2

Language Standardization 'from Above'

Gijsbert Rutten and Rik Vosters

2.1 Introduction

Language standardization 'from above' occurs when language authorities seek to disseminate a standardized variety across a speech and writing community. In the history of many European languages, standardization 'from above' is closely tied to the rise of a standard language ideology in the eighteenth century. In this chapter, we take a sociohistorical perspective. We first define the rise of standardization from above, connecting it to changes in eighteenth-century metalinguistic discourse that reflect the changing sociopolitical and language-ideological context (Section 2.2.1). Adopting the Haugen framework, we argue that the crucial aspect of language standardization 'from above' is implementation (Section 2.2.2). In Section 2.3, we describe the sociolinguistic situation in Early and Late Modern times, which can be characterized as a state of diaglossia, with fairly local writing practices on one side of the sociolinguistic continuum, supralocal writing traditions on the other side and a wide spectrum of variation in-between. Standardization 'from above' can be seen as the top-down effort to reorganize this sociolinguistic condition in terms of standard and non-standard. Many different instruments to implement the standard variety can be found in historical settings, and in Section 2.4, we will describe some of the most well-known top-down initiatives, encompassing both private and official language planning activities such as usage guides, academies, professorships in 'national' languages, language laws and educational reforms. Finally, we discuss the issue of effectiveness, whereby we distinguish between discursive effects and linguistic effects (i.e. changing patterns of language use under the influence of standardization 'from above'; Section 2.5). In particular, we discuss a number of theoretical and methodological considerations relevant to analyses of the effectiveness of implementation. We use examples from the Dutch situation and also incorporate examples from other languages, including English, German, French and Spanish, to arrive at a broader, European perspective. Note, however, that most of our cases come from larger languages that have an early standardization history, with a predominance of examples from the Germanic languages (Dutch, English and German).

2.2 What Is Language Standardization 'from Above'?

2.2.1 Changes in Metalanguage

We use the terms 'from above' and 'from below' in their *historical-sociolinguistic* meaning (Elspaß 2007a), not in their *sociolinguistic* meaning. In sociolinguistics, they refer mainly to the degree of conscious awareness of a specific variant among the members of a speech community (Meyerhoff 2011: 180; cf. Labov 1994: 78). In historical sociolinguistics, 'from below' has a polemical function, signalling a double shift of perspective in linguistic history.[1] First, and in the footsteps of a nineteenth-century practice, traditional language histories usually privilege textual products of the socioeconomically and/or politically most powerful people, primarily men. Secondly, these textual products are often confined to so-called higher registers, including literary prose and poetry, as well as grammar books and spelling guides. The historical-sociolinguistic approach from below focuses on texts written by a wider group of people with different social backgrounds. Ideally, these texts, such as private letters and diaries, are also more closely linked to their everyday lives than, for example, literary texts, on the assumption that such texts provide a more accurate representation of the common language of the past. In short, the representativeness of the empirical base is a crucial issue in historical sociolinguistics.

Here, we adopt the social dimension of the historical-sociolinguistic interpretation of *above* and *below*. If we apply Haugen's (1966) succinct view of standardization as minimal variation in form and maximal variation in function, we may say that standardization from above is a social phenomenon in which socioeconomically and/or politically powerful groups and individuals desire to reach minimal variation in form and maximal variation in function. Importantly, the object of desire is not only the language produced by the members of this particular social group, but principally encompasses the language of all members of the language community of which this group is a part. Thus, standardization from above is not restricted to 'above', but also comprises 'below'. The directionality of the envisioned change is top-down, that is, from 'above' to 'below'.

Standardization from above should be distinguished from similar, yet different types of norm convergence. Both in spoken and in written communication, language users may accommodate to each other so that their linguistic output becomes more alike. The result of multiple short-term

[1] See also Chapter 3, this volume.

accommodation events can be language change, and to the extent that this change establishes a community norm, or a norm of usage (Elspaß 2014), it may be called an example of standardization, although it is less confusing and thus advisable to choose a different term, such as *convergence* or *conventionalization*. Community norms may spread to other localities and communities, where other endogenous forms are in use. This is not necessarily accompanied by social top-down forces, so that here, too, standardization from above need not be involved. Instead, *supralocalization* and *supraregionalization* are more appropriate labels for this phenomenon (Rutten 2016a).

Contrary to convergence and supralocalization, standardization from above is an inherently metalinguistic phenomenon, and as such is always from above the Labovian level of social awareness. Language users 'from above' identify – or *select*, to use Haugen's terminology again – specific forms in the belief that these are the best forms, and they seek to prescribe these forms to the wider community, on the assumption that they have the authority to do so. Standardization from above, therefore, is a case of top-down language planning, usually resulting in concrete prescription and proscription activities.

The European metalinguistic tradition dates back to late Mediaeval and Early Modern times. Antonio de Nebrija's *Gramatica de la lengua castellana* of 1492 is often considered the first vernacular grammar of Western Europe. From the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries onwards, in particular, metalinguistic texts were produced that targeted vernacular languages. Since metalinguistic discourse, including standardization from above, is not a purely linguistic phenomenon, but also a social phenomenon and as such sensitive to language-ideological positioning, we need to interpret it within its sociohistorical and sociopolitical contexts. Paraphrasing Fishman (1965), we may say that crucial questions in this respect are: who is prescribing or proscribing which linguistic forms to whom, and why? That is: who is responsible for the metalinguistic discourse? Who constitutes its target audience? What are the targets? Which ideological positions motivate these targets?

In language histories, long linear lines are sometimes drawn from the earlier metalinguistic publications to the more recent ones, from the stages of selection and codification in late Mediaeval and Early Modern times, again following Haugen (1966), to the social and regional diffusion of the codified standard variety in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. This view is criticized from various angles in the contributions to the comparative volume edited by Rutten et al. (2014a). The supposed regional and social spread in the Late Modern period, for example, was much less linear than is often assumed. Codification practices were variable throughout the period, so that it is more appropriate to consider the late- and post-Mediaeval period as one of *codifications*, in the plural (Rutten 2016b: 19–22).

Overviewing the metalinguistic traditions in the French, German, Dutch and English language areas between 1600 and 1900, Rutten et al. (2014b:

10) claim that 'discontinuity may be more typical of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than is suggested by the perspective of a continuous process of standardization'. If the actors and goals of metalinguistic commentary, its target groups and its language-ideological embedding are taken into account, a fundamental breach is realized by the eighteenth century. We argue here that standardization from above is essentially an eighteenth-century phenomenon that differs from the earlier selection and codification practices characteristic of the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, as these were underpinned by different language ideologies, had different targets and were orientated to different target audiences than in the case of standardization from above.

We take the Dutch metalinguistic tradition as an example. The first Dutch spelling guides date back to the first half of the sixteenth century. The first fully fledged grammar, the *Twe-spraack vande Nederduitsche letterkunst* ('Dialogue about Dutch Grammar'), was anonymously published in 1584. Many metalinguistic publications of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were developed in the context of the omnipresent chambers of rhetoric, and some, such as the 1584 grammar, were part of a series of publications in the Mediaeval tradition of the trivium, comprising grammar, logic/dialectic and rhetoric. The Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric responsible for this Dutch trivium aimed to function as a public school for men from the upper and upper-middle ranks of the local social structure, teaching them a particular grammar and style in the interest of climbing the local social ladder (Rutten 2013: 272). It seems probable that this social group sought to demarcate itself from the lower ranks on the one hand, and from the local social elite of the patriciate on the other (Rutten 2013: 274).

At the end of the seventeenth and the beginning of the eighteenth centuries, a range of metalinguistic texts were published that addressed various aspects of Dutch: style, spelling, grammar and rhetoric (Rutten 2007). The authors were ministers, classicists and poets, that is, well-educated members of an intellectual and cultural elite. Their approach has been called *Vondelianist* because seventeenth-century poets such as Joost van den Vondel (1587–1679) were their main normative points of reference (Rutten & Vosters 2013; Simons & Rutten 2014: 53). Their literary orientation was further emphasized by a strong focus on young poets as their target audience. The main goal of the Vondelianist approach was to offer grammatical and stylistic advice to those who were to perform the higher linguistic registers in public life, such as politicians, lawyers, ministers and literary authors (Rutten 2009: 57).

Whereas such earlier metalinguistic texts from the sixteenth, seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries offered many concrete prescriptions and proscriptions, both orthographical and grammatical, the key issue is that we are dealing with specific members of well-defined social groups, who formulate grammatical and orthographical norms primarily for other members of these groups, which are particularly relevant when practising specific genres important to these groups. If we term this standardization, it should be clear that it is of a very local kind, both socially and generically. Moreover, such Early Modern codification practices do not need to be called 'from above', as the directionality of prescription is primarily horizontal, with certain members of the group suggesting certain forms to other members of the group. Similar arguments for a more differentiated approach to seventeenth-century codification practices can be found in Ayres-Bennett & Seijido (2013), Ayres-Bennett (2014), McLelland (2014) and Nevelainen (2014) with respect to French, German and English.

The major change in Dutch metalinguistic discourse occurred in the eighteenth century, when the previous, fairly elitist period of Vondelianism was replaced by an approach to normalized language that addressed the whole language community instead of specific groups within the community and that concerned the language as such instead of particular contextually bound genres (Rutten 2009). The concrete prescriptions and proscriptions often remained the same, with Vondel continuing to be a normative point of reference, but the sociopolitical and language-ideological embedding of codification practices changed dramatically. Similar changes from a socially and generically local orientation to a general and nationwide approach can be found in other Western European language areas at the time (Rutten et al. 2014b: 9–10).

2.2.2 Standard Language Ideology and Implementation

The changes in metalanguage outlined above signal a language-ideological change. Specifically, the eighteenth century is often seen as the period in which the standard language ideology originated (Milroy & Milroy 2012; cf. Milroy 2000, 2001; Lippi-Green 2012). The standard language ideology entails a view of language in which homogeneity is key (cf. Watts 2012: 595–6). The sociohistorical and political setting of the eighteenth century, which brought about the conceptual fusion of *language* and *nation*, extends this homogeneity to the nation. While standardization efforts from above aiming to erase heterogeneity can be traced back to before this period for many languages such as French and Italian, it is not until the eighteenth century that these efforts become thoroughly and ideologically embedded in an emerging discourse of linguistic nationalism. Burke (2004: 163) comments that, from the middle of the eighteenth century onwards, 'the links between language and nation become increasingly close and we find more and more examples of the idea that "one language" should join the traditional trinity of "one king, one faith, one law"'. The conceptual fusion of *language* and *nation*, famously realized in the works of German authors such as Herder, Fichte and Schlegel, can also be found elsewhere, including in Danish, French, Spanish and Portuguese sources (Burke 2004: 163–6). In its strongest version, the standard language ideology refers to a homogeneous, invariable language that symbolizes the essential aspects of the equally homogeneous language community or nation, which, moreover, only uses this particular language. Thus, as part of the rise of cultural and political nationalism in the course of the eighteenth century, linguistic nationalism emerges, projecting language as one of the central identity traits through a prototypical act of iconization (Irvine & Gal 2000: 37).

From this time onwards, 'the nationalization of language' (Burke 2004: 166) implied that language caught the attention of political groups engaged in nation-building processes and developed into an object of top-down normative control and 'a tool of political oppression' (Watts 2011: 209). This resulted in official and semi-official language policies throughout Europe aiming at the homogenization of national languages. In the course of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, Standard English changed from the privilege of *polite society* into the only legitimate language of the British nation-state (Watts 2011: chapters 8 and 9). The best-known example of contemporary language planning is probably Henri Grégoire's report, presented to the National Convention in 1794, in which he argued for the eradication of the *patois* and for the top-down spread of Standard French across the nation (Certeau et al. 1975; Burke 2004: 165). A similar proposal was part of the prizewinning essay written by the Dutchman Hidde Wibius van der Ploeg (1800), who stated that the *platte taalen* ('broad languages', i.e. dialects) should be expelled from the nation-state, whose members should adopt the official and national language instead (van der Ploeg 1800: 32–3, 89–90, 129–30).

The development of a standard language ideology in connection with the formation of the European nation-states implied a revolution in normative grammar. The use of normalized language was no longer confined to specific genres and domains, but instead became a moral and political duty in the interest of national unity. Naturally, the expansion of normalized language to other genres and domains implied the decline of other varieties and languages, as advocated by Grégoire and van der Ploeg. This concerned regional dialects in the first place, but also other languages spoken on the territory of the state, such as Catalan and German in France and Yiddish in the Netherlands. In nationalist discourse, the national language is the only acceptable variety and the only language that members of the nation may use. As such, it is also a *neutral* variety (Rutten 2016c), one that any member of the nation can learn in the interest of self-emancipation and nationwide communication. It is an *anonymous* tool, characterized by 'a form of aperspectival objectivity', a 'voice-from-nowhere' (Gal & Woolard 2001: 6–7), entailing a form of language that belongs to the community as a whole and at the same time to no one in particular.

In addition to this change of perspective and goal, the target audience of normative grammar changed from specific groups within society to all members of the nation. In social terms, this implied an intensification of linguistic hierarchies. Authority is intrinsically connected to metalinguistic discourse, but as argued above, in previous times linguistic authority was often linked to *primi inter pares*. Despite the discourse of neutrality and anonymity, standard languages of the nationalist period were still socially very well localizable. They were elite varieties, not only promoted among the elite, but also imposed on the lower ranks.

The politicization of language in the late eighteenth century, its development into a national attribute and the concomitant intensification of linguistic hierarchies necessitated a strong focus on *implementation*. Haugen (1987: 61) defines implementation as 'the activity of a writer, an institution, or a government in adopting and attempting to spread the language form that has been selected and codified', thereby stressing that 'the spread of schooling to entire populations in modern times has made the implementation of norms a major educational issue'. As such, implementation resembles *acquisition planning* (Cooper 1989; Hornberger 2006), that is, the often governmental efforts to spread the standard variety among speakers. In historical nationalism, the school system played a prominent role therein, as '[t]his was the institution where the ideology of one people, one territory and one language could be translated into reality' (Wright 2012: 71). In the same vein, Milroy and Milroy (2012: 22–3), in their interpretation of Haugen's (1966, 1987) model, identify *maintenance* and *prescription* as the key aspects of implementation.

Indeed, in Enlightenment discourse, education was one of the main focal points. As the target audiences and the goals of metalinguistic discourse were enlarged to include, in the most extreme case, the language produced by any member of the community in any situation, implementation emerged as a major concern. The focus on implementation resulted in top-down language planning activities, both in terms of status planning and in terms of corpus planning (Kloss 1969; Cooper 1989). A striking example is the Dutch case. By 1800, after a few decades of Enlightenment discourse on education and nationalization, there was agreement among nationally orientated politicians and intellectuals that a national language should be developed, which should be imposed on the people through the educational system. Within a few years, these ideas were realized in a series of educational reforms and language laws issued in the first decade of the nineteenth century (Schoemaker & Rutten 2017: 104–5). This policy immediately resulted in the publication of an official orthography and grammar of Dutch meant for use in education and in the administration (Siegenbeek 1804; Weiland 1805).

2.3 Standard Language Ideology and the Sociolinguistic Condition

Historical-sociolinguistic studies of the Early and Late Modern periods show that there is a continuum in the written sources that runs from fairly localizable language on the one hand to less or even hardly localizable language on the other. In terms of selection and codification, this means that we find older forms in unexpectedly recent periods, as well as supposedly recent forms in older sources (Elspaß 2007b), questioning received opinion about the supposed moment of standardization of such forms. One consequence of this is that we often have to shift a form's selection for the standard to a more recent point in time, or even abandon the idea of conscious selection altogether. The following discussion is based on Rutten (2016a, 2016b).

Elspaß (2005: 275–83), Elspaß and Langer (2012) and Langer (2014: 296–7) discuss polynegation in German, which is traditionally assumed to have disappeared from the written language by the eighteenth century. However, it can still be found in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century informal writing. A similar example is the so-called *tun-Fügung*; that is, the use of *tun* ('to do') as an auxiliary, as in *er thut Schaf hüten für einen Man* ('he tends sheep for a man') (1887, taken from Elspaß 2005: 264). Whereas this construction was stigmatized in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and disappeared from higher registers (Langer 2001), many examples can still be found in nineteenth-century private letters (Elspaß 2005: 254–69).

Similarly, the English form *you was*, which was proscribed in eighteenth-century normative grammar, was a productive variant in private letters from the nineteenth century (A. Auer 2014: 165). Martineau (2007, 2013) and Lodge (2013) discuss non-standard features in Early and Late Modern French taken from private letters and diaries. Examples include orthographical features such as *malaide* ('ill') for standard *malade*, and *pourcelain* ('porcelain') for standard *porcelain*, which reveal local pronunciations, as well as morphological variants such as *arrivarent* ('arrived-3PL') for standard *arrivèrent*, and deletion of the negative particle *ne*, where the standard maintains polynegation until the present day (Martineau 2013: 137–40).

Rutten and van der Wal (2014) analyse a corpus of almost 1,000 Dutch private letters from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries – the *Letters as Loot Corpus*. They find writing practices that are often assumed to have vanished from the written language in the post-mediaeval period, such as *h*-deletion and *h*-prosthesis, and <sc>-spellings for the original West Germanic *sk*-cluster, which already fricativized to /sx/ in many varieties, as a result of which <sch> had become the usual supralocal representation. In addition, they find forms that are only occasionally attested throughout the history of Dutch, such as deletion of the grapheme <n> in phonetically reduced final syllables of various nominal and verbal forms following the deletion of /n/ in this position in pronunciation. What is more, Simons and Rutten (2014: 60–1) suggest that the practice of <n>-deletion was spreading in the eighteenth century, even to areas where /n/ was probably maintained in the spoken language.

The ego-documents, such as private letters and diaries, investigated by historical sociolinguists generally comprise more localizable forms and more variability than contemporary published texts. This does not mean, however, that they can be used as faithful representations of base dialects in an immediate and unproblematic way (Rutten & van der Wal 2011). On the contrary, it is easy to identify supralocal variants, strongly connected to the written code, which may or may not have been used in the spoken language, such as forms of address. Furthermore, private letters are often replete with formulaic language, which is unlikely to have been used in the spoken language at all.

If we think of the history of these languages in the Early and Late Modern period as consisting of relatively uniform supralocal printed language on the one hand and localizable spoken dialects on the other, it will be tempting to describe the sociolinguistic condition as *diglossic*. However, studies have shown that there is a whole range of texts in-between the poles of *dialect* and *standard*. Such empirical results challenge traditional descriptions according to which the rise of standard languages resulted in a diglossic situation of spoken dialects and written standard languages (Rutten 2016b). Instead, a more apt descriptive tool seems to be the notion of *diaglossia*, which we conceptualize, following Peter Auer (2005), as a situation in which the dichotomy implied by *diglossia* is replaced by a continuum of variants that are often neither distinctly dialectal nor standard. Such intermediate forms are referred to with the terms *diaglossia* and *diaglossic repertoire*. Sources 'from below', such as ego-documents in particular, seem to occupy a space between dialect and standard (Fairman 2007), displaying what Martineau (2013) calls *hybridity*: they combine reflections of the spoken language with features characteristic of the written code.

The official language planning actions taken as part of the nationalist enterprise of the eighteenth century seek to bring an end to this diaglossic state. Instead, national standards are promoted that all members of the nation should live up to in any situation. The standard language ideology, therefore, intervenes in this variable situation of diaglossic repertoires and seeks to reorganize the sociolinguistic condition. As such, the standard language ideology and standardization from above represent the war to end all diaglossia, and they create first a state of diglossia (namely, of standard versus non-standard), and then a state of only standard. After all, a standard language ideology implies a discursive split of the diaglossic continuum into standard and non-standard. Subsequently, the implementation of the standard is meant to eradicate everything non-standard.

2.4 Instruments of Implementation

Early selection of language norms often comes about through the direct or indirect efforts of 'standardizers' such as printers, striving for uniformity – mostly in terms of spelling – for economic reasons, or chancery scribes, whose use of community norms can converge through accommodation and spread through contact, without specific top-down forces implementing these developing language standards. However, in terms of standardization as a top-down process, the nation-state disposes of a range of instruments to achieve the implementation of a standard language ideology, and the emergence of language authorities in various guises is particularly noteworthy. Such language authorities develop as a result of both private initiatives and as officialized institutes.

Private initiatives often served to restructure the sociolinguistic condition in terms of standard and non-standard, while at the same time aiming to establish the 'symbolic meaning of the standard variety as a badge of a specifically middle class social identity' (Deumert & Vandenbussche 2003: 461). In particular, we can think of the tradition of 'national' dictionaries that emerges especially over the course of the nineteenth century (e.g. in English, Dutch and German). Monumental dictionary projects, such as the Grimm brothers' *Deutsches Wörterbuch* (1854) and the later *Orthographisches Wörterbuch* published by Konrad Duden (1880), the Dutch *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (1864–1998) or the *Oxford English Dictionary* (1884–1928) with its origins in the Philological Society, were all started in the 1800s, and they are key instruments in establishing authority in language and implementing standard language norms. Although works such as the *Oxford English Dictionary* set out to merely record and scientifically document the language, editors were subject to heavy pressure to also prescribe correct usage and act as guardians for the language, opting for later controversial labels such as 'erroneous' (Brewer 2005). Apart from codifying lexis, such works also serve to delineate which varieties do (and which do not) belong to the standard language. In the case of Dutch, for instance, the publication of the unified *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* as a joint Dutch–Flemish project is often seen as a victory for the so-called integrationist camp, which advocated a joint language for the Northern and the Southern (Flemish) Netherlands (Willemyns 1993).

Similarly to these large dictionary projects, we can also point to the emergence of various traditions of usage guides, as these are typically organized around a strictly dichotomous opposition of 'good' versus 'bad' language. Such works are usually proscriptive, using an example-based method to criticize common patterns of usage perceived to be erroneous. In English, this tradition emerges in the late eighteenth century, with early works such as Baker's 1770 *Reflections on the English Language*, inspired by the work of Vaugelas and the French seventeenth-century *remarqueurs* tradition (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2010). Later, similar works boomed in the nineteenth century, both in numbers as well as in popularity, and they contributed to a great extent to the popular conception of usage consisting of good language on the one hand and crude, vulgar and ultimately incorrect language on the other hand. Usage guides, as well as other normative publications in this period of flourishing prescriptivism, thus cater to a growing market of linguistically self-conscious language users from the emerging middle classes, hoping to distinguish themselves as exemplary citizens by using exemplary language (cf. Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2010).

However, given the strong link between implementation and the emerging nation-state in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, it is not surprising that a reorganization of the sociolinguistic condition became a matter of official and even national concern. Top-down language planning efforts peak in many European contexts around the start of the nineteenth century, although in some cases, such as French, ordonnances on the language have an even longer history. One prime instrument for governments to regulate language is through the workings of language academies (cf. Chapter 8, this volume). While discussions about an official language academy date back to earlier centuries for a number of languages, with notable early examples being the Florentine *Accademia della Crusca* founded in 1583 (Tosi 2011) and the French *Académie Française* officialized in 1635 (Estival & Pennycook 2011), the activities of many such bodies started to be most clearly linked to the nationalist enterprise of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. An interesting case is the Spanish *Real Academia Española* (RAE). When it was founded in the early eighteenth century, based on the example of its Italian and French counterparts, it already required its members to not only be exemplary users of pure Castilian, but also to be 'of sound judgement, a decent respectable person, zealous for the glory of the Nation and language' (Fundación y Estatutos de la RAE, 1715, cited and discussed in Paffey 2007). The later implementation of the RAE's norms for spelling and grammar went hand in hand with school reform in the middle of the nineteenth century: amidst flaring language ideological debates, mainly centred around orthography (cf. Villa 2015), the 1857 Ley Moyano imposed the Academy's revised grammar and orthography as the exclusive norm for the educational domain, thus consolidating the institutionalization and officializing the hegemony of Castilian language norms across – and even beyond – the Iberian peninsula (Villa 2011). Many of the traditional language academies in Europe follow a similar development, from institutions with a mostly symbolic function at the time of their foundation to agents more actively involved in reorganizing the sociolinguistic condition in later centuries.

In other national contexts, where the debates about the establishment of a language academy were less successful (see e.g. Estival & Pennycook 2011 for an analysis of popular discourse on why there is no official academy of the English language after the French model), language legislation was put in place. Particularly during the long nineteenth century, a host of official decrees and policy decisions were issued, prescribing the language to be used in various domains, but often also aiming to implement the standard variety of a language. In the Netherlands, for instance, the government of the Batavian Republic, erected in the French revolutionary mindset of unification and standardization, mandated the Leiden-based professor Siegenbeek to draw up an official orthography for the new state and asked the preacher Weiland similarly to design an official grammar (Krogull et al. 2017). These works were published in 1804 and 1805, respectively, and they became the official norms for education and public administration. However, even beyond these two domains, the officialized norms were highly influential (cf. Section 2.5), and although they did not apply to the southern provinces of present-day Flanders, which were added to the northern Low Countries in 1815, the Siegenbeek and Weiland norms gained acceptance in a wide range of circles, even in the south (Rutten & Vosters 2010).

The educational domain was often seen as a prime target for standardization from above, and it is thus not surprising that language legislation at the time of implementation often consisted of language-in-education laws. In the Netherlands again, education became an issue of national concern at around the same time as the first official language policy measures started to be issued, and the turn of the nineteenth century, for instance, sees the establishment of a national school inspection system. The Batavian regime appointed Johannes Henricus van der Palm as the *Agent van Nationale Opvoeding* ('Agent of National Education'), who, as a minister of the central government, bore responsibility for, among other things, the purity of the Dutch language and the uniformity of its spelling (Schoemaker & Rutten 2017). A team of thirty-five school inspectors operated under his command, and they had to monitor the extent to which the centralized educational policy was implemented in practice. On a linguistic level, these inspectors' reports regularly show evidence of how non-standard language use was being policed and stigmatized in the classroom setting through descriptions of dialectal varieties as 'uncivilized' or 'impure' (Schoemaker & Rutten 2017). Similar practices can be observed elsewhere at around the same time or in later decades of the nineteenth century, as is also evidenced by the work of Langer (2011) on the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein in northern Germany. Although the area has a long and rich tradition of deeply rooted multilingualism, with as many as five languages coexisting alongside each other, school and church inspection reports from the 1830s onwards show how teachers aimed only to teach standard High German, while other languages and varieties with more communicative currency in the local communities were either stigmatized or even rendered completely invisible in the written record (cf. Langer & Havinga 2015). Moreover, this policy proved to be quite successful, as the social stigma attached to local vernaculars such as Low German still pervades the educational domain today, in spite of various degrees of protection (Langhanke & Langer 2013).

Efforts to impose the standard variety and spread a dominant standard language ideology were by no means limited to the lower levels of education. At the university level, professorships in the national language and its literature were often instituted at around the same time, and the scholars taking up these posts often served as central agents in the implementation of governmental language policy. The aforementioned Siegenbeek was appointed by the Batavian rulers to the first university chair exclusively dedicated to the study of Dutch at Leiden University in 1797. He dedicated himself to teaching literary history, rhetoric and the Dutch language, advocating the Humboldtian principle that language and nation are intrinsically linked and that consequently the characteristics of the nation must also be reflected in the language, which ought to be pure and rid of foreign influence (Rutten 2018). Exactly two decades later, when the Southern Low Countries were also placed under the rule of the Dutch king William I as part of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands (1815–1830), the new government similarly counted on university professors to be its main advocates for the Dutch language in the south. When the king established three chairs of Dutch language, literature and rhetoric at the newly established universities of Liège, Ghent and Leuven in 1817, instead of appointing local southern scholars to these posts, he deliberately opted for northerners: Johannes Kinker in Liège, Johannes Matthias Schrant in Ghent and Albert ten Broeke Hoekstra and later Gerrit Johan Meijer and Lodewijk Gerard Visscher in Leuven (de Jonghe 1967: 211–22; Janssens 2014; van der Wal 2018). They would become important agents for the spread of the northern standard variety in the south, weighing in on public discourse with essays, poems and historical reflections on the past splendour of Hollandic Dutch, even though they were met with significant hostility in their respective cities. In a similar fashion as for the universities, secondary education also served its goal as a site for implementation, and here as well northern language norms were indirectly spread through a deliberate policy of appointing northern teachers to public schools, especially in the larger cities of the south.

2.5 Effects of Implementation

2.5.1 Discursive Effects

One of the central claims of Milroy (2001: 535) is that 'an extremely important effect of standardization has been the development of consciousness among speakers of a "correct", or canonical, form of language'. We follow Milroy's lead, positing that standardization from above is an intrinsically metalinguistic phenomenon, and thus we assert that the main impact of implementation as part of standardization from above is to be situated at the *discursive* level: it imposes a standard language ideology, projecting the desire to achieve uniformity and homogeneity at the level of the nation onto the language, and it achieves a discursive split of the sociolinguistic continuum into standard versus non-standard forms of language use. This discursive turn is achieved first in metalinguistic discourse, but as talk about talk generates even more talk about talk, the standard language ideology slowly spreads through society and gradually reaches all relevant actors. Especially if we consider less typical writings, such as ego-documents or other writing from below, the evidence accumulated in the chapters on English, German, Dutch and French in Rutten et al. (2014b: 11) suggests that 'what has spread downward from the upper ranks of society, is first and foremost the standard language ideology, not so much or to a considerably lesser extent the standardized variety itself'. In the Netherlands, we see this metalinguistic discourse linking the national and linguistic aims of homogeneity emerge over the course of the eighteenth century: authors of grammars and linguistic pamphlets start discussing the need for a uniform language in order to contribute to a growing sense of national unity. As this discourse spreads and gains ground, especially in education circles, it is picked up by the government during the Batavian era, and starts finding its way into laws in the government-decreed spelling and grammar norms which we discussed above, as well as the push for Standard Dutch in the developing national education system. These legislative initiatives, in turn, lead to an even bigger increase in metalinguistic activity along the same lines: teacher societies start to be formed (Schoemaker & Rutten 2017), the production of schoolbooks based on the Siegenbeek spelling and the Weiland grammar flourishes and language debates and polemics figure prominently in learned societies, among teachers, publishers, lawyers, civil servants, newspaper publicists and so on. The standard language ideology, which was initially a relatively limited and elite phenomenon, originating in the reasonably small circles of grammarians and scholars, gradually turns into what Milroy (2001: 535) called a standard language culture, whereby 'virtually everyone subscribes to the ideology of the standard language, … one aspect of [which] is a firm belief in correctness'. The emergence of the usage guide tradition mentioned above, with hundreds of popular booklets in a format proscribing one form and prescribing another, is a prime exponent of such a standard language culture.

2.5.2 Linguistic Effects

Although we view standardization from above as an essentially discursive and metalinguistic phenomenon, it is of course by no means excluded that a growing ideology of normativity and uniformity will also have an impact on actual language use. The degree to which norms that are prescribed and imposed in a top-down fashion actually influence language praxis, however, remains a matter of much debate in historical sociolinguistics. A host of studies has been devoted to the relationship between norms and usage (Konopka 1996; Takada 1998; Langer 2001; A. Auer 2009; Poplack & Dion 2009; Rutten et al. 2014b; Poplack et al. 2015; Anderwald 2016), but it is clear that there is no one-size-fits-all answer to this question. We need to consider several important aspects of this issue, which we will outline as five separate but interrelated points below.

2.5.2.1 Chronology

First and foremost, we need to consider the chronology of norms and usage. If a new prescribed form first appears in grammarians' work and only subsequently shows up in usage, such an example would be a prime candidate to illustrate top-down standardization. However, such cases are rare, and even if they appear, the successive appearance of an innovation in norms and subsequently in usage does not guarantee a causal relationship between both: to explore this further and substantiate the link, we would need to delve into patterns of variation more carefully, focusing, for instance, on genres and text types and considering which types of writing might be most likely to undergo prescriptive influence. One such example is the prescription by the seventeenth-century German poet and grammarian Justus Georg Schottel, also known as Schottelius, to prefer -*kk*- spellings over the more established -*ck*- spellings in words such as *backen* ('to bake') (McLelland 2014). This innovation seems to have gained currency in the language use of a select number of other grammarians, literary authors, scholars and other men from the social elite, but it did not stand the test of time: it never makes it into newspapers, for instance, and after its initial success for a period of about fifty years, it slowly disappears (McLelland 2014: 267). What seemed to be on its way to being an example of top-down normative influence in fact never made it past the elite circles in the direct sphere of influence of the initial grammarian who proposed it.

More frequently, changes in usage predate changes in normative prescriptions, which reduces the possibility of top-down prescriptive influence to the transition and embedding of changes, rather than their actuation. In fact, works that are typically characterized as highly prescriptive, such as the *Remarques sur la langue françoise* of the French grammarian Vaugelas, in reality often seem to reflect trends and changes that were already ongoing in language use more generally (Ayres-Bennett 2014). Such a scenario is probably most common: rather than initiating or even causing change, grammarians capture an ongoing change, and their prescriptions or proscriptions may help to increase or slow down the speed of an ongoing process. This would certainly be the case for the rise of the progressive passive in nineteenth-century American English (Anderwald 2016): forms such as *the bridge is being built* started to replace older passival forms such as *the bridge is building*. The new progressive passive became highly stigmatized and was strongly opposed in contemporary grammars, and grammarians started noticing it fairly soon after the new construction occurred in actual usage (Anderwald 2016: 196–216). Their opposition may have temporarily slowed down the rise of the incoming form to some extent in specific genres such as newspaper discourse, but it did not succeed in halting it altogether, and the progressive passive steadily continued to be used more frequently throughout the nineteenth century (Anderwald 2016: 194). Top-down prescriptive influence thus cannot be ruled out, but if it occurred, it certainly did not represent more than a mere slowdown of the ongoing change, without a lasting effect.

In other cases where usage leads the way of normative prescriptions, such prescriptions seem to capture (rather than oppose) ongoing change or even codify practices that are already widespread. This is the case, for instance, for the Flemish <ee> versus the more Hollandic <aa> or <ae> spellings to represent the vowel before a cluster of *r* + dental in words such as *peerd* ('horse') or *steert* ('tail'). The northern <a>-based spellings had strong roots in southern writing practices early on in the nineteenth century, while they only started to be prescribed in normative publications from the 1820s onwards (Vosters et al. 2014). When grammarians started to notice these new forms as they became more frequent from 1815 onwards, they started prescribing them, capturing a change in writing practices that was already on the way for a while. Similarly, in seventeenth-century German, the grammarian Schottelius proposed the spelling of *soll* instead of *sol* ('should'), following his central principle of root word integrity (*soll* in accordance with the infinitive *sollen*). However, by the time of his prescription in 1663, such *soll* spellings had already become common practice and represented the dominant form in corpora of contemporary German usage (McLelland 2014: 258–9), so that he did little more than capture a form already present in usage.

Finally, changes in usage and in normative prescriptions can also more or less co-occur, and rather than trying to disentangle the influence of one on the other, we may also need to consider that both reflect a change in the broader sociohistorical or language political context. As discussed above, when the southern provinces, including present-day Flanders, were added to the northern Low Countries in 1815, forming the new United Kingdom of the Netherlands under the Dutch king William I, this caused a fundamental shift in the sociolinguistic condition in the Flemish south. Northern orthographies and grammars such as the aforementioned works of Siegenbeek (1804) and Weiland (1805) entered the linguistic arena, and the late 1810s and 1820s witnessed a very marked and sudden shift towards northern forms, both in terms of actual usage and in the orientation of grammars, orthographies and other works of various agents in the linguistic marketplace (Vosters et al. 2014). Although many supposedly northern forms were probably already present in southern writing before this period (cf. the *ee* + *r* + dental example discussed above), this altered language political context of the (re)unification of the Dutch language area did have an unmistakable impact on both norms and usage.

2.5.2.2 Nature of the Variable

A second important remark concerning the possibility of top-down normative influence relates to the nature of the variable or variables involved. We can hypothesize that orthographical norms spread and find acceptance more easily than grammatical norms. Of course, orthography is a domain which is often both highly regulated and highly contested, in the past and today. However, as it is the most visible and a more superficial layer of language that is always learned after early childhood and is thus never part of natural language acquisition, it is also the easiest domain to manipulate explicitly. In addition, as Nevalainen (2014: 107) remarks, '[T]he norms that reached the widest section of the population were spelling books', as these were most frequently printed and disseminated. Although comparative historical sociolinguistic research would certainly be needed to corroborate this hypothesis, there is a remarkable number of examples of successful prescriptions in the domain of orthography. The case of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands discussed above, for instance, shows how radically spelling norms *and* practices can change over time. The northern Siegenbeek spellings especially caught on in southern writing praxis with remarkable speed. One prime example is the 'Siegenbeekian' <dt> spellings to represent the ending of the second- and third-person singular and second-person plural present indicative of *d*-stem verbs: in a corpus of documents from the legal and administrative domain, such forms rose from being the minority variant in 1823 to being the majority variant in 1829, at the expense of the competing older Flemish <d> spellings (Vosters et al. 2014: 93) – a radical and almost complete shift in praxis over the course of just six years. Other features registered a marked change during the new period of linguistic (re)unification, but far less radically: the prescribed single, post-verbal negation, for instance, rose from an already fairly high 72 per cent to an even higher 91 per cent (Vosters & Vandenbussche 2012).

Of course, even for a domain as easily manipulated as orthography, there are clear limits in terms of top-down normative influence. Needless to say, conceptually oral texts by less educated writers often adopted variants which were very different from the dominant prescriptions at the time (cf. Elspaß 2005 for examples from German and Martineau 2007 and Lodge 2014 for examples from French), but sometimes economic and even aesthetic forces were at play, working against grammarians' injunctions. Focusing on Early Modern German, Voeste (2015) illustrates, for instance, how typesetters used doubling of the consonant <n> in words such as <und> versus <unnd> to meet the technically difficult demand of line justification: what were often criticized as uses of 'redundant' consonants by orthographers of the time were actually devices used by typesetters to produce aesthetically pleasing texts, with the script nicely aligned to the left as well as the right margins. Although the impact of such factors deserves much more study, these observations lead Voeste (2015: 258) to conclude that we need to reconsider the importance and impact of normative orthography and grammatography, especially for the Early Modern period.

2.5.2.3 Progressive versus Conservative Norms

As a third remark we wish to emphasize is that, when considering the impact of top-down standardization efforts, it is important to distinguish between norms representing progressive, incoming forms and norms representing conservative, historical forms. The standard language ideology is generally very much concerned with linguistic conservatism (cf. Elspaß 2014: 306), promoting a golden age myth of past stages of the language (Watts 2000; Rutten 2016c), and thus framing language changes in terms of decay and degeneration. Subsequently, many prescribed norms tend to be conservative, either by prescribing older forms or by proscribing innovations.

Synthetic genitives in Dutch are an interesting case in point (e.g. *de kroon des konings* ('the king's crown')), as the genitive case disappeared from the language a long time ago: even the earliest written records of Dutch already show analytic genitives (e.g. *de kroon van de koning*). As such, synthetic genitives had probably disappeared completely from the spoken language by the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, while they continued to be prescribed by grammarians, who modelled their prescriptions on a Latinate model and even continued to propose a system including up to six cases and three genders, completely removed of the spoken language of the time (Nobels & Rutten 2014; Simons & Rutten 2014). The occurrence of synthetic genitives in the written record, then, is most likely a case of prescriptive influence. However, in the eighteenth-century part of the *Letters as Loot Corpus* investigated by Simons and Rutten (2014), the synthetic genitives still occur in about 27 per cent of all cases. While this seems remarkably high, Simons and Rutten (2014) also investigate the context in which such forms are used, and they discover that most of these synthetic genitives show up in formulaic language use: in particular, religious formulae (e.g. *de hand des heeren* ('the hand of the Lord')) still display a large amount of genitive case forms, while they only amount to just over 10 per cent of all cases in non-formulaic stretches of text, mostly in letters written by members of the highest social ranks (Simons & Rutten 2014: 66–7). All in all, this shows that there was a large discrepancy between normative injunctions defending ultra-conservative language norms on the one hand and the very restricted use of such older forms in actual usage on the other. While top-down normative influence can certainly be attested, it is fairly limited in terms of scope, both text-internally and socially.

Grammarians do not, however, defend older language norms in all cases, and there are also instances where innovations are proposed or new, incoming forms are favoured. If not already rooted in current language use, this is where we often witness failed attempts at standardization, such as in the example of the *-kk-* instead of *-ck-* spellings proposed by Schottelius, who also made other attempts at pushing new forms, such as initial *sl-*, *sw-*, *sm-* and *sn-* spellings instead of *schl-*, *schw-*, *schm-* and *schn-*, but with no success (McLelland 2014: 267–8). Another example is the so-called diacritic spelling proposed by a number of Flemish grammarians and schoolteachers in the eighteenth century, which used accent marks to distinguish between two historically different types of long E's and O's: for example, the E vowel in *steen* ('stone'), derived from a Germanic diphthong (cf. German *Stein*), versus the E vowel in *beet* ('bite'), derived from a Germanic short **e* or **i* (cf. German *Biss*). This innovation built on an already existing distinction between these two sounds, which was marked (only) in open syllables, using vowel doubling. However, a group of Flemish grammarians extended the etymological distinction to closed syllables as well, but as vowel doubling could not be used there, they introduced the use of accents as diacritics. As such, their 'diacritic spelling' reflected the phonetic distinction still present in most spoken vernaculars of the south at the time (Rutten & Vosters 2010). This spelling system soon became established in orthographies and grammars in the second half of the eighteenth century, and it was used in printed books by a number of southern printers. However, its impact was never long-lasting, and although it developed into a shibboleth of southern language use in the early nineteenth century (Vosters et al. 2014), its spread in actual language use remained limited, and it eventually disappeared altogether.

2.5.2.4 Binary versus Complex Variables

A fourth important factor to be taken into consideration for the possibility of prescriptive influence and top-down standardization is the distinction between variables which only encompass a binary opposition of two variants and more complex variables which cover a wider range of variants. In cases of a simple dichotomy, the possibility for prescriptive influence is obviously larger, and this can also partly explain the stronger impact in the domain of spelling, as orthographical variables often just concern two variants which can be placed in a clear opposition to one another. The same, however, also holds true for some morphosyntactic variables, such as the opposition between single and bipartite negation in many of the Germanic languages, as well as in French.

In other cases, however, many forms of the same variable are involved, even if the metalinguistic discussion is limited to just the two main variants. A well-known example of supposed prescriptive influence in Dutch is the difference between *hen* and *hun* as the third-person plural personal pronoun in, respectively, the accusative and dative cases. This distinction is attributed to the seventeenth-century grammarian van Heule in his *Nederduytsche Grammatica ofte Spraec-konst* (1625), and many language users today are still aware of the difference and claim to use both forms in their respective cases consistently. In reality, however, both forms, alongside many other variants, already existed by as early as the Middle Dutch period as regional variants, which van Heule then systematized into the dative–accusative distinction (van der Horst & Marschall 1989: 63–4). In addition, even though the rule governing the difference in present-day Dutch is still fairly well known, many speakers do not systematically distinguish between both forms based on case, and there are clear regional preferences for either *hen* or *hun*. In addition, many other forms are used in the spoken vernaculars, and the non-emphatic form *ze* is used most frequently across the board (de Rooij 1990; Goeman et al. 2009: 45b). The actual influence of this grammatical injunction probably remained limited to a very small number of language users in very specific and highly formal genres (e.g. some literary authors in making the *hen/hun* distinction in their published works), and what in fact was imposed in prescription is first and foremost an ideology of correctness and standardization. Although the metalinguistic discussion of the feature is thus limited to just two variants, language praxis shows various forms, which clearly hinders the imposition of the normative prescription.

Another example illustrating the limited influence of norms on usage when more complex variables are concerned is the form of the singular neuter relative pronoun in Dutch, which could have at least five possible variants in the Late Modern period: *dat*, *wat*, *hetgeen*, *welk* and *hetwelk*. There is a general trend in the West Germanic languages to move from the originally demonstrative *d*-forms to *w*-forms, which in Dutch is exemplified by the change of *dat* to *wat* as the singular neuter relativizer, based on the type of antecedent, ranging from indefinite (including free or headless relatives, which lack an antecedent altogether), preferring the incoming *w*-forms, to definite antecedents (e.g. definite noun phrases), preferring the older *d*-forms (Rutten 2010; Rutten & van der Wal 2014; Krogull et al. 2017). However, the different possible forms probably contributed to the fact that this feature was hardly ever given any serious attention in normative works throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Some grammarians such as Ten Kate mention that different relativizers exist and that variation for stylistic purposes is possible, but it is not until Weiland (1799, 1805) that specific rules for the usage of the various forms are proposed (Krogull et al. 2017): he offers a fairly detailed set of rules for which forms to use in which contexts. Nonetheless, a diachronic corpus analysis of newspaper material, private letters, diaries and travelogues reveals considerably more variation than was acknowledged by Weiland (1805). Krogull et al. (2017) observe a high degree of diachronic stability across contexts, gender and regions, and they conclude that the normative influence for this feature was very limited.

2.5.2.5 Indexicality

As a final remark, we wish to point out that variables show a large amount of variation in terms of indexicality, and it can be expected that this will have a distinct impact on the effectiveness of top-down prescriptions or proscriptions. Of course, variables which are situated very much below the radar of metalinguistic awareness will often not show up in grammars or other normative publications, and thus top-down standardization efforts do not apply at all. This is the case for the rise of the inverted word order after initial negators in English (e.g. *neither did we decide to stay home*, rather than *neither we did decide to stay home*). In Middle English, negators such as *neither* or *never* did not usually provoke inversion, but this pattern became increasingly frequent over the course of the sixteenth century, and by the middle of the seventeenth century, inversion after initial negators accounts for over 90 per cent of all tokens in the Corpus of Early English Correspondence (Nevalainen & Raumolin-Brunberg 2017: 72–3). In grammars of the time, however, this change remains largely unnoticed (Dons 2004: 155–6).

Some variables, however, do attract a great deal of – often negative – normative attention, leading to fierce opposition and intense stigmatization of variants, which will naturally help to impose non-stigmatized forms in a top-down fashion. One such example is the use of auxiliary *tun* in German mentioned in Section 2.3: constructions with *tun-Fügung* became highly stigmatized from the Early Modern period onwards and subsequently disappeared from more formal written registers (Langer 2001), although they still occur in more conceptually oral genres (cf. Elspaß 2005: 254–69, as cited above). Another example is adnominal flexion in Southern Dutch: masculine adnominals such as articles and demonstratives in the nominative singular could appear uninflected (e.g. *de*, *een*, *deze*) or with a final -*n* ending (e.g. *den*, *eenen*, *dezen*). Constructions such as *de man* ('the man') had become the northern standard by the eighteenth century, while constructions such as *den man* ('the man') were used across the southern provinces of what is Flanders today (Vosters & Rutten 2015). As the *n*-forms were originally restricted to the accusative case, this feature was also called accusativism, and although it is in itself a highly insignificant and mostly orthographical feature with little linguistic depth, it developed into a shibboleth of southern versus northern language use around the turn of the nineteenth century: southerners in favour of the political union with the north started adopting the uninflected forms, where a small but fierce opposition of so-called southern 'particularists' rejected them as signs of northern linguistic hegemony. The variable thus quickly developed into a site for political and even religious identity work: one Catholic southern grammarian even claimed that phrases such as *de paus* ('the pope'), as used by the Protestant Hollanders, were heretical, because the lack of the masculine -*n* ending suggested that the pope was not of the masculine gender (Henckel 1815: 135). In such a context of strong iconization, the traditional southern -*n* forms were disappearing from language use, and a corpus analysis showed that they dropped from about from 58 per cent of the total in 1823 to just 35 per cent in 1829 (Vosters & Rutten 2015: 271).

2.6 Conclusion

As with all historical phenomena, language standardization and the linguistic ideologies that it signifies must be analysed in the specific historical contexts in which they arose. Apart from occasional local divergences from the general pattern, standardization from above in many European languages is tied to the eighteenth century; that is, to the period that also gave rise to cultural and political nationalism. In fact, the rise of a standard language ideology in this period can be seen as the linguistic counterpart of these wider, European phenomena (Leerssen 2018). Crucial to the rise of standard language ideology are changes in metalanguage, in which local and genre-specific concerns are replaced by the nation as the target audience and the national language as the target variety of normative control. Top-down, often even official interference with language aimed at restructuring the inherently diaglossic sociolinguistic continuum into standard and non-standard diglossia. In some cases, subsequent eradication of everything non-standard was argued for.

Since imposition of the official and/or national variety on the members of the nation became the main goal of language planning initiatives and concomitant legislation, implementation is at the heart of standardization from above. Often, education was the primary field through which policymakers and standardizers sought to disseminate the standard, but many other instruments of implementation can be found. When assessing the effectiveness of implementation and language prescription, several aspects need to be taken into account, including the chronology of normative and usage patterns, the nature of the variable and its history, complexity and indexical values.

In this chapter, we have taken a sociohistorical approach, focusing on the emergence of the standard language ideology and standardization from above. Both the instruments of implementation and the discursive and linguistic effects of standardization discussed above have resulted in standard language cultures with continued top-down efforts to maintain standard languages until the present day (Milroy & Milroy 2012). Institutions such as the *Académie Française* and the RAE are still significant in standard language debates, and the English usage guide tradition has even greatly expanded since its beginnings in the eighteenth century (Tieken-Boon van Ostade 2018). Print and broadcasting media such as newspapers and the BBC have also started to produce style guides. New institutions have been established that depend on governmental funding, such as the *Gesellschaft für deutsche Sprache* (1947) and the *Nederlandse Taalunie* ('Dutch Language Union'; 1980). While the sociolinguistic condition may have altered due to twentieth-century phenomena such as destandardization and restandardization, it is clear that standardization from above continues to play a crucial role in many language areas.

References

Anderwald, L. (2016). *Language between Description and Prescription: Verbs and Verb Categories in Nineteenth-Century Grammars of English*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Auer, A. (2009). *The Subjunctive in the Age of Prescriptivism: English and German Developments in the Eighteenth Century*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Auer, A. (2014). Nineteenth-century English: norms and usage. In G. Rutten, R. Vosters & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 151–70.

Auer, P. (2005). Europe's sociolinguistic unity, or: a typology of European dialect/standard constellations. In N. Delbecque, J. Van der Auwera & D. Geeraerts, eds., *Perspectives on Variation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 7–42.

Ayres-Bennett, W. (2014). From *l'usage* to *le bon usage* and back: norms and usage in seventeenth-century France. In G. Rutten, R. Vosters & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 173–200.

Ayres-Bennett, W. & Seijido, M., eds. (2013). *Bon Usage et variation sociolinguistique: Perspectives diachroniques et traditions nationales*. Lyon: Éditions de l'École Normale Supérieure (ENS).

Brewer, C. (2005). Authority and personality in the Oxford English Dictionary. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, **103**(3), 261–301.

Burke, P. (2004). *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge, UK/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Certeau, M. de, Julia, D. & Revel, J. (1975). *Une politique de la langue: La Révolution française et les patois, l'enquête Grégoire*. Paris: Gallimard.

Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

de Jonghe, A. (1967). *De taalpolitiek van Koning Willem I in de Zuidelijke Nederlanden (1824–1830)*. Sint-Andries-bij-Brugge: Darthet.

de Rooij, J. (1990). Over hun en hen, en hun: vorm en functie van de niet-gereduceerde voorwerpsvormen van het persoonlijk voornaamwoord in de derde persoon meervoud, in standaardtaal, ouder Nederlands en dialect. *Taal en Tongval*, **42**(2), 107–47.

Deumert, A. & Vandenbussche, W. (2003). Research directions in the study of language standardization. In A. Deumert & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Germanic Standardizations: Past to Present*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 455–69.

Dons, U. (2004). *Descriptive Adequacy of Early Modern English Grammars*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Elspaß, S. (2005). *Sprachgeschichte von unten: Untersuchungen zum geschriebenen Alltagsdeutsch im 19. Jahrhundert*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Elspaß, S. (2007a). A twofold view 'from below': new perspectives on language histories and language historiographies. In S. Elspaß, N. Langer, J. Scharloth & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Germanic Language Histories 'from Below' (1700–1900)*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, pp. 3–9.

Elspaß, S. (2007b). Everyday language in emigrant letters and its implications on language historiography: the German case. *Multilingua*, **26**, 151–65.

Elspaß, S. (2014). Prescriptive norms and norms of usage in nineteenth-century German. In G. Rutten, R. Vosters & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 303–20.

Elspaß, S. & Langer, N. (2012). Jespersen's cycle and the history of German negation: challenges from a sociolinguistic perspective. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, **113**(3), 275–92.

Estival, D. & Pennycook, A. (2011). L'Académie française and Anglophone language ideologies. *Language Policy*, **10**(4), 325–41.

Fairman, T. (2007). Writing and 'the Standard': England, 1795–1834. *Multilingua*, **26**(2–3), 167–201.

Fishman, J. A. (1965). Who speaks what language to whom and when? *La Linguistique*, **1**(2), 67–88.

Gal, S. & Woolard, K. (2001). Constructing languages and publics: authority and representation. In K. Woolard & S. Gal, eds., *Language and Publics: The Making of Authority*. Manchester: St Jerome, pp. 1–12.

Goeman, T., van Oostendorp, M., van Reenen, P., Koornwinder, O. & van den Berg, B. (2009). *Morfologische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten: Deel II*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Haugen, E. (1966). Dialect, language, nation. *American Anthropologist*, **68**, 922–35.

Haugen, E. (1987). *Blessings of Babel: Bilingualism and Language Planning. Problems and Pleasures*. Berlin/New York/Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter.

Henckel, F. L. N. (1815). *Nieuwe Vlaemsche spraek-konst*. Gent: P. F. de Goesin-Verhaege.

Hornberger, N. H. (2006). Frameworks and models in language policy and planning. In T. Ricento, ed., *An Introduction to Language Policy: Theory and Method*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 24–41.

Irvine, J. T. & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity, ed., *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities, and Identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, pp. 35–83.

Janssens, G. (2014). *Tweehonderd jaar neerlandistiek aan de Université de Liège: een geschiedenis van de oudste extramurale leerstoel Nederlands*. Leuven/Den Haag: Acco.

Kloss, H. (1969). *Research Possibilities on Group Bilingualism: A Report*. Quebec: International Center for Research on Bilingualism.

Konopka, M. (1996). *Strittige Erscheinungen der deutschen Syntax im 18. Jahrhundert*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Krogull, A., Rutten, G. & van der Wal, M. (2017). Relativisation in Dutch diaries, private letters and newspapers (1770–1840): a genre-specific national language? In T. Säily, A. Nurmi, M. Palander-Collin & A. Auer, eds., *Exploring Future Paths for Historical Sociolinguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 157–86.

Labov, W. (1994). *Principles of Linguistic Change*. Vol I: *Internal factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Langer, N. (2001). *Linguistic Purism in Action: How Auxiliary Tun Was Stigmatized in Early New High German*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Langer, N. (2011). Historical sociolinguistics in nineteenth-century Schleswig-Holstein. *German Life and Letters*, **64**(2), 169–87.

Langer, N. (2014). Standard German in the eighteenth century: norms and use. In G. Rutten, R. Vosters & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 277–302.

Langer, N. & Havinga, A. E. (2015). Invisible languages in historical sociolinguistics: a conceptual outline, with examples from the German-Danish borderlands. In A. E. Havinga & N. Langer, eds., *Invisible Languages in the Nineteenth Century*. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, pp. 1–34.

Langhanke, R. & Langer, N. (2013). How to deal with non-dominant languages – metalinguistic discourses on Low German in the nineteenth century. *Linguistik Online*, **59**(1), 77–97.

Leerssen, J., ed. (2018). *Encyclopedia of Romantic Nationalism in Europe*, Vols. I–II. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Lippi-Green, R. (2012). *English with an Accent: Language, Ideology and Discrimination in the United States*, 2nd edn. London/New York: Routledge.

Lodge, R. A. (2013). A lady-in-waiting's begging letter to her former employer (Paris, mid-sixteenth century). In M. van der Wal & G. Rutten, eds., *Touching the Past: Studies in the Historical Sociolinguistics of Ego-Documents*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 19–43.

Lodge, R. A. (2014). Jacques-Louis Ménétra and his experience of the langue d'oc. In G. Rutten, R. Vosters & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 201–22.

Martineau, F. (2007). Variation in Canadian French usage from the 18th to the 19th century. *Multilingua*, **26**(2/3), 201–25.

Martineau, F. (2013). Written documents: what they tell us about linguistic usage. In M. van der Wal & G. Rutten, eds., *Touching the Past: Studies in the Historical Sociolinguistics of Ego-Documents*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 129–48.

McLelland, N. (2014). Language description, prescription and usage in seventeenth-century German. In G. Rutten, R. Vosters & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 251–76.

Meyerhoff, M. (2011). *Introducing Sociolinguistics*, 2nd edn. London/New York: Routledge.

Milroy, J. (2000). Historical description and the ideology of the standard language. In L. Wright, ed., *The Development of Standard English, 1300–1800*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 11–28.

Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, **5**(4), 530–55.

Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. (2012). *Authority in Language: Investigating Standard English*, 4th edn. London/New York: Routledge.

Nebrija, A. de (1492). *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. Salamanca: n. pub.

Nevalainen, T. (2014). Norms and usage in seventeenth-century English. In R. Vosters & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 103–28.

Nevalainen, T. & Raumolin-Brunberg, H. (2017). *Historical Sociolinguistics: Language Change in Tudor and Stuart England*, 2nd edn. London/New York: Routledge.

Nobels, J. & Rutten, G. (2014). Language norms and language use in seventeenth-century Dutch: negation and the genitive. In G. Rutten, R. Vosters & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 21–48.

Paffey, D. (2007). Policing the Spanish language debate: verbal hygiene and the Spanish language academy (Real Academia Española). *Language Policy*, **6**(3–4), 313–32.

Poplack, S. & Dion, N. (2009). Prescription vs. praxis. The evolution of future temporal reference in French. *Language*, **85**(3), 557–87.

Poplack, S., Jarmasz, L.-G., Dion, N. & Rosen, N. (2015). Searching for standard French: the construction and mining of the Recueil historique des grammaires du français. *Journal of Historical Sociolinguistics*, **1**(1), 13–55.

Rutten, G. (2007). Remark and remember: cultivating Dutch in Early Modern Europe. *Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas Bulletin*, **49**(1), 39–52.

Rutten, G. (2009). Grammar to the people: the Dutch language and the public sphere in the 18th century with special reference to Kornelis van der Palm. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*, **19**, 55–86.

Rutten, G. (2010). Vroegmoderne relativa: naar een diachrone constructiegrammatica. *Nederlandse Taalkunde*, **15**(1), 1–32.

Rutten, G. (2013). Waarom verscheen de Twe-spraack in 1584? In T. Van Hal, L. Isebaert, & P. Swiggers, eds., *De tuin der talen: taalstudie en taalcultuur in de Lage Landen, 1450–1750*. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 254–78.

Rutten, G. (2016a). Diaglossia, individual variation and the limits of standardization: evidence from Dutch. In C. Russi, ed., *Current Trends in Historical Sociolinguistics*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, pp. 194–218.

Rutten, G. (2016b). Historicizing diaglossia. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, **20**(1), 6–30.

Rutten, G. (2016c). Standardization and the myth of neutrality in language history. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, **242**, 25–57.

Rutten, G. (2018). Matthijs Siegenbeek in defense of Dutch. In R. Honings, G. Rutten & T. Kalmthout, van, eds., *Language, Literature and the Construction of a Dutch National Identity (1780–1830)*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 25–48.

Rutten, G. & van der Wal, M. (2011). Local dialects, supralocal writing systems. The degree of orality of Dutch private letters from the seventeenth century. *Written Language & Literacy*, **14**, 251–74.

Rutten, G. & van der Wal, M. (2014). *Letters as Loot: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Dutch*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Rutten, G. & Vosters, R. (2010). Chaos and standards: orthography in the Southern Netherlands (1720–1830). *Multilingua*, **29**(3/4), 417–38.

Rutten, G. & Vosters, R. (2013). Une tradition néerlandaise ? Du bon usage aux Pays-Bas (1686–1830). In W. Ayres-Bennett & M. Seijido, eds., *Bon Usage et variation sociolinguistique: Perspectives diachroniques et traditions nationales*. Lyon: Éditions de l'École Normale Supérieure, pp. 233–43.

Rutten, G., Vosters, R. & Vandenbussche, W., eds. (2014a). *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.

Rutten, G., Vosters, R., & Vandenbussche, W. (2014b). The interplay of language norms and usage patterns: comparing the history of Dutch, English, French and German. In *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 1–18.

Schoemaker, B. & Rutten, G. (2017). Standard language ideology and Dutch school inspection reports (1801–1854). *Sociolinguistica*, **31**(1) 101–16.

Siegenbeek, M. (1804). *Verhandeling over de Nederduitsche spelling, ter bevordering van eenparigheid in dezelve (Gebruikte editie: Amsterdam, 1805)*. Amsterdam: Allart.

Simons, T. & Rutten, G. (2014). Language norms and language use in eighteenth-century Dutch: final n and the genitive. In G. Rutten, R. Vosters & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 49–72.

Takada, H. (1998). *Grammatik und Sprachwirklichkeit von 1640–1700: Zur Rolle deutscher Grammatiker im schriftsprachlichen Ausgleichsprozess*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I. (2010). The usage guide: its birth and popularity. *English Today*, **26**(2), 14–23.

Tieken-Boon van Ostade, I., ed. (2018). *English Usage Guides: History, Advice, Attitudes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tosi, A. (2011). The Accademia della Crusca in Italy: past and present. *Language Policy*, **10**(4), 289–303.

van der Horst, J. & Marschall, F. (1989). *Korte geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taal*. Amsterdam: Nijgh & Van Ditmar.

van der Ploeg, H. W. (1800). *Het belang der waare volksverlichting*. Amsterdam: Wed. Harm. Keijzer, Corns. de Vries & Hendrik van Munster.

van der Wal, M. (2018). Johannes Kinker: a Kantian philosopher teaching Dutch language, literature, and eloquence. In R. Honings, G. Rutten & T. Kalmthout, van, eds., *Language, Literature and the Construction of a Dutch National Identity (1780–1830)*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 97–118.

van Heule, C. (1625). *De Nederduytsche Grammatica ofte Spraec-konst*. Leyden: Roels. (Reissue of the text by W. J. H. Caron, Groningen: Wolters, 1953.)

Villa, L. (2011). 'Because when governments speak, they are not always right': national construction and orthographic conflicts in mid-nineteenth century Spain. In N. Langer, S. Davies & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Language and History, Linguistics and Historiography*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 209–28.

Villa, L. (2015). Official orthographies, spelling debates and nation-building projects after the fall of the Spanish Empire. *Written Language & Literacy*, **18**(2), 228–47.

Voeste, A. (2015). Proficiency and efficiency: why German spelling changed in Early Modern times. *Written Language & Literacy*, **18**(2), 248–59.

Vosters, R., Belsack, E., Puttaert, J. & Vandenbussche, W. (2014). Norms and usage in nineteenth-century Southern Dutch. In G. Rutten, R. Vosters & W. Vandenbussche, eds., *Norms and Usage in Language History, 1600–1900: A Historical-Sociolinguistic and Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, pp. 73–100.

Vosters, R. & Rutten, G. (2015). Three Southern shibboleths: spelling features as conflicting identity markers in the Low Countries. *Written Language & Literacy*, **18**(2), 260–74.

Vosters, R. & Vandenbussche, W. (2012). Bipartite negation in 18th and early 19th century Southern Dutch: sociolinguistic aspects of norms and variation. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, **113**(3), 343–64.

Watts, R. J. (2000). Mythical strands in the ideology of prescriptivism. In L. Wright, ed., *The Development of Standard English, 1300–1800: Theories, Descriptions, Conflicts*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 29–48.

Watts, R. J. (2011). *Language Myths and the History of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Watts, R. J. (2012). Language myths. In J. M. Hernandez Campoy & J. C. Conde Silvestre, eds., *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 585–606.

Weijermars, J. (2009). Neerlandistiek als bindmiddel van de natie: Hoogleraar Schrant in Gent 1817–1830. *De Negentiende Eeuw*, **1**, 4–19.

Weijermars, J. (2012). *Stiefbroeders: Zuid-Nederlandse letteren en natievorming onder Willem*. Hilversum: Verloren.

Weiland, P. (1799). *Nederduitsch taalkundig woordenboek*. Amsterdam: J. Allart.

Weiland, P. (1805). *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst*. Amsterdam: J. Allart.

Willemyns, R. (1993). Integration vs. particularism: the undeclared issue at the first Dutch Congress in 1849. In J. A. Fishman, ed., *The Earliest Stage of Language Planning*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 69–83.

Wright, S. (2012). Language policy, the nation and nationalism. In B. Spolsky, ed., *The Cambridge Handbook of Language Policy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 59–78.