



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Cultural Nationalism and the Rise of Dutch Studies

Rutten, G.J.; Kalmthout, T. van; Honings, R.; Rutten, G.

Citation

Rutten, G. J., & Kalmthout, T. van. (2018). Cultural Nationalism and the Rise of Dutch Studies. In R. Honings & G. Rutten (Eds.), *Language, Literature and the Construction of a Dutch National Identity (1780-1830)* (pp. 9-24). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
doi:10.5117/9789089648273/INTRO

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66698>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Introduction

Cultural Nationalism and the Rise of Dutch Studies

Gijsbert Rutten and Ton van Kalmthout

Honings, Rick, Gijsbert Rutten and Ton van Kalmthout (eds.), *Language, Literature and the Construction of a Dutch National Identity (1780-1830)*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2018.

DOI: 10.5117/9789089648273/INTRO

1 Cultural Nationalism and Agency

De taal is de ziel der natie, zij is de natie zelve; that is, 'language is the soul of the nation, it is the nation itself'. So reads one of the mottos of what is often considered to be the largest dictionary in the world: the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*, or 'Dictionary of the Dutch Language'. From the first instalment (1864) through the first volume (1882) to, finally, volume XXIX (1998), the dictionary's opening pages were adorned with this motto.¹ The dictionary itself is one of the great achievements of nineteenth-century linguistic nationalism, not unlike Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm's *Deutsches Wörterbuch* or the *Oxford English Dictionary*. It is thus no coincidence that one of the mottos chosen for it captured the ethnolinguistic essentialism of the age.

One useful framework for analysing eighteenth and nineteenth-century scholarly activities in the fields of language and literature has been proposed by Leerssen.² Following Hroch's well-known tripartite division of the development of national movements into the phases A, B and C, which roughly correspond to the respective cultural, social and political concerns of the nationalists involved, Leerssen argues that 'nationalism is always, in its incipience at least, cultural nationalism'.³ In this volume, we focus

1 The motto is attributed to the Frisian linguist Joast Hiddes Halbertsma (1789-1869). See, among others, Breuker, 1994 and Dykstra, 2011. For the history of the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* or *WNT*, see van Sterkenburg, 1992.

2 Leerssen, 2006.

3 Leerssen, 2006, p. 562. See also Hroch, 1968, 1985.

on early 'phase A' cultural nationalism in a specific place and time: the Low Countries in the final decades of the eighteenth and the first decades of the nineteenth century. From c. 1750 onward, the study of the Dutch language and of the literary history of the Low Countries intensified, and was increasingly justified as a *national* enterprise. There had been calls, for example, for a dictionary comprising all the words of the Dutch language since the 1760s. The publication of the first instalment of the national dictionary in 1864 was the long-awaited result of more than a century of nationalistically-inspired lexicographical debates.

What, then, is cultural nationalism? In the context of eighteenth and nineteenth-century Europe, its core activity is the *cultivation of culture*: 'the new interest in demotic, vernacular, non-classical culture, and the intellectual canonisation process that constitutes such vernacular culture, not merely as a set of trivial or banal pastimes, or as picturesque 'manners and customs', but as something which represents the very identity of the nation, its specificity amidst other nations.'⁴ Intellectual activities typically associated with the cultivation of culture include grammar-writing, lexicography, etymology, rhetoric or eloquence, literary history, the collection and study of fairy-tales, myths, legends and proverbs, and the study of antiquities. The brothers Grimm can be cited as exemplary proponents of the cultivation of culture. An eighteenth-century Dutch term that covers all of these seemingly divergent scholarly enterprises is *letterkunde*, 'the study of letters'. An alternative label, more characteristic of the nineteenth century, is *filologie*, 'philology'.

From the list of activities, it becomes immediately clear that language and literature are the central concerns of many cultural nationalists. Other aspects of culture subject to cultivation are artefacts such as paintings and monuments, and cultural practices such as manners and customs.⁵ The dominant approach to all such expressions of the supposedly national culture is historical.⁶ Studies of national literatures, for example, are generally historical overviews.

One implication of this concept of eighteenth and nineteenth-century cultural nationalism is that it is an elite phenomenon. A small layer of socio-economically privileged people, mostly men, was engaged in the study of cultural products; high culture, but also mass or popular culture,

4 Leerssen, 2006, p. 568.

5 Joseph, 2004; Leerssen, 2006, pp. 567-569.

6 See e.g. Jensen, Leerssen & Mathijssen, 2010; Mathijssen, 2013.

giving rise to the formation of folklore studies.⁷ The issues raised by having a relatively small group of identifiable ‘cultivators of culture’ are linked to issues of agency, used here in the sociological sense of the individual capacity to make choices and take action. Who were these cultivators? What ideas did they have and how did they disseminate them? In what kinds of social, intellectual and institutional networks did they participate?⁸ Given that cultural nationalism in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was primarily the concern of a handful of historical actors, it makes sense to map out these actors and their publications, ideas, attitudes and networks. The *Study Platform on Interlocking Nationalisms* (SPIN) aims to do this at the broad European level.⁹ In the present volume, we focus on the incipient phase of Dutch cultural nationalism in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, focusing on a range of both well-known and lesser-known historical actors who formed part of contemporary efforts to cultivate Dutch culture.

As such, the present volume ties in with many studies published in recent years that are more or less situated within the framework of cultural nationalism, such as the studies by Jensen, Leerssen and Mathijssen on the intersection of historicism and nationalism, and the studies by Rock and Petiet on Dutch literary history and text editions in the context of nationalism.¹⁰ A recent volume by van Kalmthout & Zuidervaart discusses philology in the Low Countries in the broad nineteenth-century sense of the term, mainly focusing on case studies from the middle and the end of the century.¹¹ In this context, ‘national’ is obviously a crucial concept, too. With the present volume, we shift back a few decades in time, and focus on what preceded mid- and late-nineteenth-century national philology.

The crucial role played by language and language-related disciplines in periods of nationalism is widely acknowledged, though not uncontested.¹² Historically, however, it is extremely difficult to distinguish metalinguistic reflection from the developing cultural nationalism of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.¹³ In fact, from the times of John Locke (1632-1704), Étienne Bonnot de Condillac (1714-1780), Johann David Michaelis (1717-1791) and, perhaps more famously, Johann Gottfried Herder

7 Burke, 1992, 2009; Bendix, 1997; Koolhaas-Grosfeld, 2010.

8 Leerssen, 2006, pp. 556-567; de Jong, 2009.

9 See <http://spinnet.humanities.uva.nl/>. See also Leerssen, 2010.

10 Jensen, Leerssen & Matthijssen, 2010; Mathijssen, 2013; Rock, 2010; Petiet, 2011.

11 Van Kalmthout & Zuidervaart, 2015. See also Turner, 2014, for the concept of philology.

12 Joseph, 2006.

13 Cf. e.g. Benes, 2008.

(1744-1803) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835) onward, the intrinsic relationship between language and nation has formed a stable element of both metalinguistic and nationalist discourse.¹⁴ The key cultural position of language during the rise of cultural nationalism and the formation of modern European nation-states led to intensified interest in the study of the 'national' language and literature, and to the rise of the new discipline of national philology across Europe.

Bringing together many of the actors involved in the cultivation of Dutch culture, this volume charts the individuals engaged in the construction of Dutch studies as a national philology.¹⁵ The late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries not only witnessed the nationalisation of language and literature; in addition to this process of discipline formation, institutional and political developments advanced the rise of Dutch studies. First, Dutch entered the universities as an academic discipline, and professors of Dutch were gradually appointed throughout the Netherlands. Furthermore, a national language policy was developed, resulting in official regulations for orthography and grammar. In section 2, we present a brief historical overview of the period under discussion. In section 3, we take up the topic of the rise of Dutch studies, and explain the structure of this volume.

2 The Low Countries, 1750-1850

With respect to the construction of a national philology, the Dutch case is particularly interesting. In the decades around 1800, the Netherlands underwent several profound upheavals and transformations, not only in a cultural sense, but also socially and politically.¹⁶ Unlike simultaneous events in North America and France, however, these changes took place in a relatively peaceful manner.

Since 1588, the northern part of the Low Countries had been formed by the Republic of the United Netherlands, a federation of seven sovereign states or provinces, which also exercised control over nearby regions outside their own territory.¹⁷ The Republic developed into a political and economic world power in the seventeenth century, a position that was partly achieved

14 See a.o. Bauman & Briggs, 2003.

15 Cf. Johannes, 2015.

16 For some more detailed surveys of political and social-cultural developments in the decades around 1800, see Schama, 1992; Kloek & Mijndhardt, 2004.

17 Israel, 1998.

through its colonies in South America and South East Asia. From 1747, executive power over the provinces was held by Prince Willem IV, the hereditary stadtholder from the House of Orange-Nassau, and (after an interim regency by army commander Ludwig-Ernst von Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel), from 1766, by his eldest son, Willem V. Both stadtholders behaved as though they were absolutist monarchs, while they ruled over an empire that was increasingly living on past glory.

Before they had taken office, the Republic had already fallen into economic decline. Moreover, it was wedged between the allied powers of Britain and Prussia on the one hand, and the allies France and Austria on the other; a situation that led to a constant threat of war. In 1780, the British defeated the Dutch in the Fourth Anglo-Dutch War, as a result of which the Republic had to cede several colonised territories. After some time, the bourgeois 'Patriot' movement arose. Encouraged by the successful North American struggle for independence, the Patriots demanded more freedom and power for the civilian population.¹⁸ When, in 1787, there was a risk that this egalitarian movement would gain ascendancy over the 'Orangists' supporting the stadtholder, Prussia invaded the Republic and restored Willem V to power. Many Patriots fled to France, where they would soon be joined by insurgents from the South.

The Southern Netherlands, comprising ten to eleven Belgian provinces, had been ruled by an Austrian emperor from the House of Habsburg since 1715, but enjoyed a fairly high degree of autonomy.¹⁹ Nevertheless, in the second half of the eighteenth century, the successive rulers Maria Theresa, Joseph II and Leopold II implemented a series of enlightened reforms, some of which, for instance, reduced the influence of the Roman Catholic Church. In spite of revolts against the measures, the Austrians largely succeeded in holding political power until 1794. In this year, the French First Republic, which had arisen after the French Revolution of 1789, defeated Austria and went on to annex the Southern Netherlands a year later.²⁰ The French moved on to the Dutch Republic, where some Patriots proclaimed the Batavian Republic (1795-1801) a satellite state and French colony. The stadtholder fled to England and ordered the overseas territories to subject themselves to British authority. Thus the Republic once again lost part of its colonial empire, and would lose even more when the French conducted peace negotiations with the British.

18 Grijzenhout & van Sas, 1987.

19 Billen et al., 1987.

20 Craeybeckx & Scheelings, 1990.

The Batavian Republic was named after the Batavians; a Germanic tribe that was thought originally to have inhabited the main province of Holland and to have passed on its characteristics to the Dutch people over the generations. The Republic, set up in accordance with the French departmental model, obtained a parliament in 1796 and a constitution in 1798, and was thereby turned into a democratic unitary state.²¹ A constitutional amendment would turn the Batavian Republic into the Batavian Commonwealth (1801-1806), but after Napoleon Bonaparte was elected French emperor in 1804, he transformed the Commonwealth, in turn, into the Kingdom of Holland (1806-1810), ruled by his brother Louis Napoleon I.²² Unpopular measures such as heavy taxes and conscription frequently incited the population to various forms of resistance, which were often harshly suppressed by the French ruler.²³

King Louis Napoleon failed to meet Napoleon's expectations, however: according to the emperor, he was too self-willed and allowed Dutch interests to prevail over French concerns. For this reason, Napoleon incorporated the kingdom into his empire.²⁴ Three years later, the allied powers forced him to resign as emperor and the Northern and Southern Netherlands regained their independence. The French Period had not only brought conscription, censorship and great economic damage, but also, for instance, the separation of Church and State, a centralised polity with modern legislation, a land registry and a civil registry. Furthermore, Louis Napoleon had founded national institutions such as the Royal Institute of Sciences, Literature and Fine Arts, the Royal Library and the Royal Art Gallery.

After the departure of the French in 1813, the Northern Netherlands welcomed the eldest son of Stadtholder Willem V, Prince Willem Frederik, as their sovereign, in an Orangist restoration-attempt based on the idea that a state should be rooted in the past. One year later, when Napoleon escaped from his exile on Elba and seemed likely to return to the European stage, the prince proclaimed himself King of the Netherlands. King Willem I managed to gain sovereignty over both the Northern and the Southern Netherlands, which were joined in the United Kingdom of the Netherlands after Napoleon's final defeat at Waterloo in 1815.²⁵ Luxemburg was connected to this unitary state in a political and personal union until 1839

21 Van Sas, 2011; Grijzenhout et al., 2013; Rutjes, 2013.

22 Hallebeek & Sirks, 2006; Tibbe et al., 2006.

23 Joor, 2000; Jensen, 2013.

24 Uitterhoeve, 2012.

25 Judo & Van de Perre, 2016.

and 1890, respectively, as Willem I was also Grand Duke of Luxemburg. An enlightened despot with great constitutional powers, he was committed to the advancement of prosperity and literacy in his kingdom.

In the South, this could not prevent growing discontent about the administrative underrepresentation and financial disadvantaging of the region. What is more, this part of the country, with its predominantly Roman Catholic culture, felt alienated from the mainly Calvinist and liberal culture of the North, whereas Willem I's attempts to make Dutch the official language of his kingdom encountered strong resistance from the French-speaking elites and the Walloon population. All this led to a southern revolt in 1830, resulting in a declaration of independence by the Belgians. One year later, they appointed Leopold I of Saxe-Coburg and Gotha as their own king. Willem I responded with a Ten Days' Campaign against the rebellious provinces, but he finally had to acquiesce in the splitting of his territory into a Kingdom of the Netherlands and a Kingdom of Belgium.²⁶

As we have seen, the Northern and Southern Netherlands experienced a very unstable political situation in the decades around 1800, in which efforts to achieve political and cultural unity stagnated time and again. Given these circumstances, it is not surprising that purveyors of culture in both regions, in the wake of similar cultural-national tendencies elsewhere in the Western world, were in search of what distinguished them from competing powers. In addition, the need to recover the Republic's former economic and cultural efflorescence was felt intensely; a need that strengthened historical awareness and stimulated a historiography at the service of a respectable national identity. This nurtured national thought around the turn of the century, an ideology based on a shared illustrious past and a common vernacular language and culture as repositories of the national character. These repositories should be unveiled, codified, standardised and taught in order to unify the nation, to cultivate patriotism, and to guard against foreign and hostile influences.²⁷

For an important part, reflection about the Dutch nation found its expression in print and in oral debates in cultural and reformist associations. There were close ties between the two forms of communication; associational treatises and recitations of poetry were often released in print, whether or not in affiliated series or journals. These circuits mobilised a public of readers and listeners from the upper layers of the urban bourgeoisie, whose literacy rate was high, especially in the North. As a result, the number of

²⁶ Judo & Van de Perre, 2007.

²⁷ Bank, 1990; Kloek & Dorsman, 1993; Deprez & Vos, 1998; Stengers, 2000; Bemong et al., 2010.

Dutch-language works published in print – books, pamphlets, periodicals and journals – increased exponentially in the course of the eighteenth century. Journals in particular were on the rise.²⁸ In the final decades of the century, they made a significant contribution to the dissemination and popularisation of topical scientific and cultural information in the vernacular. In addition to general cultural magazines, journals for specific interests or disciplines, also in the vernacular, emerged around 1800. A considerable part of what was read in the Netherlands originated from abroad, whether or not in translation. This made it difficult for Dutch and Flemish journals and magazines to survive. They had to compete, among other things, with imported periodicals and proceedings of foreign societies.

Similar to elsewhere in the Western world, Dutch cultural and scientific life in the second half of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth century was to a great extent organised in the abovementioned associations: a form of private sociability focused on social intercourse, on the spiritual development of their own members or the outside world, and in many cases also on the promotion of certain social interests.²⁹ By means of competitions, debates, treatises and readings, as well as the construction of scientific collections and other activities, learned societies contributed in their own way to the national and international exchange of new scientific insights. In the decades around 1800, the *Hollandsche Maatschappij der Wetenschappen* ('Holland Society of Sciences'; 1752), the *Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde* ('Society of Dutch Language and Literature'; 1766), the *Zeeuwsch Genootschap* ('Zealandish Society'; 1769), the *Bataafsch Genootschap voor Proefondervindelijke Wijsbegeerte* ('Batavian Association for Experimental Philosophy'; 1769) and the *Provinciaal Utrechtsch Genootschap* ('Provincial Utrecht Association'; 1773) were among the most important learned societies in the Low Countries. Partly because of double memberships, they had a total of no more than 700 members between 1770 and 1806;³⁰ scholars who were often also involved in less specialised associations, such as general cultural or poetic societies.

For many people, these societies offered a useful opportunity for social mobility. Their members – almost exclusively men – not only trained themselves in writing poetry, but also in recitation, they judged each other's work, and held discourses on literary and related topics. Just like the major learned societies, smaller associations could therefore devote themselves to

28 Johannes, 1995.

29 Eijssens et al., 1983; Mijnhardt, 1987.

30 Kloek & Mijnhardt, 2004, p. 123.

the study of Dutch language and literature, something that the universities were still hesitant to do. It is particularly thanks to the involvement of larger and smaller private societies – a topic that Gert-Jan Johannes will discuss in more detail in his concluding chapter – that, in the years around 1800, the field of study emerged that we nowadays call *Neerlandistiek*.

3 The Rise of Dutch Studies

Neerlandistiek, which we translate as ‘Dutch studies’, is the study of Dutch language and literature. Until recently, all Dutch universities offering *neerlandistiek* called their study programmes *Nederlandse taal- en letterkunde*; the ‘study of the Dutch language and of Dutch literature’. This has now been changed to *Nederlandse taal en cultuur*, ‘Dutch language and culture’. Despite this, the content of the study programmes still falls largely within the realm of what we call Dutch studies; that is, the combined study of cultural phenomena created in the Dutch language, in the past or in the present, and of the Dutch language itself. This inherently diverse intellectual field, which also encompasses rhetoric or eloquence, became a focal point of cultural nationalism in the second half of the eighteenth century.

Scholarly and pedagogic interest in the Dutch language dates back to the sixteenth century, when printers, booksellers, schoolteachers and rhetoricians began to write orthographies, grammar books and dictionaries. There was great diversity, however, with respect to aims, target audiences and meta-language. At the beginning of the eighteenth century, grammar and spelling were primarily conceptualised as distinctive elements in an elite culture of poetry and stylised prose and sermons. From around the middle of the eighteenth century, a gradual nationalisation can be perceived in contemporary meta-linguistic discourse. In the second half of the century, grammatical and orthographical expertise in the Dutch language was increasingly demanded of members of the entire Dutch language community – that is, of the members of the Dutch nation and the citizens of the Dutch state.³¹

The institutional rise of Dutch studies also began in the second half of the eighteenth century. Meinard Tydeman (1741-1825) was the author of two seminal essays, written in 1761 and 1762, which addressed the importance of a national ‘mother tongue’ and the need to impose this on

31 Rutten, 2009, 2016.

a nationally-organised educational system.³² In 1764, Tydeman took up a chair in history, rhetoric and Greek at the University of Harderwijk. In his 1765 inaugural address, he repeated his arguments for the cultivation of the national *vernaculus sermo* or 'native tongue'.³³ Tydeman also intended to teach Dutch grammar, but in view of his departure to Utrecht, where he would become professor of law in 1766, it is unlikely that he ever taught Dutch at the university level.³⁴

Tydeman's successor in Harderwijk was Herman Tollius (1742-1822), whose intention to teach Dutch at university level was approved in 1773. He taught a Dutch course in 1773, and perhaps also in 1774, to students of law and theology. Several sets of lecture notes have been preserved, as well as a manuscript grammar written by Tollius himself in the same period.³⁵ The grammar, well-rooted in the eighteenth-century metalinguistic tradition, remained unpublished until de Bonth's edition in 2007.

In 1790, Everwinus Wassenbergh (1742-1826), professor of Greek at the University of Franeker from 1771, asked permission to teach a course on Dutch language and literature. His request was granted by the board of curators. It remains unclear whether Wassenbergh actually started teaching Dutch in 1790, but he certainly did so from 1797 onward, when his teaching commitment was officially extended to include Dutch, to which several sets of lecture notes testify.³⁶

Matthijs Siegenbeek is traditionally considered to have been the first professor of Dutch. Although there were a few predecessors, Siegenbeek was the first to have a chair solely devoted to Dutch.³⁷ He was appointed extraordinary professor of Dutch rhetoric at the University of Leiden in 1797. His professorship was transformed into a regular chair in 1799, which included the fields of Dutch linguistics and literature. Siegenbeek's appointment in the 1790s is generally considered a prime example of cultural nationalism, and it therefore seems appropriate that Siegenbeek is the topic of the next chapter, written by Gijsbert Rutten.

For many years, Siegenbeek would remain the only professor with a chair exclusively devoted to Dutch. Soon after the establishment of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, however, King Willem I developed a policy to introduce chairs in Dutch throughout the Netherlands. In 1815, Barthold

32 Published in 1775, see Tydeman, 1775a and 1775b.

33 Noordegraaf, 2012, p. 90.

34 Noordegraaf, 2012, pp. 91-92.

35 Cf. de Bonth in the introduction to his edition of Tollius, 2007, pp. IX-XXX.

36 Noordegraaf 1997.

37 Vis [2004], p. 10.

Hendrik Lulofs was appointed in Groningen; Francien Petiet will discuss Lulofs in chapter 2. Similarly, the poet Adam Simons took up the chair in Dutch studies at the University of Utrecht in 1816; for Simons, see chapter 3 by Rick Honings. In 1817, Johannes Kinker, a Kantian philosopher, accepted the chair in Dutch in Liège; chapter 4 by Marijke van der Wal discusses his activities in the field of Dutch studies. Likewise, chairs in Dutch studies were created in Amsterdam, Deventer, Ghent and Louvain.³⁸ In the same spirit, Ulrich Gerhard Lauts was appointed at the Brussels Athenaeum in 1822, and Lauts is the topic of chapter 5 by Wim Vandenbussche.

As was mentioned above, the same period also saw the rise of an official language policy. In 1804 and 1805, an orthography and a grammar were published on behalf of the national government, to be used for administrative and educational purposes. The author of the orthography was Siegenbeek. The Rotterdam-based clergyman Pieter Weiland wrote the official grammar, which will be discussed in chapter 6 by Jan Noordegraaf. The first official codification of the 'national' language was carried out under the authority of the Minister of Education, Johan Hendrik van der Palm. In chapter 7, Ellen Krol focuses on van der Palm and his extensive contributions to Dutch studies.

The label 'Dutch' is not easy to define in this period; the national culture that historical actors were aiming to cultivate varied individually and regionally, as well as under the influence of the national political situation. The term 'Dutch' was often used to refer to the language and culture of the northern parts of the Netherlands; that is, of the Dutch Republic. It could also refer to the entire language area, including the southern parts of present-day Belgium, particularly in the period of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. At the same time, cultural nationalism also affected areas within larger political units such as Friesland, a province of the Northern Netherlands.³⁹ Furthermore, emancipatory efforts such as those of the Flemish movement drew attention to the importance of Dutch areas *within* a larger Dutch framework. Focusing on the southern and the northern parts of the Low Countries, a few crucial figures stand out for their foundational contributions in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In addition to those already mentioned, this volume discusses Jan Frans Willems and Adriaan Kluit. Willems, discussed by Janneke Weijermars in chapter 8, was the so-called father of the Flemish movement and an extremely active scholar in the field of Dutch studies. Kluit was a prominent member

38 See Vis, [2004].

39 Cf. de Jong, 2009.

of many learned societies in the north in the second half of the eighteenth century. As such, he wrote influential treatises about the Dutch language that would greatly influence Siegenbeek's spelling rules of 1804. Kluit is the topic of chapter 9 by Lo van Driel and Nicoline van der Sijs.

The many societies and periodicals that existed throughout the Netherlands formed key cultural and social structures in the second half of the eighteenth century. These learned circles had promoted the study of the 'national' language and literature since the 1760s. For example, Tydeman made his plea for the 'mother tongue' within the Utrecht-based society *Dulces Ante Omnia Musae*. The *Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde* ('Society of Dutch Language and Literature'), worked on a national dictionary from the 1770s. The national spelling and grammar rules of 1804/1805 were first approved by representatives of various learned societies before being accepted by and printed for the government. Towards the end of the century, the need for normative control of language was accompanied by an interest in historical overviews of linguistic and literary heritage. Around 1800, various people were working on a literary history of the Netherlands, all of whom can be considered 'fathers' of Dutch literary history-writing.⁴⁰ In addition to Siegenbeek, they include Jacob van Dijk, Hendrik van Wijn and Jeronimo de Vries, discussed in chapters 10, 11 and 12 by Peter Altena, Ton van Kalmthout and Lotte Jensen.

Many more 'cultivators' of Dutch culture could have been included, of course, such as the omnipresent intellectual Willem Bilderdijk (1756-1831), the intriguing professor of Dutch at the University of Ghent, Johannes Schrant (1783-1866), and the author of the first history of the Dutch language, Annaeus Ypeij (1760-1837).⁴¹ Nevertheless, with the present selection of historical actors who played a crucial role in the development of Dutch studies in a period of intense cultural nationalism, we hope to paint a more fine-grained and coherent picture of what are in themselves familiar changes and developments, but ones that are often addressed only in a global manner. We are delighted that Gert-Jan Johannes agreed to write a concluding chapter offering insightful generalisations and reflections, bringing together many of the themes and threads that the next twelve chapters have in common.

40 Van den Berg, 1989.

41 For Bilderdijk, see van Eijnatten, 1998; Honings & van Zonneveld, 2013. For Schrant, see Weijermars, 2009. For Ypeij: van Rossem, 1994.

References

- J.Th.M. Bank, *Het roemrijk vaderland. Cultureel nationalisme in Nederland in de negentiende eeuw* (The Hague: Sdu, 1990).
- R. Bauman & C.L. Briggs, *Voices of Modernity. Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- N. Bemong, M.G. Kemperink, M. Mathijssen & T. Sintobin (eds.), *Naties in een spanningsveld. Tegenstrijdige bewegingen in de identiteitsvorming in negentiende-eeuws Vlaanderen en Nederland* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2010).
- R. Bendix, *In Search of Authenticity. The Formation of Folklore Studies* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1997).
- T. Benes, *In Babel's Shadow. Language, Philology, and the Nation in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2008).
- W. van den Berg, 'Over het vaderschap van de Nederlandse literatuurgeschiedschrijving', *Literatuur*, 6 (1989), 320-324.
- C. Billen et al., *Oostenrijks België, 1713-1794. De Zuidelijke Nederlanden onder de Oostenrijkse Habsburgers* (Brussels: Gemeentekrediet, 1987).
- Ph.H. Breuker, 'De vriendschap tussen Bilderdijk en Halbertsma', *Het Bilderdijk-Museum*, 1 (1994), 1-14.
- P. Burke, 'We, the People: Popular culture and popular identity in Modern Europe'. In *Modernity and Identity*, ed. by S. Lash & J. Friedman (Oxford & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 293-308.
- P. Burke, *Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009 [3rd ed.]).
- J. Craeybeckx & F.G. Scheelings (eds.), *De Franse Revolutie en Vlaanderen. De Oostenrijkse Nederlanden tussen oud en nieuw régime / La Révolution française et la Flandre. Les Pays-Bas autrichiens entre l'ancien et le nouveau régime* (Brussels: VUB Press, 1990).
- A. de Jong, *Knooppunt Halbertsma. Joast Hiddes Halbertsma (1789-1869) en andere Europese geleerden over het Fries en andere talen, over wetenschap en over de samenleving* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2009).
- G.L. Deprez & L. Vos (eds.), *Nationalism in Belgium. Shifting identities, 1780-1995* (Basingstoke etc.: Macmillan / New York, NY: St. Martin's Press, 1998).
- A. Dykstra, *J.H. Halbertsma als lexicograaf. Studies over het Lexicon Frisicum (1872)* (Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy & Afûk, 2011).
- J. van Eijnatten, *Hogere sferen. De ideeënwereld van Willem Bilderdijk (1756-1831)* (Hilversum: Verloren, 1998).
- H. Eijssens et al. (ed.), *Genootschapsleven in Nederland 1800-1850*, special issue of *De Negentiende Eeuw*, 7 (1983).
- F. Grijzenhout & N. van Sas, *Voor vaderland en vrijheid. Revolutie in Nederland 1780-1787* (Utrecht: Centraal Museum, 1987).

- F. Grijzenhout, N. van Sas & W. Velema (eds.), *Het Bataafse experiment. Politiek en cultuur rond 1800* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2013).
- J. Hallebeek & A.J.B. Sirks (eds.), *Nederland in Franse schaduw. Recht en bestuur in het Koninkrijk Holland (1806-1810)* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2006).
- R. Honings & P. van Zonneveld, *De gefnuikte arend. Het leven van Willem Bilderdijk (1756-1831)* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2013).
- M. Hroch, *Die Vorkämpfer der nationalen Bewegung bei den kleinen Völkern Europas. Eine vergleichende Analyse zur gesellschaftlichen Schichtung der patriotischen Gruppen* (Prague: Universita Karlova, 1968).
- M. Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe: A Comparative Analysis of the Social Composition of Patriotic Groups among the Smaller European Nations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- J. Israel, *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477-1806* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998 [reprint, 1st ed. 1995]).
- L. Jensen, *Verzet tegen Napoleon* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2013).
- L. Jensen, J. Leerssen & M. Mathijssen (eds.), *Free Access to the Past. Romanticism, Cultural Heritage and the Nation* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2010).
- G.-J. Johannes, *De barometer van de smaak. Tijdschriften in Nederland 1770-1830* (The Hague: Sdu, 1995).
- G.-J. Johannes, 'Dutch Language and Literature' (and other 'national philologies') as an example of discipline formation in the humanities. In *The Practice of Philology in the Nineteenth-Century Netherlands*, ed. by Ton van Kalmthout & Huib Zuidervaart (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2015), pp. 37-52.
- J. Joor, *De adelaar en het lam. Onrust, opruiing en onwilligheid in Nederland ten tijde van het Koninkrijk Holland en de inlijving bij het Franse keizerrijk (1806-1813)* (Amsterdam: De Bataafsche Leeuw, 2000).
- J.E. Joseph, *Language and Identity. National, Ethnic, Religious* (Houndmills etc.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
- J.E. Joseph, 'The grammatical Being called a Nation'. History and the Construction of Political and Linguistic Nationalism. In *Language and History. Integrationist Perspectives*, ed. by Nigel Love (London & New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 120-141.
- F. Judo & S. Van de Perre (eds.), *De prijs van de Scheiding. Het uiteenvallen van het Verenigd Koninkrijk der Nederlanden (1830-1839)* (Kapellen: Pelckmans, 2007).
- F. Judo & S. Van de Perre (eds.), *Belgen Bataaf. De wording van het Verenigd Koninkrijk der Nederlanden* (Antwerp: Polis, 2016 [2nd ed.]).
- T. van Kalmthout & H. Zuidervaart (eds.), *The Practice of Philology in the Nineteenth-century Netherlands* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2015).
- E. Kloek & L. Dorsman (eds.), *Nationale identiteit en historisch besef in Nederland* (Utrecht: Instituut voor Geschiedenis, 1993).

- J. Kloek & W. Mijnhardt, *1800. Blueprints for a National Community* (Assen: Van Gorcum & Basingstoke etc.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).
- E. Koolhaas-Grosfeld, *De ontdekking van de Nederlander in boeken en prenten rond 1800* (Zutphen: Walburg Pers, 2010).
- J. Leerssen, 'Nationalism and the Cultivation of Culture', *Nations and Nationalism*, 12 (2006), 559-578.
- J. Leerssen, *National Thought in Europe. A Cultural History* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2010).
- M. Mathijssen, *Historiezucht. De obsessie met het verleden in de negentiende eeuw* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2013).
- J. Noordegraaf, 'Het begin van de universitaire neerlandistiek: Franeker 1790?' In *Voorlopig verleden. Taalkundige plaatsbepalingen, 1797-1960* (Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1997), pp. 14-27.
- J. Noordegraaf, 'Over taal en maatschappij in de achttiende eeuw. Het werk van Meinard Tydeman (1741-1825)', *Neerlandica Wratislaviensia*, 21 (2012), 87-100.
- F. Petiet, 'Een voldoende bewijs van ware vaderlandsliefde'. *De creatie van literair erfgoed in Nederland, 1797-1845* (Unpublished PhD dissertation Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2011).
- J.A.T. Rock, *Papieren monumenten. Over diepe breuken en lange lijnen in de geschiedenis van tekstedities in de Nederlanden 1591-1863* (Unpublished PhD dissertation Universiteit van Amsterdam, 2010).
- C. van Rossem, 'Annaeus Ypeij and the Frisian language'. In *Wat oars as mei in echte taal*, ed. by Ph.H. Breuker, H.D. Meijering & J. Noordegraaf (Ljouwert: Fryske Akademy, 1994), pp. 186-199.
- M. Rutjes, *Door gelijkheid gegrepen. Democratie, burgerschap en staat in Nederland* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2013).
- G. Rutten, '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 (2009), 55-86.
- G. Rutten, 'Standardization and the Myth of Neutrality in Language History', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 242 (2016), 25-57.
- N. van Sas, *Bataafse Terreur. De betekenis van 1798* (Nijmegen: Vantilt & Amsterdam: Stichting Daendels, 2011).
- S. Schama, *Patriots and Liberators. Revolution in the Netherlands, 1780-1813* (London: Fontana, 1992 [2nd ed.]).
- J. Stengers, *Histoire du sentiment national en Belgique des origines à 1918*, T. 1: *Les racines de la Belgique jusqu'à la Révolution de 1830* (Brussels: Racine, 2000).
- P.G.J. van Sterkenburg, *Het Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal. Portret van een taalmonument* (The Hague: Sdu, 1992).

- L. Tibbe et al. (ed.), *Het Koninkrijk Holland (1806-1810)*, special issue of *De Negentiende Eeuw*, 30 (2006), 3-4.
- H. Tollius, *Proeve eener Aanleiding tot de Nederduitsche Letterkunst*, ed. by Roland de Bonth (Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU & Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 2007).
- J. Turner, *Philology. The Forgotten Origins of the Modern Humanities* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).
- M. Tydeman, 'Betoog der nuttigheid en noodzakelijkheid van de beoeffening onzer moedertaal', *Proeve van oudheid-, taal- en dichtkunde, door het genootschap Dulces ante omnia musae*, 1 (1775a), 1-14.
- M. Tydeman, 'Vertoog over de dienstige middelen ter verbetering der Nederduitsche taal', *Proeve van oudheid-, taal- en dichtkunde, door het genootschap Dulces ante omnia musae* 1, (1775b), 15-20.
- W. Uitterhoeve, *Koning, keizer, admiraal. 1810: de ondergang van het Koninkrijk Holland* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2012 [3rd ed.]).
- G.J. Vis, *Van Siegenbeek tot Lodewick. Verkenningen naar de geschiedenis van de studie der Nederlandse letterkunde, speciaal in het onderwijs* (Amsterdam: Amsterdamse Historische Reeks, [2004]).
- J. Weijermars, 'Neerlandistiek als bindmiddel van de natie. Hoogleraar Schrant in Gent 1817-1830', *De Negentiende Eeuw*, 33 (2009), 4-19.