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9. Mapping Dutch and Flemish

1. Introduction

The beginnings and growth of dialectology in the Netherlands and Flanders can only be discussed against the background of the situation in neighboring countries. In reaction to the Enlightenment, the Romantic period brought with it an interest in and appreciation of prescientific culture and nostalgia for the past. More attention came to be paid to art, myths, fairy tales and the language of ordinary people past and present, as opposed to the Enlightenment period interest in cultured standard language. The new focus was imported from the France of Rousseau and the Germany of Schiller. But later developments in the Netherlands and Flanders did not take place in isolation either. Thus, the German linguist Georg Wenker and his French colleague Jules Gilliéron were the unmistakable precursors of Dutch linguistic atlas projects, while the work of Jean Séguy and of Hans Goebl served as models for dialectometry in our region.

In section 2 of this chapter, we take a brief look at prescientific linguistic maps and dialect collections. In section 3, dialect surveys that have not been developed into linguistic atlases are discussed. Section 4 reviews linguistic atlases that cover the whole Dutch language area, generally including Frisian and the West Flemish dialects in northwest France, and section 5 those covering Dutch language regions. Special linguistic atlases and maps are discussed in section 6. Wherever possible, attention is paid to the raison d’être for the atlases and maps, as well as their findings and reception. In addition, scholars’ views about the classification of Dutch dialects are reviewed — these views are closely linked to dialect surveys and map drawing. Finally, section 7 contains a short conclusion, and a few desiderata for the future are outlined. In this way, language mapping is set in a broader context than has hitherto been achieved under the denominator “linguistic atlas”: smaller collections of linguistic maps will also be investigated; little attention will be paid to language contact studies, however.

2. Prescientific linguistic maps or dialect data covering the entire Dutch language area

In the Renaissance, people developed an interest in their own language, making attempts at creating a standard language (cf. Van der Sijs 2004, with 52 maps). To this end, choices had to be made: certain linguistic items (forms, words, combinations) would henceforth be considered civilized while variants would be rejected as not civilized. People began to distinguish differences within one and the same language, and the term *dialect* was introduced. For the first time, attention was paid to regional differences between languages and dialects, in dictionaries (section 2.1) and in texts (section 2.2).

2.1. Dialect data in dictionaries

In some dictionaries, information began to be provided about the regional distribution of words. The lexicographer Hadrianus Junius was the first, in his *Nomenclator omnium rerum* (1567), to add such information to some entries – thus, he marked *room* ‘cream’ as “Hollandish and Flemish” and *zaen* as “Brabantian”. Much more information is to be found in Cornelis Kiliaan’s *Etymologicum Teutonicae Linguae sive Dictionarium Teutonico-Latinum* from 1599. In this dictionary, Kiliaan took his own Brabant dialect as his point of departure. For words deviating from this, he gave regional indications such as Flemish, Hollandish, Frisian, Low Saxon, etc.; he also mentioned city dialects, such as Ghentish, Louvainian and Gorinchem.

The year 1766 marked the birth of the Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde (‘Dutch Literary Society’), and there plans originated for the collection of materials, including from the dialects, for a large-scale descriptive dictionary of the Dutch language. That dictionary never materialized, but smaller partial collections were made and published (Grootaers and Kloeke 1926: 1; Weijnen 1966: 3). These collections show the influence of the first great and national collections of objects of art which were also started in the second half of the eighteenth century. Parallel to the interest in dialects we begin to see a new museological interest in non-established art forms, resulting in the stadholders’ curio collections in Brussels and The Hague (Kruijsen 2002: 29–35) – and collecting strange words was part of all that. But comparisons over geographical space were as yet out of the question. In the second half of the nineteenth century, a large number of dialect dictionaries were published, describing in each case the dialect of a single village, town or small region (see also section 5.1).

2.2. Dialect texts

From the fifteenth century, people started to compare languages and dialects with each other by setting up text collections of certain Bible passages, initially usually the Lord’s Prayer (see Berns 1997). In 1723, Lambert ten Kate, in his two-volume *Aenleiding tot de kennisse van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche sprake* (Ten Kate 1723), was the first Dutch linguist to draw a language map showing the distribution of peoples and languages across Europe. He illustrated the differences between the languages with the help
of the opening lines of the Lord’s Prayer. This means that the map, in the words of Berns (2003), “is based on the earliest ‘dialect-geographical’ collection, that of the texts of the Lord’s Prayer in the various languages and dialects”.

By order of the Minister of the Interior of the French Empire, in 1807 an inquiry was set up into the languages and dialects spoken in the country. The inquiry was organized by Baron Charles-Etienne Coquebert de Montbret. As his working text he took the parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke 15: 11–32). The results were published in part in 1824. The investigation covered a few southern Dutch dialects as well: in most cases the texts are the earliest recorded in these dialects (Bakker and Kruijsen 2007).

The first systematic and scientific dialect study of the Dutch language area is by Johan Winkler. In his two-volume *Algemeen Nederduitsch en Friesch Dialecticon* from 1874, he recorded translations of the parable of the Prodigal Son into 186 Dutch and Frisian dialects in the Netherlands, Flanders and Germany. This work is our best source of knowledge about the state of the Dutch language in the nineteenth century and is considered to represent the start of comparative dialectology in the Netherlands (Weijnen 1966: 3). Under the title of The New Winkler, new (present-day) dialect versions of the parable of the Prodigal Son have been collected since 1996 by the Meertens Institute in Amsterdam, in many cases from the same places that figure in the 1874 *Dialecticon*. For further information see the introduction by Harrie Scholtmeijer at <http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/books/winkler/> and an annotated selection from this in Scholtmeijer (1999: 96–132).

Between 1876 and 1881, Johan and Lubbertus Leopold published *Van der Schelde tot de Weichsel, Nederduitsche dialecten in dicht en ondicht* in two volumes. This valuable dialect anthology contains a large number of samples of Dutch dialects, but in this case in different texts and with different spellings, which does not make for easy comparisons.

In 1892, the German linguist Hermann Jellinghaus published the first classification map of the Dutch dialects – based largely on the dialect texts from the works of the Leopold brothers and Winkler. Jellinghaus presented his data on an area map, showing surface distributions with border lines, a so-called chorochromatic map.

3. Dialect surveys

In the course of the nineteenth century, a new investigation method came to be used, with which dialect differences could be described more adequately than through text comparisons, namely that of the dialect survey. With the aid of dialect surveys it becomes possible to make linguistic maps and atlases. Dialect investigations depend upon scientific aims: one should think about what to collect, what to chart, how to set about that and why. The first attempts at a dialect survey were made by the Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde in 1852 and 1857, but these two attempts did not get past the stage where a few written word lists were sent around. The plan was caught up in the dispute about theoretical principles that the leading linguists, who were only interested in “rarities and antiquities”, were engaged in (Grootaers and Kloeke 1926: 4).

Not all dialect surveys led to the immediate production of linguistic atlases or large-scale dialect-geographical studies. In this section such dialect surveys will be discussed; in section 4 surveys that did serve as material for linguistic atlases will be examined.
3.1. Zuidnederlandsche Maatschappij van Taalkunde, 1872

In 1872, the newly established Zuidnederlandsche Maatschappij van Taalkunde (‘Southern Netherlands Linguistic Society’) set up a written inquiry into the gender of 580 substantives in the Flemish dialects. With it, the Flemish movement wanted to establish the independent identity of their own language as opposed to Northern Dutch. Sixty-one replies were received, but the material remained unanalyzed for over 60 years — not until 1938, when dialect geography had been further developed, did Jan L. Pauwels produce an analysis of this material, at which point he published 27 dialect maps and a composite map (Goossens 1977a: 127). From this study it appeared that the number of words whose gender is the same in all southern Dutch dialects is only small.

3.2. Aardrijkskundig Genootschap, 1879–1895

The initiative for the first great survey came from outside the circle of linguists. In 1879, at the instigation of Hendrik Kern, the Aardrijkskundig Genootschap (‘Geographical Society’) of Amsterdam sent out a questionnaire containing 184 questions about words and sentences, and received 284 completed forms back from 212 places in the Netherlands. With this material, Kern intended to compose a linguistic map showing what regions the various Dutch dialects were spoken in. The task proved too formidable.

In 1892, Jan te Winkel took charge of the material, intending to chart individual speech sounds first. He supplemented Kern’s material with a new questionnaire with a series of 113 words featuring a historically identical vocalism, four additional questions about morphology and two detailed ones about vocabulary. He received another 209 completed lists back from 194 locations, 171 of which had not been involved in the first questionnaire, so that ultimately data from 383 Dutch locations were available from the two questionnaires.

In 1898, in the second edition of Hermann Paul’s Grundriss (1896–1909), Jan te Winkel was the first Dutch scholar to publish a survey map of the Dutch dialects (an area map, reproduced here in the maps volume as Map 0901), based on the two linguistic questionnaires of the Geographical Society from 1879 and 1895 — he also included it in his history of the Dutch language (Te Winkel 1901). Furthermore, Te Winkel published three installments of an atlas, De Noordnederlandsche TongvalLEN (‘The Northern Dutch Dialects’; Te Winkel 1899–1901). In these, he published the Geographical Society questionnaires, a map of Germanic long ą and one of long ı together with the relevant area maps. After that, the undertaking came to a halt, not least because of the criticism from the linguistic world (see Van Ginneken 1913: 105).

In 1979, the Meertens Institute redistributed the Geographical Society’s questionnaire among its correspondents. With Marinel Gerritsen as editor, a comparison was published that same year between the answers to the two surveys that were separated by a century, mostly illustrated by two maps (Gerritsen 1979). In 1995 the Stichting Nederlandse Dialecten (‘Netherlands Dialects Foundation’) used the second Aardrijkskundig Gen-
ootschap questionnaire for a large-scale repetition (see Belemans and Van de Wijngaard 1995). The Aardrijkskundig Genootschap material has been incorporated in the entries of the three southern Dutch regional dictionaries (see section 5.1).

3.3. Inquiry of Pieter Willems, 1885

In the final decades of the nineteenth century, a Leuven professor, Pieter Willems, set up an extensive inquiry covering over two thousand words and phrases, which he sent out in 1886 in what were known as the Frankish areas: the two Flanders, the provinces of Brabant and Limburg, southern Utrecht and Gelderland and the neighboring Rhine-land. His aim was to produce a comparative phonology and morphology of the Frankish dialects. Willems undertook the processing himself, but the work was never published. He presented the completed forms – 374 replies from 337 towns – to the Ghent Academy, together with his extensive adaptations. For practically the whole of the first half of the twentieth century (with some interruptions), Jacques van Ginneken was in possession of the material and, thinking that it was a donation (Brok 1989: 55–57), made ample use of it for his dialect-geographical work, often, incidentally, without acknowledgement. Ludovic Grootaers sharply criticized the reliability of Willems’ material and the way it had been processed (Hagen 1988: 272).

In 1989, Goossens, Taeldeman and Weijnen edited an evaluative special issue of the journal *Taal en Tongval* devoted to Willems’ material and the use made of it in the preceding century. Some of the data were used later on for the three southern Dutch regional dictionaries (see section 5.1). Map 0903 shows the area covered by the survey.

3.4. SGV, 1914

In 1914, the Nijmegen professors Joseph Schrijnen and Jacques van Ginneken, assisted by J. J. Verbeeten, set up a large-scale survey in the southeast of the Netherlands, known as the SGV survey after the surnames of its initiators (cf. Kruijsen 2006). Their questionnaire covers 51 pages, with an alphabetical word list that had to be translated — the most error prone way of surveying, as it turned out. The list was sent to local correspondents who were considered to be experts, most of them schoolteachers. The result was quite impressive: circa 350,000 pieces of data from 194 places were collected.

On the basis of these data, Schrijnen (1917: 34) drew a map of the dialect terms for ‘butterfly’ in Dutch Limburg, southeast Gelderland and east Brabant — this is held to be the first word map in the Dutch-speaking regions. Quite in line with Gilliéron, “(historical) succession” and “(spatial) co-existence” were linked together.

The results of the SGV survey were further used by Van Ginneken (Frings and Van Ginneken 1919) and Schrijnen in monographs in which they described the course of southern language boundaries. Especially successful was Schrijnen’s (1920) *De isoglossen van Ramisch in Nederland*, in which the dialect boundaries drawn by the German linguist Ramisch for the Rhineland in 1908 were extended into the Dutch province of Limburg.
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Before that, in 1913, Jacques van Ginneken had drawn a survey map of the Dutch dialects for the first part of his *Handboek der Nederlandsche Taal* – he based this on the earlier classification map by Te Winkel, the material collected by Willems in 1885 and Winkler’s dialect texts. Like his predecessors, Van Ginneken produced an area map, and he named the various regions after Germanic tribes. He arranged the dialects into five main groups: Dutch Frankish, Brabant Frankish, Limburg Frankish, Saxon and Frisian. These groups were then subdivided by him. Additionally, in imitation of Joseph Schrijnen, he drew isoglosses in the southeastern area, for example the Uerdingen line and the Benrath line.

The data from the so-called SGV survey were also incorporated into the three southern Dutch regional dictionaries (see section 5.1).

4. Linguistic atlases of the entire Dutch language area

From 1925 on, new dialect surveys were initiated, resulting in the following linguistic atlases of the entire Dutch language area.


What began in the early twenties as a small, personally conducted survey of the dialect of Klein Brabant, the native region of author Edgard Blancquaert, had, nearly sixty years later, grown into an immense collection of linguistic maps and reply lists from circa 3,000 locations: the *Reeks Nederlandse Dialectatlassen* (RND). During that period, Willem Pée and Frits Vanacker continued Blancquaert’s work. The collections were put together from oral inquiries carried out by experienced dialectologists who were familiar with their area of investigation.

The *RND* is a series of two-part volumes. The atlas part of every installment covers about 150 phenomena in the region in question; the data are recorded on the maps in phonetic transcription (i.e., they are diplomatic maps). They show the distribution of words, sounds and morphological and syntactic data. The text part contains the translations of around 140 sentences and word lists for each location, also presented in the phonetic alphabet.

Indisputably, great methodological progress had been made with the shift to oral rather than written surveys, but the disadvantage was that the project had taken far too long: developments within the dialects during that period were so fast that the linguistic context of the first volume is hardly comparable with that of the last. Further, the volumes each describe only a part of the Dutch linguistic area, and although the questionnaires for the various regions are largely identical, it is not easy to gain an overall impression of the variation within the whole Dutch linguistic area from the different RND volumes. Moreover, the maps do not provide an easily surveyable picture, because the data have been annotated in phonetic script. Nevertheless, thanks to its large-scale survey, the RND remains an invaluable foundation for comparative (historical) language study in the Dutch language area.

In 1948, Blancquaert published a pamphlet in which he surveyed the methods and findings of the RND and replied to criticism. Goossens (1965) evaluates the volumes under RND in the list of atlases for the handbook as a whole. Figure 9.1 shows the area covered by each installment.
published thus far, and in 1976 a special issue (number 28) of the journal *Taal en Tongval* was devoted to the completion of the *RND*. The next year, *RND* registers for sound-geographical study were published in the same journal (Taeldeman 1977). Van de Wijngaard and Belemans (1997) contains observations and evaluations about the *RND* and a bibliography, from which Figure 9.1 has been reproduced.

The dialectologist Antoon A. Weijnen, who was responsible for volume 9 of the *RND*, drew a new classification map for the Dutch dialects in his *De Nederlandse dialecten* (1941), in which he abandoned the old tribal terminology and based his division on the course of the isoglosses (Goossens 2008: 41–42). Weijnen classified the dialects into six main groups: the northern central, northwestern, southern central, southwestern, northeastern and southeastern dialects. This classification is still in use.


In 1926, one year after the publication of the first volume of the *RND*, the literary section of the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences in Amsterdam installed a dialect committee to co-ordinate dialect studies in the Netherlands. This committee decided that a research institute should be set up by order of the Government and this was realized in 1930 with the founding of the *Dialectenbureau*, later known as the *Instituut voor Dialectologie, Volkskunde en Naamkunde*, and from 1979 on as the (P. J.) Meertens-Instituut, after the first secretary of the committee, folklorist Piet Meertens. Right from the start, the main objective of the dialect bureau was the compilation of an atlas of the whole Dutch language area, for which purpose written material would be collected. Setting up a national network of correspondents was one of the bureau’s first activities. The first questionnaire was published in 1931 and since then the bureau and its later incarnations have sent out a questionnaire every year. Two registers of the Meertens Institute questionnaires have been published as internal publications: *Vragenlijsten met register* (1931–1958) (Daan 1960) and *Dialectvragenlijsten met register* (1959–1975). The Meertens Institute has maintained a register of the questionnaires since 1931.

Meanwhile, Kloeke and Grootaers had provided a blueprint for a linguistic atlas of the Dutch language area with their *Handleiding bij het Noord- en Zuid-Nederlands dialectonderzoek* (Grootaers and Kloeke 1926). In 1924, Grootaers started to send out written inquiries from the Zuid-Nederlandse Dialectcentrale in Leuven (the *ZND-lijsten* [1924–1958]). Since 1931, these ZND questionnaires have been administered partly parallel to those of the dialect committee.

One of the maps included in the *Handleiding* is a base map of the area with a commentary and a place-name register. Kloeke’s unique numbering of thousands of villages and hamlets in Holland, Flanders, French Flanders and northwest Germany is still in use at the Meertens Institute, and all Dutch-language dialectologists use the Kloeke codes as unique location indicators in their descriptions and studies, cf. section 4.6 and chapter 20.

1939 saw the publication of the first installment of the *Taalatlas van Noord- en Zuid-Nederland*, edited by Grootaers and Kloeke; informally, the project was called the “Leidse Taalatlas”, later simply the “Taalatlas”. The atlas consisted of a folder of symbol
maps with no accompanying commentary, because Kloeke wanted to leave any interpretation to the users. From the sixth installment on, the editorial staff was replaced by the dialect committee – who decided that brief commentaries should be added to the maps. Nine installments featuring 110 (mostly word) maps (TNZN) and two Toelichtingen (‘Notes’: Daan and Meertens 1963; Stroop 1974) with very brief, predominantly technical commentary were published. In the later continuation of the project, the Taalatlas van het Nederlands en het Fries (TNF), another 20 maps with the same design and including Frisian were published between 1981 and 1988. Because of the high costs and the new technical possibilities opened up by computers, the project was stopped in 1988. By way of illustration, the word map for ‘the tang of a scythe’, the first map of the TNZN, is reproduced as Map 0902.

The maps cover the whole Dutch language area, making the distribution of a phenomenon clear at a glance. A disadvantage, however, is that the maps give only brief commentaries. For the history and the reception of the TNZN see Berns 1988.

In 1968, Jo Daan and D. P. Blok used the so-called arrows method as developed by Weijnen (1946, reproduced as Map 0904; cf. Goossens 1977a: 165–168 and chapter 6) to draw a dialect distribution map on the basis of the replies that had been received to the first question of the questionnaire sent out by the Meertens Institute in 1939: “In what place(s) in your neighborhood is the same or almost the same dialect spoken as in yours?” The places mentioned by the respondents are then linked by arrows on the map – producing openings where there are no arrows; these gaps represent dialect boundaries in the language awareness of the dialect speakers. We are thus dealing with a subjective dialect configuration here. For Belgium, Daan and Blok used the judgments of language researchers, because there were not enough informants. Daan and Blok’s map was published in a booklet together with a vinyl record, additional maps and commentary (Daan and Blok 1968). Like Weijnen’s 1941 classification, this one is also still being used.

4.3. Atlas van de Nederlandse klankontwikkeling (ANKO), 1972–1977

Between 1972 and 1977, Jo Daan and Marie J. Francken published the Atlas van de Nederlandse klankontwikkeling (ANKO), comprising 20 symbol maps with separate commentary volumes. The atlas was published at the initiative of the dialect committee, and was intended as a supplement to the TNZN, in which only brief commentaries accompanied the maps. According to the introduction, the aim of the ANKO is to present, by means of extensive commentaries, “an aid for the study of the history of Dutch sounds across space”, with maps especially chosen to enable discussion of a number of important topics about sound developments in Dutch in the accompanying commentaries – in practice only about vowels, classified on the basis of their origin (e.g., Proto-Germanic ai, West Germanic ã). The data were derived from the RND and cover both the Dutch and Frisian territories. The FAND (see section 4.6) can be seen as a further development of the ANKO.
4.4. A. Weijnen’s *Klankleer*, 1991

In 1991, Weijnen published his *Vergelijkende klankleer van de Nederlandse dialecten* (‘Comparative Phonology of the Dutch Dialects’, *Weijnen 1991*). It contains 102 maps, based on Weijnen’s own data collection and drawn with the aid of different methods: there are symbol maps, isogloss maps and area maps. Every map is accompanied by a brief commentary. Most of the maps cover the whole Dutch area including Friesland, but some only a part of it — the reference base is provided by the reconstructed Proto-Germanic sounds. Many of the maps had not been published previously. While it is true that the commentaries are much shorter than those in the *ANKO*, the number of maps and cartographic data is considerably larger.

4.5. *Atlas van de Nederlandse dialectsyntaxis* (AND), 1991

In 1991, the *Atlas van de Nederlandse dialectsyntaxis* (AND) was published, edited by Marinel Gerritsen — it consisted of one volume with commentaries and one volume with 44 symbol maps. It was the first atlas devoted to Dutch dialect syntax. The AND questionnaires formed part of the questionnaire sent out annually by the Meertens Institute. The survey for the AND used a combination of two methods: judgment tests and translations. The AND was later continued as the SAND (see section 4.6).


During a conference of Dutch and Flemish dialectologists in 1975 (cf. Berns 1976) a plan was conceived to set up a new survey of the whole language area in accordance with the latest theoretical insights and to store the material in a databank. At first, the inquiry was set up as a joint project of the Meertens Institute in Amsterdam and the Seminarie voor Vlaamse dialectologie in Ghent — hence its name, after the respective leaders, of “Goeman-Taeldeman project”. From early on, the Free University in Amsterdam also participated and the name became the Goeman-Taeldeman-van Reenen project (GTRP). Later on, The Louvain Catholic University and the Fryske Akademy joined the project (Frisian is not represented in the FAND); finally, the Nedersaksisch Instituut of Groningen University also took part, providing coverage for Drenthe.

The questionnaire contains 1,854 words and word groups and 22 phrases, selected in such a way that all the inflected forms of as many basic words as possible are presented, as well as the consonant clusters and the full set of historical vowels in as many contexts as possible. The field of inquiry is slightly different for each volume and comprises a maximum of 613 locations. The investigation lasted from 1979 until 1994 and, like the RND, it was conducted by linguists who were familiar with the area. The data can be consulted on the website of the Meertens Institute; users can select data and make maps themselves. Sound files will be added in future; for the syntactic data this has already been realized.
With the aid of this material, a phonological and a morphological atlas have been produced: the F AND and the MAND. A syntactic atlas (SAND) has been made on the basis of three new surveys: written (initial investigation), oral (using specially trained fieldworkers) and telephone-based (checking). These data, too, can be found on the Meertens Institute website, where the DynaSAND particularly catches the attention. This is an online tool for variational syntactic investigation with a cartographic component. Commentaries have been added to the maps; those for the F AND are conspicuously oriented to issues of language history. The maps are mostly symbol maps, sometimes combined with an areal representation. For the maps, the Kloek map (from Grootaers and Kloeke 1926) and the list of place-names have been digitized. Evert Wattel and Piet van Reenen have produced a new base map, recodifying the Kloekke numbers – more information can be found at <http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/projecten/mand/CARTkartografiefie.html>.

Four volumes of the F AND have appeared, the first three (in 1998 and 2000) devoted to vocalic phenomena, the last (2005) to consonantal features. The MAND has appeared in two parts, Zelfstandig naamwoord (2005) and Graden van vergelijking, voornaamwoorden en werkwoordsysteem (2008). The two published volumes of the SAND are Syntactische variatie bij voegwoorden, voornaamwoorden en topicalisatie (2005) and Werkwoordelijk systeem en negatie (2008). A detailed bibliography of the F AND, MAND and SAND is given in the list of atlases for the handbook as a whole (see maps volume). Map 0905 provides an example from the MAND: the diminutive suffix in bruggetje ‘little bridge’. Map 0906 shows a specimen from the SAND: a map of the reflexive pronoun as the object of a transitive verb.

The GTRP project and the MAND, F AND and SAND provide the most recent information about the Dutch language area and, given the large number of mapped data about a multitude of linguistic facts, they also represent an impressive achievement internationally. The F AND contains 496 maps, the MAND 307 and the SAND 234.

Goeman and Taeldeman (1996) give background information about the data collection and the F AND and MAND. In 2006, a special issue of the journal Taal en Tongval devoted to these three new atlases of the Dutch dialects appeared.

4.7. Plantennamen in de Nederlandse Dialecten (PLAND), 2003–

Since 1976, Har Brok at the Meertens Institute has been collecting popular names of plants in the Dutch area. To this end, he has excerpted not only all the questionnaires described above, but also monographs and local word lists. From 2003 on he has, in collaboration with Joep Kruijssen, stored these in an interactive database at <http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/pland>. From the database, dictionary entries are compiled and also distribution symbol maps of the popular names of plants, making the PLAND a virtual linguistic atlas at the same time.
By mid 2009, the PLAND contained over 275,000 pieces of data. More than 100 data items are available for 373 plants, making a linguistic map useful; an example of a PLAND map is Map 0907, *kruisbes* ‘gooseberry’.

5. Linguistic atlases or maps covering a Dutch region (regional atlases)

New dialect surveys have not only resulted in linguistic atlases covering the whole Dutch area, but also in regional atlases or maps. Frisian has usually been included in the larger atlases.

5.1. The southern dialects

In 1960, Antoon A. Weijnen started investigations for a large-scale regional project, an exhaustive, thematically arranged dictionary of the Brabant dialects in the Netherlands and Belgium (the provinces of North Brabant, Antwerp and Flemish Brabant), in which word maps have been provided for entries showing a regional distribution of the lexemes. The first volume appeared in 1967. Two years later, he started a similar investigation of the Limburg dialects, also in the Netherlands and Belgium (the two Limburg provinces and the traditionally Germanic speaking northeastern region of the province of Liège). In 1972, a project similar in set-up and execution was started under the direction of Willem Pée; this investigated the dialects of the old county of Flanders, i.e., the provinces of East and West Flanders in Belgium, French Flanders in France and Zeelandic Flanders in the Netherlands. The southern Dutch language areas south of the major Rhine and Meuse rivers are thus covered by one and the same type of dialect geography.

The three southern Dutch regional dictionaries are presented here as linguistic atlases, because they cover a large area and include a great many distribution maps of the Brabant, Limburg and Flemish dialects. For the distribution area of the southern Dutch dictionaries, see Figure 9.2.

The *Woordenboek van de Brabantse Dialecten* (*WBD*) was completed in 2005; it comprises thirty-three thematic installments spread over two introductions, agrarian vocabulary (eight installments), other technical jargons (nine installments) and general vocabulary (fourteen installments). The use of the label “Brabant atlas” is no exaggeration, as can be seen from the number of maps: 401 word maps of agrarian vocabulary and 2,541 of general vocabulary. No maps have been published of the 37 technical jargons terms (whose distribution is mostly limited) in part II; this part contains a total of 9,394 entries, the whole *WBD* 16,240.

The last few installments of the *Woordenboek van de Limburgse Dialecten* (*WLD*) appeared in 2008 — it then comprised thirteen installments on agrarian vocabulary (2,404 entries with 681 maps), twelve installments devoted to other technical jargon (37 separate jargons, 8,308 entries and 143 maps) and fourteen on general vocabulary (4,421 entries with 2,014 maps) — in all, 39 installments featuring 15,133 entries and 2,838 maps.
The full phonetic documentation and the geographic positions of the dialect forms, together with the registers and the bibliographies of the two dictionaries can be found at <http://dialect.ruhosting.nl>. Information and publications (digital tools and databases for the WBD and WLD) relating to the D-Square project, in which the data from the two dictionaries have been digitized and linked to the cartographic technology behind Google Earth, can be found at <http://dialect.ruhosting.nl/d2>; see de Vriend et al. (2007).

The descriptions of technical jargons in the two dictionaries do not completely parallel each other since the realia are different: the mining industry is typical of Limburg; the textile industry is typical of old Brabant. For the rest, the dictionaries can easily be put side by side and compared.

This also holds for the Woordenboek van de Vlaamse Dialecten (WVD), which was started later and is still in preparation. Special mention should be made of the position of the West Flemish dialects in northern France, whose umbrella standard language is not Dutch but French.

By mid 2009, twenty-four installments of the WVD have appeared: eleven on agricultural vocabulary (2,033 entries with 976 maps), seven on other technical jargons (3,099 entries with 638 maps) and six devoted to general vocabulary (2,027 entries with 838 maps). The WVD registers can be found at <http://www.wvd.ugent.be>. On this site there is also a “talking map”, designed by the WVD editors; by clicking on a place-name you will hear the dialect pronunciation of the word in question.
The Meertens Institute is working on the further elaboration and enlargement of this “talking map”.

Nearly all of the maps in these three dictionaries are symbol maps. In the maps volume we include *Madeliefje* ‘daisy’ as Map 0908.

All three dictionaries are based on material collected *in situ*: the Nijmegen questionnaires for the *WBD* and *WLD* (1960–2004) and the Ghent *WVD* questionnaires for the *WVD* (1972–), including some data collected previously (investigations by Jan Goossens in Belgian Limburg as well as by the Zuid-Nederlandse Dialectcentrale (ZND) and the dialect committee, Willems and the SGV, see above) and a number of monographs.

As opposed to the situation on the eastern border (see section 5.2), we do not find any geolinguistic projects which transcend the southern language borders — as stands to reason, because there is no linguistic continuum. We have already referred to the special position of West Flemish in French Flanders. Denise Poulet’s 1987 investigation deserves special notice — she describes in detail the traditional lexicon of French Flanders in the region between Calais and Saint-Omer; see also the detailed evaluation of this work by Hugo Ryckeboer (1997: 170–292). Mention should also be made of the classic standard works on loans from across the Germano-Romance linguistic border: Frings (1932), *Roukens 1937*, Müller and Frings (1968) and Weijnen (1975).

Following the dictionaries of the Brabantian, Limburg and Flemish dialects, similar projects, also with maps, have been started in the Achterhoek and in the provinces of Gelderland and Overijssel — these are, however, of more limited scope and cover only the general vocabulary: they are the *Woordenboek van de Achterhoekse en Liemerse Dialecten*, *Woordenboek van de Overijsselse Dialecten* and the *Woordenboek van de Gelderse Dialecten* (*WALD*; *WOD*; *WGD*).

5.2. The eastern dialects

Although the eastern half of the Netherlands and Belgium is included in the base map of Wenker’s *Deutscher Sprachatlas* (*DSA*), the national border is only very rarely transcended in the maps. The same goes for König (1978). In 2008, the *Handboek Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde* was published, edited by Henk Bloemhoff and others — in it, many different aspects of eastern Dutch are discussed, but no new linguistic maps were designed for it.

Over the course of time, however, various cross-border atlases or maps, in which the closely related dialects in the east of the Netherlands and the northwest of Germany are described, have been produced, viz.:

1. *Wort- und Sachgeographie Südost-Niederlands und der umliegenden Gebiete* (*Roukens 1937*). This Nijmegen dissertation by Roukens consists of two parts: the first contains 487 pages of commentaries and the second an atlas, with introductory historical maps and illustrations and 91 linguistic, mostly isogloss, maps, in which the two provinces of Limburg, central and east Brabant, southeast Gelderland and the German border country are discussed. In his choice of maps and commentaries, Roukens was primarily guided by the loanwords from the Rhineland and from the Walloon dialects. Limburg is, rightly, presented as an axis of influences from all corners.
2. Taalatlas van Oost-Nederland en aangrenzende gebieden (TON). In 1957, 1960 and 1963, Klaas Heeroma published three installments of ten maps each of the TON. These are chiefly word maps with symbols describing the eastern Netherlands including Friesland and the contingent northwestern part of Germany. Each installment contains a map section and a commentary section. The underlying aim of the author was to prove his theory about Westphalian expansion, the Westphalian influence on the language in the eastern part of the Netherlands. This theory is rejected by most dialectologists, among them notably Weijnen.

3. Grenzmundarten und Mundartgrenzen. Untersuchungen zur wortgeographischen Funktion der Staatsgrenze im ost-niederländisch-westfälischen Grenzgebiet (Kremer 1979). This study contains a geolinguistic description of the eastern half of Overijssel and Gelderland on the one side, and of the counties of Bentheim, Ahaus and Borken on the other side of the state border between the Netherlands and Germany. In 208 mostly symbol maps, of which the linguistic maps have often been divided up into old and new material, and a commentary volume, a survey is given of the linguistic relations in the area. (See also Kremer 1983.)

4. Sprachatlas des nördlichen Rheinlands und des südöstlichen Niederlands (FSA). In 1981, Jan Goossens began publication of his “Fränkischer Sprachatlas” with his research plan and the presentation of the base map and the list of places investigated. The area covers the south of the Dutch linguistic area and the contingent Rhineland: from Rotterdam to Münster in the north, in the south following the language border as far as Eupen and from there to Luxemburg and Birkenfield in the Rhineland. In the first installment (1988), ten symbol-type word maps from the domains of flora and fauna are discussed with an extensive historical linguistic commentary; in the second installment (1994), the paradigm of the personal pronoun is the topic of discussion in thirteen maps; in the third installment (also 1994), another ten word maps are presented.

5. Neue Sprachschranken im ‘Land ohne Grenzen’ (Cajot 1989). In 543 symbol maps on modern vocabulary with geolinguistic commentary and an analysis of the isoglosses discovered, Cajot studied the influence of political and standard-language boundaries on the dialects in the Germanic-Romance border zone. This area comprises Dutch South Limburg and the section of the language border further south (as far as Luxemburg).

6. Dialekt à la carte: Dialektatlas Westmünsterland – Achterhoek – Liemers – Niederrhein (Cornelissen, Schaarss and Sodmann 1993). This presents a cross-border description of usage in central east Holland and contingent northwestern Germany, with 57 symbol maps, especially word maps, and commentary. The area comprises the quadrangle between Apeldoorn, Gronau, Recklinghausen and Venray.

5.3. North and West

Linguistic atlases or maps that span the western and northern borders and describe Dutch–English or Dutch–Scandinavian language features do not exist – suffice it to refer here to a few articles: Heeroma (1952), Weijnen (1965), Miedema (1971, 1977 and 1980) and Van Bree (1997).
6. Special linguistic atlases or linguistic maps

6.1. Historical linguistic atlases

The atlases mentioned so far all describe contemporary language material, sometimes a little older simply because processing the data took some time. In addition, though, a few historical maps and atlases that cover the Dutch language area have appeared. Kloeke, one of the initiators of the TNZN, published his dissertation in 1927 — the title of which was also a program: *De Hollandsche expansie in de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw en haar weerspiegeling in de hedendaagse Nederlandse dialecten* (‘The Hollandic Expansion in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries and its Reflection in the Present-Day Dutch Dialects’). In his dissertation, Kloeke showed, with the aid of maps for *huis* ‘house’ and *muis* ‘mouse’, that the *ui* sound [œj] developed from earlier *uu* [y], spreading during the Renaissance from Amsterdam via the cities of Holland to other regions. He pointed out the role of prestige in this process — which makes him a sociolinguist *avant la lettre*. He also showed that the spread occurred word by word, a lexically diffuse process. The archaic forms (*hoes, moes*) have been preserved only in the periphery. Kloeke’s work led to much discussion, and has had a lasting influence on the methods of dialect studies. Recently, in Van Reenen (2006) and Postma and Van Reenen (2008), a new interpretation of Kloeke’s *huis-muis* map was presented.

In 1935, Klaas Heeroma published *Hollandse dialektstudies; bijdrage tot de ontwikkelingsgeschiedenis van het algemeen beschaafd Nederlands*. On the basis of localized medieval texts from the western north Netherlands, the most prominent Dutch characteristics were charted and compared with the Dutch dialects of the early twentieth century and with Standard Dutch. The work contains 32 maps.

In the *Corpus van Middelnederlandse teksten (tot en met het jaar 1300)*, edited by Maurits Gysseling between 1977 and 1987, we find in series I the so-called official documents, with localized and dated texts from the thirteenth century. On the basis of this corpus two atlases of thirteenth-century Dutch have appeared (in the form of dissertations). In 1984, Armand Berteloot published his *Klankatlas van het dertiende-eeuwse Middelnederlands*, in two volumes with 150 maps (*Berteloot 1984*). Berteloot drew symbol maps, with (among other features) circles reflecting the total number of locations in their circumferences and the relations between the charted variants in their proportions of black and white. In 1992, Marijke Mooijaart published *Atlas van Vroegmiddelnederlandse taalvarianten*, with 160 maps. About her use of cartography (*Mooijaart 1992*: 38), Mooijaart writes,

> Preference is given to area maps in which the results (something not unusual in dialectometric investigations) are presented along the lines of choroplethic technique: in these maps, specific values that are valid for the geographic areas under study are expressed by graphic marking of the areas [...]. This charting method is combined with the direct representation of the original values as presented in numbers.

At the Amsterdam Free University (VU), Maaike Mulder and Piet van Reenen supervised the collection of fourteenth-century Middle Dutch records. This is known as the “Corpus Van Reenen-Mulder 14de eeuws Middelnederlands” (CRM) and has formed the basis for a dissertation with 101 maps (*Rem 2003*: *De taal van de klerken uit de*)
Hollandse grafelijke kanselarij (1300–1340). Naar een lokaliseringsprocedure voor het veertiende-eeuwse Middelnederlands. Rem makes use of a cartographic method that is a further elaboration of the chorophletic technique, developed by Evert Wattel and Piet van Reenen, in which areas are calculated from the distribution and intensity of the data (see Chapter 25). This is sometimes called a probabilistic map. On the Vroegmiddelnederlands Woordenboek internet site, <http://gtb.inl.nl>, Wattel maps can be generated automatically, provided sufficient data are available.

6.2. Special maps

Onomastics

Onomasticians in the Netherlands and Belgium launched the website at <http://www.naamkunde.net>, where databanks of Dutch first names and surnames can be found. Maps of surnames are generated automatically according to the postcodes. On <http://www.familienaam.be> and <http://www.familienaam.nl>, maps are drawn of the surnames in Belgium or the Netherlands; the websites have been constructed in collaboration with the Belgian onomastician Ann Marynissen.

Dialectometrics

The Dutch dialect classification map drawn by Daan and Blok in 1968 was based on the subjective judgments of the interviewees. Since then, a number of researchers have tried to create an objective classification as well, using what is known as dialectometrics, set up by Jean Séguy (ALG, esp. vol. 6) and elaborated by Hans Goebl (1984), to establish the dialect differences on the basis of dialect features. Thus, John Nerbonne and Wilbert Heeringa (1998) published a “Computational classification of Dutch dialects” on the basis of the RND data; see also Heeringa 2004. In 2001, in De indeling van de Nederlandse streektalen, Cor and Geer Hoppenbrouwers determined the mutual relationships between the dialects of 156 Dutch and Flemish places, using what they call the feature frequency method (FFM). To this end, a computer program counts the phonetic features in texts from the RND and then works out the relationships between the various dialects. Finally, Marco René Spruit calculated the syntactic distance between the Dutch dialects on the basis of the data from the SAND in Quantitative perspectives on syntactic variation in Dutch Dialects (Spruit 2008). Recently, a special issue of Lingua (Nerbonne and Manni 2009) was devoted to an overview of Dutch dialectometry.

Special cartography

For the latest developments in cartography in the Dutch language area readers are referred to chapters 20 and 25.

7. Conclusion

Phenomena at all linguistic levels (phonology, morphology, etc.) of the Dutch language area have been charted, with words and sounds receiving the most attention. A few non-linguistic phenomena, such as the distance between dialects, have been discussed as well.
The Dutch material has been used in the semantic maps or concepts maps of the European linguistic atlas, the *Atlas Linguarum Europae (ALE)*, of which seven parts with commentaries have been published since 1986. 2010 will see the publication of *Beeld van het Nederlands*, edited by Nicoline van der Sijs. In this book, the regional variety of Dutch in sounds, word forms, words and phrases will be charted for a general public for the first time — with special emphasis on recognizable, modern linguistic phenomena. About 150 large maps will be included and around 25 smaller supporting maps. This book is to be a cartographic supplement to the *Taal in stad en land (TISEL)* series under the general editorship of Van der Sijs, in which the modern dialect variety in the entire Dutch language area is described in 27 volumes published between 2002 and 2005, but in which only a restricted number of maps are included.

After the completion of the *FAND*, *MAND* and *SAND*, no new inquiries or linguistic atlases of the Dutch territory are envisaged for the near future. What is being tackled is the further utilization of existing material. Efforts have been made, so far without result, at constructing an integrated register of all the dialect questionnaires of the various dialectological centers, as well as a register of all linguistic maps and charted phenomena.

The present handbook makes clear how much work has been done in the field of geolinguistics in the Germanic languages. From a scientific point of view, a logical next step would be the composition of a concrete Germanic linguistic atlas, an atlas of the lexicon, the morphological, phonological and syntactic phenomena in the Germanic languages and dialects. Would it perhaps be possible to find, among the contributors to this handbook, people interested in such an undertaking? We can think of two already …
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