems. This was due, on the one hand, to the economic recession following the first world oil crisis in 1973 and, on the other, to the fact that universities had to economize as the number of students decreased due to the lower birth rate in the 1970s. The struggle for research funds led to a schism between dialectologists and sociolinguists, as the major part was employed for sociolinguistic projects. The sociolinguistic projects seemed to bear more relevance for society than the dialect projects. One of these important sociolinguistic projects was, for example, the so-called Kerkrade project (Kerkrade is a town near the German-Dutch border in the south of The Netherlands). This project investigated whether speaking a dialect has consequences for success in school. When it turned out that dialect speaking children were less successful than children speaking Standard Dutch, methods were developed to teach the standard language to dialect speakers (Hagen 1981). Dialectologists and sociolinguists were reconciled when the problems of dialect-speaking children were pushed aside by the still more serious problems of children from foreign workers in The Netherlands (Moroccans, Turks). A lot of the financial resources consequently went to projects in which the linguistic and communicative problems of foreign workers were analyzed.

Nowadays dialect geographers successfully apply sociolinguistic methods. Kruisjen (1995) used them in his study of the spread of French elements in the area just north of the French-Flemish border. Earlier, Gerritsen & Jansen (1982) used data collected with a sociolinguistic methodology and with a quantitative analysis for their investigation of the expansion of the Amsterdam dialect in the area around Amsterdam. The classic dialect monograph giving a qualitative description of nearly all dialect characteristics of a dialect is nowadays replaced by the thorough quantitative sociolinguistic study of a small number of dialect phenomena (Van Hout 1989, Brouwer 1989). Not only the dialect of the lower classes is investigated, but also the dialect of the elite. Voortman (1994), for example, gives a thorough description of the language of the upper class in a number of places in the Netherlands. The psycholinguistic approach to language variation that is frequently used in sociolinguistics, the study of language attitudes and the domains in which varieties are used, is also applied to Dutch dialects (van Hout & Knops 1988). Summarizing, we can say that sociolinguistics has contributed highly to methodological innovations in dialectology.

In addition to sociolinguistics, theories of language change, especially those developed in the paradigm of Weinreich, Labov & Herzog (1968), have contributed to dialectological research. Not only because the spread of a linguistic element tells us something about its history, but also because the dialects have been recorded carefully in the past. By doing this in the same way today, we can study dialect change in real time and thus put theories on language change to a test. There have been a number of such projects in the Dutch-speaking language area.

The first dialect survey ever held in the Netherlands (1879, cf. 4.1) was repeated 100 year later in the same way (Gerritsen 1979). A number of dialectologists traced the changes in the answers to the questions between the 1879 survey and the 1979 survey on the lexical, phonological and morphological levels. Some adaptations to Standard Dutch were found, but the majority of the aspects that were investigated showed no change. The results of the survey indicated that the dialects are much more stable than had ever been imagined. In 1995 a similar project was carried out using the questionnaire of 1895 (cf. 4.1); it yielded similar results. In 1995, the Dialectenbureau, since 1979 Department of dialectology of the P. J. Meertens-Institute in Amsterdam (P. J. Meertens was the first director of the Dialectenbureau, cf. 5.3.) began again collecting translations of the Parabel of the Prodigal Son in a number of dialects in the Dutch-speaking language area and in Germany in order to compare the results with those published by Winkler in 1874 (cf. 3.3). A remarkably similar project is the survey that Harrie Scholtmeyer (1992) performed in the reclaimed Zuiderzeepolders (cf. 5.5.). Contrary to expectation, the population did not yet speak Standard Dutch by 1990, but it had adapted its language to the dialects spoken on the nearest mainland.
Theories of the linguistic and sociolinguistic mechanisms of language change have also been tested in Dutch dialects with the help of the apparent-time method. In this method one studies at a certain moment the speech of people of different ages and one interprets differences between the age groups as changes. Insightful studies included, for example, Van Bree (1985) on the adaptations to Standard Dutch in the dialect of Haaksbergen, Gerritsen (1999) on standardization in three similar dialects under influence of three different standard languages, and Vousten (1995) on the acquisition of the Venray dialect by adolescents who had acquired Standard Dutch as their first language.

6.3. The future of Dutch dialectology
We noted earlier in (5.5) that during the 1960s almost all professors in linguistics had some association with dialectology. That almost a guarantee that courses in dialectology would be given and that dialectological research would be promoted. There are nowadays still some professors in linguistics who work in dialectology. Cor van Bree in Leiden, Toon Hagen in Nijmegen, Johan Taaldeman in Gent, Georges de Schutter in Antwerpen, and Herman Niebaum in Groningen, but most of them are on the point of retiring. Due to the fact that universities have to economize, it is almost certain that they will not be succeeded by a dialectologist, provided that their post will be filled after their retirement at all. This means that the transfer of dialectological knowledge is not secure. All the more since the reorganization of higher education will decrease the number of disciplines. The large-scale atlas and dictionary projects will have to be completed before the 21th century, because future financial support is in doubt.

The unfavourable position for the future of dialectology can be seen in terms of the absence of chairs, general education and large-scale projects. The main hope may lie with the involvement of lay persons. Every self-respecting local historical circle has a dialect branch writing a traditional dialect monograph or a dictionary of the local dialect. There is a flourishing Stichting Nederlandsche Dialecten (Dutch Dialects Foundation) that organizes every two years much frequented dialect days. Each province partly finances the dictionaries in their area. The interest in the dialect of a particular place or area can be seen also as a reaction to the over-all unity and linguistic stream-lining for which the European Community strives. People want to emphasize the characteristics and the uniqueness of their own area. This reaction has aroused interest in the regional culture, food, and also, language. Proposals for the development of spelling systems for the dialects and education in the dialect have to be considered from this point of view.

Weijnen (1975) said that a dialectologist at a Dutch university feels lonely. This is certainly very true today, but s/he can find solace in the vitality of dialect speakers themselves.
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1. Standard versus nonstandard

A standard variety of written English may be dated from the 15th century with the rise of the dialect of London, which had gained enormous prestige. Gorlach (1995a: 192) observes:

"The early spread of the written standard brought with it a stigmatization of regional dialects, which became restricted to literary niches as in pastoral poetry, satire and substandard stage diction (in stereotypical form) before their scope was widened again in 18th-century Scotland and 19th-century England [i.e., through new forms of writing in Scots and English dialects]." Early attitudes to dialects are revealed in Puttenham (1589, cited after Wakelin 1977: 27), who advised people to adopt as a standard "the vsual speach of the Court, and that of London and the shires lying about London within lx. myles, and not much aboue". There were some in any shire who spoke in the approved manner, "but not the common people of euer shire, to whom the gentlemen, and also their learned clarkes do for the most part condescend". We may note here Puttenham's awareness of social variation and attitudes to dialects as well as regional variation. Words such as 'barbarous' and 'vulgar' become common from the 16th century on as epithets describing nonstandard speech. However, Renaissance nationalism fostered historical interest in the English language, and that interest included local speech. It was a part of the wider fascination with antiquities, the Society of Antiquaries being founded in 1572. Thus Dean Laurence Nowell's (c. 1514–1576) *Vocabularium Saxonicum* (c. 1565) cited non-standard words to help illuminate Old English texts (see Marekwardt 1952).

2. The 17th century

The study of regional dialects in England began during the 17th century. Although the 19th century is our focus here, we cannot simply begin in the year 1800, for 19th-century dialectologists were working in part within a long-established tradition. Alexander Gill (1565–1635) attempted the first, admittedly very broad, classification of the Modern English dialects: "There are six major dialects: the general, the Northern, the Southern, the Eastern, the Western, and the Poetic" (1619 II. 102). He outlined the main characteristics of each. As Ihlalainen (1994: 199) comments, Gill, a schoolmaster, was probably motivated chiefly by a "desire to eradicate provincialisms from the language of his young scholars" rather than by any profound interest in Dialectology.

Some dictionaries of the English language included "hard" words whose distributions were regionally restricted, but more importantly for dialect lexicology, John Ray (1627–1705) compiled *A Collection of English Words Not Generally Used* (1674), which was the first general English dialect dictio-