

- Verhoeven, J. & Van de Poel, K. (1994). Aspecten van buitenlanderaccent bij vreemdetaalverwerving. Wroclaw : Acta Universitatis Wratislaviensis, nr. 1651, pp. 304-311.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). Languages in contact. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Werker & Pegg (1992). Infant speech perception and phonological acquisition. From Ferguson, C.A., Menn, L. & Stoel-Gammon, C. Phonological Development: models, research, implications, 285-311. York Press, Timonium. Md.
- Yavas, Mehmet (1994). First and Second Language Phonology. Singular Publishing Group, Inc.

## Southern Standard Dutch in Flemish pronunciation guides <sup>1</sup>

Hanne Kloots

Department of Germanic Languages • Centre for Dutch Language and Speech

Universiteitsplein 1 • B-2610 Wilrijk

Hanne.kloots@ua.ac.be

### 0. Introduction

Like English, German and Frisian, Dutch is a West Germanic language. It is the official language of the Netherlands, Belgium, Surinam and the Dutch Antilles (see also De Vries e.a. 1993, Geerts 1992, Vandeputte e.a. 1997). In the Netherlands, it is spoken by about 15 million people. In Flanders, the northern part of Belgium, about 6 million people speak Dutch. Surinam is a former colony of the Netherlands in South America, and Dutch is still the only official language there. However, in everyday situations many Surinamese use Sranan, a creole language. On the Dutch Antilles, which still form part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, Papiamentu is used as lingua franca. This article focuses on the situation in the Dutch language area in the narrow sense, the Netherlands (North) and Flanders (South).

In discussions about the Dutch language area, some terms can easily lead to confusion (cf. also Vandeputte e.a. 1997 : 6 ff.). The Kingdom of the Netherlands with Amsterdam as its capital is usually referred to as 'the Netherlands'. An unofficial but also frequently used name for this country is 'Holland'. In fact, this is a pars pro toto, referring to North and South Holland, two provinces of great economic and cultural importance. In addition, the term 'Netherlands' can be used as an umbrella term for the lowlands of north-western Europe, i.e. the kingdoms of the Netherlands and Belgium, Northern France as far as the river Somme, and the Grand-Duchy of Luxemburg. A synonym for 'Netherlands' in this broad sense is 'Low Countries'. Historically speaking 'Flanders' refers to a former county, consisting of the present-day Belgian provinces East- and West-Flanders, the Dutch province Zeeland-Flanders and the North of France as far as the Somme. Dialectologists still use 'Flanders' in its historical sense. In today's political context, 'Flanders' refers to the northern part of Belgium, bordered by the Kingdom of the Netherlands in the north and the Dutch-French language border in the south. In this paper, 'Flanders', 'Flemish' and 'Flemings' refer to North Belgium and its inhabitants, whereas 'Dutch' and 'Dutchmen' refer to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Georges De Schutter, Kas Deprez (†), Jo Verhoeven and Griet Depoorter for their suggestions to earlier versions of this text.

Both Flemings and Dutchmen speak Dutch, but to a certain extent, their varieties are different. Traditionally, variants which are typical for Flanders are considered to be 'deviations' from the language of the Netherlands. Today, more and more linguists studying national varieties think in terms of pluricentricity. Every national variety develops its own norms, which are more or less codified in dictionaries, grammars and/or spelling manuals. In certain language components, variation is more accepted than in others. Variants in pronunciation encounter the least resistance, lexical variation is generally more accepted than morphological and syntactical variation (cf. Clyne 1992, Deprez 1997 : 291-292, De Rooij 1987). In this paper, the language of public broadcasting and education in Flanders is referred to as Southern Standard Dutch, whereas the standard variety used in the Netherlands is called Northern Standard Dutch.

For a good understanding, the history of the Dutch language area will be briefly discussed (cf. also De Vries e.a. 1993, Deprez 1997, Vandeputte e.a. 1997). In the Middle Ages the standard language had not developed yet. Writers who wanted their texts to be intelligible for readers outside their own region, tried to avoid local words and expressions, and imitated the language of economically, politically and culturally dominant regions and social classes. In the 13th century, cities like Bruges, Ghent and Ypres in East and West Flanders were economically and politically dominant. As a consequence, the Flemish dialects had the greatest prestige. In the course of the 15th century, the Duchy of Brabant with cities like Antwerp, Louvain, Mechelen and Brussels became increasingly important. Writers started adding Brabant elements to their idiom. In the first half of the 16th century, present-day Belgium and the Netherlands belonged to the Habsburg Emperor Charles V, who considered the Low Countries to be an indivisible whole. In the second half of the 16th century, the process of unification ended with the revolt against Philip II, son of Charles V. Philip II had never been very popular in the Low Countries. He seldom visited this part of his Empire. During his absence, he was represented by Spanish noblemen, disregarding the local nobility. Moreover, there was no freedom of religion. Philip II was a strict catholic, and he expected the same from his subjects. In 1566 the Calvinist-inspired Iconoclastic Fury broke out: churches and saint's figures were damaged, books were burnt. To eradicate Protestantism, Philip II sent the Duke of Alva to the Low Countries. Finally, the southern regions were reconquered by the Spanish troops, while the northern provinces remained in Protestant hands. For religious, economic or political reasons, many people did no longer want to live under Spanish rule. A massive exodus to the North followed. Most emigrants settled in Holland (e.g. Amsterdam, Haarlem, Leyden) and Zeeland. Many of them were wealthy and well-educated citizens, with a high social prestige. They would make an important contribution to the economic growth of the North. At

the end of the 16th century the separation of North and South was a fact, and the economic and linguistic centre shifted from Brabant to Holland. The independence of the northern provinces was recognized in 1648 when the Treaty of Münster was concluded. In the 17th century, both in the northern and the southern provinces a process of nation building started. The differences between the two nations were considerable. There was a religious opposition (Protestantism in the North, Catholicism in the South), going hand in hand with a cultural contrast: the Reformation in the North was characterized by sobriety, the Counter Reformation in the Catholic South was characterized by Baroque. Another important factor was economic competition. To protect Holland's economic interests, the Scheldt river was closed and the South was forced to give up the Ostend Trade Company, because it was a potential competitor of the United East India Company. In the northern provinces Dutch gradually developed into a standardized language, although the spoken language of the upper class remained regionally coloured until the 19th century (Daan 1990 : 152, Hagen 1990 : 33). In the South, a collection of local forms and dialects was spoken. The language of culture and administration was French. A social language-barrier came into being: the upper-class changed to French because of its great prestige. From 1815 until 1830, present-day Belgium was a part of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands under William I, serving as a buffer state against revolutionary France. After more than two centuries of separation, the feeling of community between North and South had faded. The vernacular of Bruges, Ghent, Brussels, Antwerp and Hasselt was very different from the language of Holland, so that mutual intelligibility was not self-evident.

When Belgium became an independent state in 1830, it was to be a French-speaking nation, although the Belgian Constitution of 1831 defined freedom of language. The social elite used French as a language of culture, education and science, and despised the dialects spoken in North Belgium. In several European countries, the end of the ancien regime and the rising power of the bourgeoisie involved a larger appreciation of the national language (Van Belle & Jaspaert 1988 : 379). In Flanders, however, this was not the case. The elite which could have developed a Flemish standard language, preferred French (Deprez 1997 : 249, 258; cf. also Geeraerts 1990 : 437). The absence of a standard was an ideal argument for those who did not want to take southern variants seriously (Suffeleers 1979 : 51, Willemyns 1979 : 295). Because it was not realistic to establish separate Flemish norms in the short term, and because the standard had to be equivalent to French, many Flemish intellectuals and purveyors of culture took the language of the Netherlands as their beacon. In other words: the standard language of the North was also to become the norm for the southern part of the language area. In this discussion, three arguments returned regularly (Deprez 1999 : 103). Firstly: on its own,

the language of North Belgium was quantitatively not important enough to offer resistance against French. Secondly: a language strongly influenced by French was not considered to be a suitable expression of the new sense of self-esteem that characterized the nineteenth century. Thirdly: linking up with the northern standard language was a way of linking up with the own glorious past, the period before the separation of North and South.

Very soon, some Flemish philologists started a process of corpus planning, i.e. 'changes by deliberate planning to the actual corpus or shape of a language' (Clyne 1997a: 1; cf. also Haugen 1987: 61, 64; Clyne 1997a: 482, 486-487; Wardhaugh 1998: 347). A language (variety) is standardized and developed, so that it can be used in all domains and functions in society. In corpus planning and the distribution of language norms 'models' (people who set a good example, e.g. teachers, news readers), dictionaries, spelling lists and grammars play an important part. A good example of this is Hebrew. After having been a dead language for ages, it was resuscitated again (HaCohen 1997, Dalby 1998: 245, Verhasselt 1999). At present, it serves all language functions in Israel. For modern inventions (e.g. *electricity*, *bicycle*) Hebrew names were developed, and geographical names were hebraized, the new ones being promoted by the public media, schoolbooks, maps and signposts. In Norway, the standardization process even resulted in two standard varieties (Jahr 1997, Dalby 1998: 459-460, Wardhaugh 1998: 364-365). In 1814, Norway became an independent state. During the long Dano-Norwegian Union, Danish was generally used as the written medium, and the speech of the Norwegian upper- and middle class was strongly influenced by Danish. However, many people thought an independent nation should have its own standard language. The school teacher and linguist Knud Knudsen (1812-1895) wanted typically Danish features to be gradually replaced by elements from the spoken Norwegian of the upper class. The author and linguist Ivar Aasen (1813-1896) wanted the local dialects to be the basis of the Norwegian standard language. The first variety is called Bokmål, the second Nynorsk.

The aim of corpus planning can also be reconvergence of two varieties. For example, after the reunification of East and West Germany in 1990, considerable attempts were made to teach the 'Ossis' to use German the way 'Wessis' do (Clyne 1997b). There was a taboo on political terms which reminded of communist East Germany. In special courses the former East Germans learnt e.g. which language is to be used in a job interview. Furthermore, the University of Halle started a telephone advisory service, and in the printed media, names of West German institutions were explained.

Flanders also has a long tradition of language planning, which is reflected in a considerable number of language guides. Those guides play(ed) an important role in the process

of 'Dutchification', which started in the course of the nineteenth century. 'Dutchification' means in this context: the replacement of common southern variants by their Dutch counterparts, in other words 'convergence to the North'. The pronunciation norm for Flanders was more or less definitively established in the *Praktische uitspraakleer van de Nederlandse taal* [Practical Pronunciation Guide of the Dutch Language], written by E. Blancquaert (1st edition 1934). Cassier & Van de Craen (1986) and Van de Velde (1996) studied the standard pronunciation in 20th century radio and/or television broadcasts. Cassier & Van de Craen (1986) compared speeches of well-known Dutch and Flemish politicians, dating from 1936-1984. Van de Velde (1996) studied Dutch and Flemish reports about royal events and sports commentaries from the period 1935-1995. Both studies showed important changes in the standard pronunciation of Northern Standard Dutch, and only minimal phonetic changes in the spoken Standard Dutch of the Flemings. Present-day Southern Standard Dutch appears to be very similar to the northern standard from the 1930s. This was also noticed by the widow of the Dutch writer Louis Couperus (1863-1923). She had the impression that the pronunciation of Southern Standard Dutch in the 1960s resembled the Dutch standard pronunciation from the 1920's (reported by Marc Galle and cited in Cassier & Van de Craen 1986: 59). Flanders held on to the norm, codified by Blancquaert and confirmed in the pronunciation dictionary of De Coninck (1970). The pronunciation changes in the Netherlands (e.g. gradual acceptance of diphthongized /o./, /e./, /ø./, devoicing in word-initial /v/, /z/, /ɣ/) did not lead to the publication of new (editions of) pronunciation guides. On the contrary, the Flemings started assessing (certain aspects of) Dutch pronunciation as sloppy (e.g. Hagen 1980: 170). The southern pronunciation found justification in an (older) northern standard, although this pronunciation could hardly be found in the Netherlands (anymore). In other words, today's divergence is the result of Flanders sticking to the 'orthodox pronunciation' (Pauwels 1954, 1972: 114), disregarding the evolutions taking place in the Netherlands. Obviously, the diverging trend is not considered to be a problem, and full convergence is not a target anymore.

In this paper, primarily based on data from Kloots (1998), the evaluation of southern variants in Flemish pronunciation guides will be studied, in order to establish whether these are systematically rejected. The point of departure is the contemporary language situation: the term 'southern variant' refers to a realisation which is nowadays considered to be typical for Flanders.

### 1. The pronunciation guides

The following pronunciation guides have been studied (cf. Appendix I): Ternest (1860, 1882), Verachttert (1911), the concise edition of this guide (1912, 1920), Scharpé

(1912), Blancquaert (1950, 1962), De Coninck (1970), Scherps (1979), Van Haver (1972, 1980) and Paardekoooper (1987). For decades, the pronunciation guide of Ternest (1st edition 1860) was the (only) standard work in Flanders. In September 1900, the *Algemeene Belgische Onderwijzersbond* [General Belgian Union of Primary School Teachers] still suggested that a commission should outline "cultivated" pronunciation using the guide of Ternest as starting point. It took several years before new guides appeared. Well-known are the guides of Verachttert (1911) and Scharpé (1912). Another standard work is the *Praktische uitspraakleer van de Nederlandse taal* [Practical Pronunciation Manual of the Dutch Language] by Blancquaert (1st edition 1934). It is said to have influenced the pronunciation of Southern Standard Dutch more than any other guide (cf. also Suffeleers 1979 : 64-65, 69, 77, 79; Deprez 1997 : 282). Together with the pronunciation dictionary of De Coninck (1970), it was the basis of the pronunciation of public broadcasting (Van de Velde 1996 : 37, 237). Recent publications refer to De Coninck (1970), but also to the *ABN-uitspraakgids* [Pronunciation Guide for General Educated Dutch] by Paardekoooper (e.g. De Vries e.a. 1993 : 129, Van Bezooijen & Geritsen 1994 : 145). The pronunciation guide by Scherps was referred to in the syllabus *Nederlandse mondelinge oefeningen* (Daems & Gerits 1994-1995 : 48), used in the first year of language education at university level. All guides are written by Flemings, except for the guide of Paardekoooper, who is a Dutchman, who has been living in Flanders for many years. Because several school grammars also have a chapter about pronunciation, the following grammar books are studied as well (cf. Appendix II): Moke (1823), Roucourt (1884), Vercoullie (1900), Bols (1912), Allegaert & Abeele (1915), Vits (1921), Abeele & Peeters ([1943]), Vindevogel (1962), Verbanck (1974) and Smedts & Van Belle (1993).

In the introduction of almost all the older guides, the editor explains that the pronunciation standard is imported from the Netherlands. Editors of more recent guides (De Coninck, Van Haver, Scherps, Paardekoooper) do not mention that they promote a northern pronunciation. The absence of an explanation in the guides of De Coninck and Paardekoooper has probably something to do with the fact that these books are pronunciation *dictionaries*: they do not contain an extensive theoretical introduction. Van Haver and Scherps explicitly argue that they want to keep their works as practical and simple as possible. They do not want to participate in theoretical discussions. In addition, the recent guides are written in another era. Today, for most Flemings it is self-evident that the standard language of Flanders is Dutch. In the past, people had to be convinced of this, e.g. in the introduction to language guides. There is probably still another reason why more recent editors do not mention that they promote a northern pronunciation. Attitude research showed that many Flemings do not *want* to speak like

'Hollanders' (cf. Deprez 1985-1986 : o.a. 108-109, 113; De Caluwe 1991 : 52-55), e.g. because they consider (certain aspects of) Northern Standard Dutch to be sloppy (cf. supra). As a result, they would perhaps not be willing to accept a guide, promoting the pronunciation which makes a speaker sound like a Dutchman. Besides, the editors of the older guides did not promote a strict northern norm either. In their introductions, they emphasized the importance of uniformity, but they did not want to take over all aspects and realisations without any reflection (e.g. Ternest 1860 : 8; Scharpé 1912 : 5).

## 2. Variables

This paper examines 11 variables. The selection is based on quite an extensive list of pronunciation variants, typical for the Netherlands (Van Haver (1972, 1980 : 51-52). Of course such a list is only a rough approximation of reality: the pronunciation of a Dutchman does not need to show all the features listed below to speak 'real' Northern Dutch. The extent to which everyone considers these variants equally 'standard' should in fact still be investigated.

1. Diphthongization of the long midvowels [o:], [e:], [ø:].
2. Voiceless fricatives [v], [z], [ʃ] in word-initial position
3. Reduction of the initial cluster [sxr] to [sr]
4. Vowel reduction in unstressed syllables (e.g. *kanon* {cannon}, *moment* {moment})
5. No phonetic difference between [ʌ] and [ə]
6. Bilabial (Fl.) versus labiodental (Nl.) pronunciation of /w/

### Pronunciation of loan words

7. [s] (Fl.) or [z] (Nl.) in word-internal clusters like /ns/ or /rs/, e.g. *consul* {consul} and *cursief* {italic}
8. [s] (Fl.) or [tʃ] (Nl.) in the suffix /-tie/, e.g. in *politie* {police} and *natie* {nation}
9. [s] (Fl.) or [ʃ] (Nl.) in words with /ti/ or /ci/ in inlaut, e.g. in *nationaal* {national} and *officieel* {official}
10. [o:] (Fl.) or [ɔ:] (Nl.) in the open syllable of French loan words like *controle* {control} and *zone* {zone}
11. [ø:] (Fl.) or [œ] (Nl.) in Greek loan words like *therapeut* {therapist} or *eufemisme* {euphemism}

## 3. Results

Table 1 summarizes the results. The guides are discussed in chronological order. In total, eleven variables are studied. For every guide, it is investigated how many vari-

ables are mentioned and/or discussed ('mentioned'). It will be seen that mentioning both variants does not imply they are explicitly called northern resp. southern Dutch ('identified'). The next rows show in how many cases the northern resp. the southern variant is preferred. The table contains a few decimal numbers. Studying one variable, we sometimes discuss more than one sound (e.g. diphthongization of [e.], [o.], [ø.], loss of voice in [v], [z], [ɣ] in word-initial position) or editors distinguish between several conditions (e.g. <-tie> after consonant or after vowel, *fractie* vs. *natie*). In the case of [o.]/[e.]/[ø.] and [v]/[z]/[ɣ], 0.33 (1/3) is counted per sound, in the case of <-tie>, 0.5 (1/2) is counted per condition. From the school grammars, only Smedts & Van Belle (1993) can be found in the table, because this is the only grammar which pays quite some attention to the differences between Northern and Southern Standard Dutch. Van Haver's guide is not mentioned in table 1. The selection of the variables was based on his overview of northern variants. His overview was meant to show which features should not be adopted by the Flemings, so Van Haver's evaluation would result in 'mentioned', 'identified' and 'southern variant preferred' all along the line.

Table 1: occurrence and assessment of eleven pronunciation variables in Flemish pronunciation guides.

n = 11	Ternest	Verachtert	Scharpé	Blancquaert	De Coninck	Scherps	Paardekooper	Smedts e.a.
Variables mentioned	1	4.33	4.33	8.33	7	9	8	10
identified	0	2.66	3.33	2	1	3.33	2.33	7
Preference:								
southern variant	1	1.66	1.66	6.33	1	3.5	2.33	7
no preference	0	2.66	2.66	2	6	4	4.33	3
northern variant	0	0	0	0	0	1.5	1.33	0

Comparing the rows 'mentioned' and 'identified', it is clear that variants are often mentioned and judged without explicitly stating which one of them is typical for Flanders and which one is typical for northern Dutch. In other words, one variant should (not) be replaced by another, but there is no indication which variant is used in Flanders and which one in the Netherlands. There are several possible explanations. Explicitly mentioning which national variety a variant belongs to, is only necessary when the pub-

lic needs this information. Going through the guides, it is clear they are meant for native Flemings, not for learners of Dutch as a second or foreign language. Apparently, the users of the guides are expected to know from their own personal experience which national variety variants belong to. In addition, as the older guides were written, several variants which are now typical for Flanders, could still be heard in Northern Standard Dutch. It cannot be expected that editors make a clear distinction between northern and southern variants when this distinction did not yet occur in (the Standard Dutch) reality. The table also shows that in many cases, editors do not prefer one variant over the other, or they consider the southern realisation to be better than the northern variant. For example, neither the diphthongization of /o./, /e./ and /ø./ nor the realisation of *officieel* {official} with [ʃ] is promoted. Preference for the northern realisation is rare, e.g. the [o.]-pronunciation for *controle* {control} in Scherps (1979) and Paardekooper (1987). From this it can be concluded that Flanders has its own pronunciation norms which have been codified in Flemish pronunciation guides. By tolerating southern variants many editors accept the divergence between Flanders and the Netherlands ('no preference'), or even encourage this trend ('southern variant preferred'). However, it should be remembered that the pronunciation of Southern Standard Dutch is largely based on the former Northern Standard Dutch pronunciation.

In addition, it can be seen that recent guides mention a larger number of variables than the older ones. Ternest only provides information on the pronunciation of the suffix <-tie>. Verachtert and Scharpé discuss (the same) five variables: diphthongization of the long midvowels, loss of voice in fricatives in word-initial position, vowel reduction, labial versus labiodental realisation of /w/ and the pronunciation of <-tie>. The first guide in which most variables are discussed (nine of eleven), is Blancquaert's *Praktische uitspraakleer van de Nederlandse taal*. The question is why there is less attention for the differences between North and South in older guides. Perhaps the editors did not hear northern Dutch very often. The (few?) Dutchmen they met, were probably other philologists, who cultivated their language and tried to avoid features which were typical for 'ordinary' northern Dutch (e.g. reference to the Leyden professor Kern in Ternest 1882 : VIII). Some features which were considered to be 'uncultivated' in those days, are now common in Northern Standard Dutch. However, it is self-evident the editors of the older Flemish pronunciation guides did not want to promote 'Hollandic' sounds, which were not accepted by the Dutch elite of those days (cf. also Pauwels 1954, 1972 : 114).

Comparing the prescriptions of the older Flemish guides with the Northern Standard Dutch pronunciation of that moment is not an easy matter. It is however possible to study the prescriptions in Dutch pronunciation guides from the same period. This would

be interesting, especially because Verachttert, Scharpé and Blancquaert used Dutch guides as a source of inspiration. They, for example, refer to *Spoken en Zingen* [Speaking and Singing] by A.M. Eldar (1886, several reprints and new editions), the *Phonetische Woordenlijst der Nederlandsche Taal* [Phonetic Word List of the Dutch Language] by Branco van Dantzig (1901), *Methodisch Spreken* [Methodical Speaking] by J. Reinink (1911, reprint 1927), *De Techniek van het Spreken* [The Technique of Speaking] by K. Veldkamp (1911, several editions) and the famous *Leerboek der Phonetiek* [Manual of Phonetics] by H. Zwaardemaker & L.P.H. Eykman (1928).

To discover to which extent Dutch pronunciation guides influenced their Flemish counterparts, exhaustive comparative research is needed. This study limits itself to some general remarks and a few examples taken from the following Dutch guides: Van Dantzig (1901), Eldar (1906), Veldkamp (1911) and Reinink (1911) (cf. Appendix I). Van Dantzig's guide is a alphabetic word list, preceded by a brief introduction. The guides of Eldar, Veldkamp and Reinink contain a lot of information about the functioning of the speech organs and breathing, whereas the principal goal of most Flemish editors seems to be to teach the Flemings a dialectfree pronunciation. However, it is not clear-cut. Most Flemish guides also provide some information on articulation, and the older Dutch editors also discuss some dialect features. Furthermore, it is not always clear whether a Dutch editor simply wants to describe a variant like diphthongized [e.], or whether the description is meant to explain which features should disappear. A common feature of the older Dutch and Flemish guides is that they hardly pay attention to the pronunciation of loan words. Just like in Flanders, the first 'loan sound' which is discussed in more than one Dutch guide is the <v> of *politie* {police} and *nationaal* {national} (Van Dantzig 1901 : passim, Reinink 1911 : 179).

Although the editors of the Flemish guides refer to their Dutch colleagues, they do not always copy the Dutch comments. Furthermore, some Dutch guides seem to be more 'conservative' than others. This can be illustrated by means of some northern variants, which were already mentioned in the older Flemish guides, but not considered to be 'better' than their southern counterparts, e.g. diphthongized [e.], [o.] and [ø.], voiceless [v], [z] and [y] in word-initial position and labio-velar [w]. Eldar (1906 : 90, 96), whose guide was first published in 1886, is strongly against diphthongization. Veldkamp (1911 : 143) finds a transitional sound after [e.], [o.] and [ø.] very common, as long as the long midvowels do not become diphthongs. However, Reinink (1911 : 67 - 71) only states that [e.], [o.] and [ø.] are often realised as diphthongs. Loss of voicing is criticised by Eldar (1906 : 173, 185), but Veldkamp (1911 : 132, 237, 251, 256) and Reinink (1911 : 94, 96, 104) simply state (and accept?) that [v], [z] and [y] are at least partly voiceless, especially in word-initial position. However, the last two guides con-

tain exercises which focus on voiced and voiceless fricatives (e.g. Reinink 1911 : 201-203, Veldkamp 1911 : 191-195). For Eldar (1906 : 140) and Reinink (1911 : 129), [w] is a labiodental sound in word-initial position and a bilabial sound between two vowels. Veldkamp (1911 : 129) does not seem to make this distinction: for him, [w] is a labiodental sound. With regard to [w] editors of Flemish guides do not promote the northern variant. In the case of diphthongization and loss of voicing in fricatives, they follow the 'conservative' judgement of Eldar (1906).

#### 4. Conclusion

Corpus planning can bring varieties of a pluricentric language closer together (convergence), but corpus planning can also confirm or even stimulate tendencies of growing apart (divergence). In corpus planning and the distribution of language norms 'models' (people who set a good example, e.g. news readers, teachers) and all kinds of more or less prescriptive publications (e.g. dictionaries, grammars, language guides) play an important role. This article focuses on Flemish pronunciation guides. In recent guides more variables are discussed than in the older ones. It was also seen that editors of pronunciation guides often mention and judge variants without explicitly mentioning which one of them is typical for Flanders and which one is typical for the Netherlands. Presumably many variants which are now considered to be typical for Southern Standard Dutch still appeared in the speech of the Dutch elites at the time the older guides were written. In the Netherlands, the pronunciation of Standard Dutch has undergone many changes during the twentieth century. Flanders did not keep pace: it held on to the norm, established by Blancquaert in the 1930s, and based on the pronunciation of 'civilized' Dutchmen in the first decades of the twentieth century. Many variants which are today considered typical for Flanders, find their justification in the northern standard language of those days. Therefore, southern realisations are generally found quite as acceptable as their northern counterparts, or they are even preferred. Preference of the northern variant is rare. Generally, divergence in pronunciation between North and South is accepted without a hitch. A new converging trend in northern direction is therefore not considered necessary or desirable.

#### References

- Cassier, L., Van de Craen, P. (1986). Vijftig jaar evolutie van het Nederlands. IN: J. Creten, G. Geerts & K. Jaspaert [ed.], *Werk-in-uitvoering. Momentopnamen van de sociolinguïstiek in België en Nederland*. Leuven/Amersfoort, Acco, p.59-73.

- Clyne, M. (1992). *Pluricentric Languages. Differing Norms in Different Nations*. Berlin / New Nork, Mouton de Gruyter [= Contributions to the Sociology of Language 62].
- Clyne, M. (1997a). *Undoing and Redoing Corpus Planning*. Berlin / New York, Mouton de Gruyter [= Contributions to the Sociology of Language 78].
- Clyne, M. (1997b). The reconvergence of German after unification and its limits. IN: M. Clyne [ed.], 1997a, p.117-142.
- Daan, J. (1990). The relation between dialect and standard language in the Netherlands in the past as a key to the present. IN: J.A. Van Leuvensteijn and J.B. Berns [ed.]: *Proceedings of the Colloquium Dialect and Standard Language*. Amsterdam, Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, New Series, vol.150, pp. 147-161.
- Daems, F. & Gerits, J. (1994-1995). *Nederlandse mondelinge oefeningen*. Syllabus for the 1st kandidatuur Germaanse filologie, Universiteit Antwerpen, Universitaire Faculteiten Sint-Ignatius.
- Dalby, 1998: *Dictionary of Languages. The Definitive Reference to more than 400 Languages*. London, Bloomsbury Publishing, 1st edition.
- De Caluwe, J. (1991). Attitudes van Vlamingen tegenover de taal van het Noorden. IN: M. Demoor [ed.], *De kracht van het woord*. Gent, Studia Germanica Gandensia, Taalkunde 24, p.51-63.
- Deprez, K. (1985-1986). De aard van het Nederlands in Vlaanderen. IN: Heibel, vol. 19, 4, p.101-127.
- Deprez, K. (1997). Diets, Nederlands, Nederduits, Hollands, Vlaams, Belgisch-Nederlands. IN: M. Clyne [ed.], 1997, p.249-312.
- Deprez, K. (1999). De taal van de Vlamingen. IN: K. Deprez & L. Vos [ed.], *Nationalisme in België. Identiteiten in beweging 1780-2000*. Antwerpen/Baarn, Houtekiet, p.103-116.
- De Rooij, J. (1987). *Variatie en Norm in de Standaardtaal*. Amsterdam, PJ Meertens Instituut.
- De Vries, J. (1993). *Het verhaal van een taal. Negen eeuwen Nederlands*. Amsterdam, Prometheus.
- Geeraerts, D. (1990). Het dialect en de dialectiek, de Verlichting en het Vlaams. IN: *Dietsche Warande & Belfort*, vol. 135, 4, p.432-441.
- Geerts, G. (1992). Is Dutch a pluricentric language?. IN: M. Clyne [ed.], 1992, p.71-91.
- HaCohen, R. (1997). Influence of the Middle-East Peace Process on the Hebrew language. IN: M. Clyne [ed.], 1997, p.385-414.

- Hagen, A. (1980). Attitudes van leerkrachten tegenover het Standaardnederlands in Vlaanderen. IN: Joep Kruijsen [ed.], *Liber Amicorum Weijnen*. Assen, Van Gorcum, p.164-175.
- Hagen, A. (1990). Groepsportret van het Nederlands. IN: *Onze Taal*, vol. 59, 2-3, p.32-39.
- Haugen, E. (1987). *Blessings of Babel. Bilingualism and Language Planning*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jahr, E.H. (1997). The fate of Samnorsk: a social dialect experiment in language planning. IN: M. Clyne [ed.], 1997, p.215-248.
- Kloots, H. (1998). *Vlaams-Nederlands in Vlaamse taalgidsen*. Unpublished licentiate's thesis Universitaire Instelling Antwerpen.
- Pauwels, J.L. (1954). In hoever geeft het Noorden de toon aan?. IN: *Nu Nog*, vol. 2, p.1-9. Also in G. Geerts [ed.], 1972: *Taal of taaltje?* Leuven, Acco, p.113-120.
- Suffeleers, T.J. (1979). *Taalverzorging in Vlaanderen. Een opiniegeschiedenis*. Brugge / Nijmegen, Orion / B. Gottmer.
- Van Belle, W., Jaspaert, K. (1988). Het proces van de taalverandering in Vlaanderen rond de eeuwwisseling. IN: *Ons Erfdeel*, vol.31, p.375-382.
- Van Bezooijen, R., Gerritsen, M. (1994). De uitspraak van uitheemse woorden in het Standaard-Nederlands: een verkennende studie. IN: *Nieuwe Taalgids*, vol. 87, 2, p.145-160.
- Vandeputte, O., Vincent, P., Hermans, T. (1997). Dutch. The language of twenty million Dutch and Flemish people. Rekkem, Flemish-Netherlands Foundation Stichting Ons Erfdeel vzw.
- Van de Velde, H. (1996). *Variatie en verandering in het gesproken Standaard-Nederlands (1935-1993)*. Ph.D. thesis Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen.
- Verhasselt, R. (1999). De koosjere woordfabriek in Jeruzalem. IN: N. van der Sijs [ed.], *Taaltrots. Purisme in een veertigtal talen*. Amsterdam/Antwerpen, Contact, p.320-322.
- Wardhaugh, R. (1998). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Malden/Oxford, Blackwell, 3rd edition.
- Willemyns, R. (1979). Invloed van "Power" en "Solidarity" op het gebruik van dialect en standaardtaal in Vlaanderen. IN: *De nieuwe taalgids*, vol.72, 4, p.289-302.

#### Appendix I: List of pronunciation guides

- Blancquaert, E. (1950). *Practische Uitspraakleer van de Nederlandse Taal*. Antwerpen, De Sikkel, 3rd edition.

- Blancquaert, E. (1962). Praktische Uitspraakleer van de Nederlandse Taal. Antwerpen, De Sikkel, 6th edition.
- De Coninck, R.H.B. (1970). Groot uitspraakwoordenboek van de Nederlandse taal. Antwerpen, De Nederlandsche Boekhandel.
- Eldar, A.M. (1906). Spreken en zingen. Tiel, D. Mijs, 10th, revised edition
- Paardekooper, P.C. (1987). ABN-uitspraakgids. Antwerpen, Heideland-Orbis, 2nd, entirely revised edition.
- Reinink, J. (1911). Methodisch spreken. Groningen, Noordhoff.
- Scharpé, L. (1912). Nederlandse uitspraakleer. Lier, Jozef Van In & Co.
- Scherps, G. (1979). Nederlandse uitspraakleer. Leuven, Acco [= Contrastive Analysis Series 7].
- Ternest, C.L. (1860). Beknopte Uitspraakleer der Nederduitsche Tael. Gent, C. Annoot-Braeckman.
- Ternest, K.L. (1882). Uitspraakleer der Nederlandsche Taal. Gent, Vuylsteke, 3rd edition.
- Van Dantzig, B. (1901). Phonetische woordenlijst der Nederlandsche taal. Groningen, Wolters.
- Van Haver, J. (1972). De uitspraak van het Nederlands. Een beknopte handleiding. Leuven, Acco, 2nd edition.
- Van Haver, J. (1980). De uitspraak van het Nederlands. Een beknopte handleiding. Leuven, Acco, 3rd edition.
- Veldkamp, K. (1911). De techniek van het spreken. Groningen, Wolters.
- Verachtert, Ev. (1911). Theoretische en practische Uitspraakleer der Nederlandsche Taal. Brugge, Houdmont-Carbonez.
- Verachtert, Ev. (1912). Ik spreek beschaafd Nederlandsch. Beknopte Uitspraakleer der Nederlandsche taal met talrijke oefeningen. Brugge, Houdmont-Carbonez.
- Verachtert, Ev. (1920). Ik spreek beschaafd Nederlandsch. Beknopte Uitspraakleer der Nederlandsche taal met talrijke oefeningen. Brugge, Houdmont-Carbonez, 2nd, revised edition.

#### Appendix II: List of school grammars

- Abeele, H., Peeters, C.H. [1943?]: Moderne Nederlandsche spraakkunst voor normaal- en middelbaar onderwijs en zelfonderricht. Turnhout, Brepols.
- Allegaert, E., Abeele, H. (1915). Nederlandsche spraakkunst ten dienste van Onderwijzers en Onderwijzeressen Normaal en Middelbaar onderwijs. Tienen, Weduwe L. Verheyen.

- Bols, J. (1912). Handboekskken, waar de Vlaamsche studenten hunne moedertaal behoorlijk in leeren schrijven en uitspreken. Lier, Jozef Van In & Co.
- Moke, J.-J. (1823). Nederduitsche spraakkunst. Naar het Hollandsch, ten bijzonderen gebruike der Vlaamsch-sprekenden. Gent, J.-N. Houdin.
- Roucourt, Th. [1884]: Beknopte spraakleer der Nederlandsche taal. [Mechelen, Ryckmans - Van Deuren].
- Smedts, W., Van Belle, W. (1993). Taalboek Nederlands. Kapellen, De Nederlandsche Boekhandel, Pelckmans.
- Verbanck, P. (1974). Beknopte Nederlandse grammatica. Antwerpen / Utrecht, De Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 7th edition.
- Vercoullie, J. (1900). Nederlandsche spraakkunst voor de Athenaeen, Colleges en Normaalscholen. Gent, J. Vuylsteke, 2nd edition.
- Vindevogel, Th. (1962). Nederlandse grammatica. Antwerpen, De Sikkel, 3rd edition.
- Vits, J.D. (1921). Nederlandsche Spraakkunst. Lier, Jozef Van In & Co.