

Netherlandic language research

C.B. van Haeringen

bron

C.B. van Haeringen, *Netherlandic language research*. E.J. Brill, Leiden 1960 (tweede druk)

Zie voor verantwoording: http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/haer001neth01_01/colofon.htm

© 2009 dbnl / erven C.B. van Haeringen



From the preface to the first edition (1954)

The initiative for this publication was taken by the 'Belgisch-Nederlands Interuniversitair Centrum voor Neerlandistiek', a committee composed of all the professors of Dutch Language at Belgian and Dutch universities. It was their opinion that a short survey of methods and results in the study of the language of the Low Countries might have its uses for Germanists and other linguists abroad.

For the contents of this book, however, I myself am entirely responsible. It was not my intention to compile a complete bibliography, the very completeness and impersonality of which would have rendered it unpalatable. I had to be selective, therefore, and was not bound to refrain from giving my own opinions. Inevitably, both the selection and the opinions expressed are somewhat personal, and I do not expect every one to agree with them. Fellow-Netherlandists will perhaps regret the absence of certain publications, and be surprised at the presence of others. Moreover, omissions may be due, not to my lack of appreciation, but to my simply having overlooked the existence of some article or other. Nevertheless, I hope I have attained a sufficient degree of objectivity to render the book suitable both for scholars abroad and for Belgian, Dutch and South African students, as a survey of investigations and investigators in the field of Netherlandic linguistics.

Preface to the second edition

The kind reception this work has met with leads me to think that it has achieved its aim. I therefore thought it better to leave plan and outline unchanged, and to confine myself to working up the material published after 1953. What is near to one in time is fresh in the memory, and in order to avoid the danger of recent publications being unduly emphasized, I had to try and preserve a normal chronological balance. The period covered by this survey now extends to the first half of 1959.

The Index has been composed by Dr. L. Koelmans. Mr. D.A.S. Reid, M.A. and Mr. P.J. Verhoeff have corrected the English of the first edition and translated the new material.

Utrecht, Summer 1959.

C.B. VAN HAERINGEN

Abbreviations

<i>Hand. Top. Dial.</i>	Handelingen van de Koninklijke Commissie voor Toponomie en Dialectologie.
<i>Lev. T.</i>	Levende Talen, periodical.
<i>Leuv. Bijdr.</i>	Leuvense Bijdragen, periodical.
<i>Mnl.</i>	Middle Netherlandic.
<i>Mnl. Handw.</i>	Middelnederlandsch Handwoordenboek.
<i>Mnl. Wb.</i>	Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek.
<i>Neophil.</i>	Neophilologus, periodical.
<i>N.G.N.</i>	Nomina Geographica Neerlandica.
<i>N. Tg.</i>	De Nieuwe Taalgids, periodical.
<i>O.W.G.</i>	Old West Germanic.
<i>O. Tt.</i>	Onze Taaltuin, periodical.
<i>Nthl.</i>	Netherlandic.
<i>Ts.</i>	Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde, periodical.
<i>T. en L.</i>	Taal en Letteren, periodical.
<i>T. en Lev.</i>	Taal en Leven, periodical.
<i>T. en Tongv.</i>	Taal en Tongval, periodical.
<i>T.T.L.</i>	Tijdschrift voor Taal en Letteren, periodical.
<i>Ts. v. Lev. T.</i>	Tijdschrift voor Levende Talen, periodical.
<i>V.M.V.A.</i>	Verslagen en Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Taal- en Letterkunde.
<i>W.N.T.</i>	Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal.

Introduction

The language of the Low Countries has met with less interest abroad than other Germanic languages. This is explainable in part by the fact that Dutch has never become a world language, knowledge of which is of practical importance for a foreigner. The great world languages are in a much more favourable situation. English, for example, is taught and studied almost everywhere outside the English linguistic area. Teachers in non-English-speaking countries are obliged to concern themselves seriously with Modern English, both written and spoken, and in many cases this study involves an acquaintance with the historical foundation of the language. The need to train teachers efficiently leads in its turn to the establishment of centres of English studies and thus to the publication of much valuable work on English philology. Modern English Grammar in particular would not be what it is had not many foreign scholars contributed to its study.

Another cause of the small interest taken, even by Germanic philologists, in the Dutch language is the fact that the written tradition of Dutch goes back a comparatively short way. Because Germanic studies are carried out mainly on comparative-historical lines, it is the older documents that attract the attention of linguistic workers not specializing in one of the Germanic languages. No Germanic or Indoeuropean linguist can do without a knowledge of Old High German and Old English, but because Old Netherlandic hardly exists at all Netherlandic itself escapes their notice. The Scandinavian languages are in a happier position. Old Norse, for example, with its inscriptions of very early date, is bound to receive the attention of every comparative linguist and this entails a knowledge of modern Scandinavian languages or at least the ability to read the vast number of publications on Old Norse written in one of the Scandinavian languages. Despite this, many Germanists of renown have shortcomings in this respect and will blithely misquote the title of a Danish or Swedish book. It is not only the Dutch language that has to put up with careless treatment of this sort.

From the viewpoint of both comparative Germanistic studies and general linguistics, Dutch deserves more attention than it has hitherto enjoyed outside the Low Countries. Its linguistic territory, small as it is, provides a wealth of dialectal differentiation such as is hardly

to be found anywhere else in the Germanic area. To start with, there is Frisian, which survives in the Low Countries not in the form of scattered remains, as in East Frisia and the North Frisian islands, but as a coherent area where it is regularly written and where it is steadily becoming an independent language within the territory of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. This independence extends even to linguistic research: the study of Frisian lies for the most part beyond the horizon of Netherlandists in the strict sense and is carried on chiefly by scholars whose mother tongue is Frisian. But even within 'Netherlandic' proper there are large dialectal differences. We cannot, it is true, make a strict division based on the Germanic tribes - traditionally the Frisians, Saxons and Franks - that peopled the Low Countries in the first centuries of our era, for subsequent moves, particularly from west to east, changed the old tribal boundaries. Notwithstanding this, the north-eastern 'Saxon' dialects have so many peculiar traits in common that there is a sound basis for differentiating between the north-eastern area and that composed by west and south. Moves of an older date took place from south to north, sliding a Franconian superstratum over the former 'Ingwaeonic' dialects. The isolation of 'Ingwaeonic', from Frisian on the one hand and from Franconian and Saxon on the other, is an important problem in the linguistic history of the Netherlands and one that has a bearing on Germanistics in general.

Old Netherlandic may be less accessible than other Germanic dialects of the older period, but there is something to compensate for this disadvantage, namely that in the Netherlands, and particularly in the south-west corner, a great number of the ancient elements have been preserved. The German scholar TH. FRINGS, who displays towards Netherlandic the interest it deserves, has pointed out repeatedly that West Flemish is of exceptional interest as regards Latin and Romance influence.

A matter of special interest for the Netherlands themselves is the rise of a common cultivated language as a result of political and economic events in the Low Countries. Towards the end of the Middle Ages the provinces of the Southern Netherlands were economically and culturally the centre of the Low Countries, and the dialect of the most important province, Brabant, showed every sign of becoming the basis of a common language. The separation of the Southern and Northern provinces as a result of the revolt against Spain, and the

foundation of the Republic of the Seven Provinces with Holland as its powerful centre led, however, to the dialect of the province of Holland becoming predominant and eventually, after the incorporation of southern elements, especially in the written language, to its becoming the common language of the country. This political, economic and linguistic hegemony of Holland explains the use of 'Holland' as a name for the Kingdom of the Netherlands and of 'Hollandic' (Germ. *holländisch*, French *hollandais*) for the language known in English as Dutch. In this book we shall avoid using the term 'Dutch' because of its imprecision and shall use instead the term 'Netherlandic' (Germ. *niederländisch*, Fr. *néerlandais*), one that is rapidly gaining ground, especially in linguistic publications.

The history of Standard Netherlandic is an interesting one and deserves the attention of general linguistics for the same reasons as, for example, the peculiar circumstances in Norway do. The situation in the Netherlands is unlike the Norwegian, however, in that it is an example of almost completed evolution, in so far as one can speak of completion where linguistic development is concerned.

At any rate we would appear to be justified in claiming that the language of the Low Countries forms a linguistically interesting part of Continental Germanic, and it is the aim of this booklet to present linguists outside Holland and Belgium, especially those occupied with Germanic studies, with a general view of linguistic activity in the Low Countries and of the methods used and results gained. In particular it provides a survey of monographs and papers on Netherlandic linguistic subjects that should be of help to foreign scholars whose studies bring them, regularly or not so regularly, into contact with Netherlandic. If, in addition, the book should succeed in arousing interest in linguists who hitherto have paid little attention to Netherlandic, the author would feel that his labours have not been entirely misdirected. Nor is it foreigners alone for whom this book is designed; students in the Low Countries themselves may perhaps be able to find here signposts that will guide them on their way.

The book is mainly concerned with the activities of the last forty years, but since the younger generations are building on the foundations laid by the older ones and some of the great serial publications started in the 19th century, we have taken the year 1880 as point of departure. The earlier period, from 1880 till about 1920, has been treated fairly broadly, from 1920 onwards the ground has been covered

more closely. Even in the second period, however, no attempt has been made at completeness. Any such attempt would have made the book unreadable and, besides, is hardly necessary, since constant reference is made to works containing extensive bibliographies.

Frisian is treated in this book only when publications are quoted dealing with both Frisian and Netherlandic proper or with the mutual influence of the two languages. Little harm will come of this apparent omission for, strange as it may seem, Frisian linguists have more international contacts than their Netherlandic colleagues and the publications in this field are sufficiently known abroad.

Chapter One

The Netherlands and Netherlandic.

Definitions and Terminology

English and American readers are accustomed to use the term 'Dutch' for the language of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. In this book, however, we propose to avoid using that term and to substitute for it, as we mentioned in the Introduction, the term 'Netherlandic'. Now, this may seem a completely unnecessary complication designed for the sole purpose of baffling the English-speaking reader. But the fact is that the language we are considering is not confined to the Kingdom of the Netherlands but is spoken and written in the northern part of the Kingdom of Belgium as well. And the farther back we go in history the more impracticable it becomes to use the term 'Dutch', associated as it is with a political situation of comparatively recent birth.

The area where Netherlandic is spoken as the mother tongue can be seen in the map (Fig. 1). The southern limit is sharply defined and is formed by the boundary between Netherlandic and French in Belgium. In the east the language boundary follows the political frontier, but the popular dialects on either side of the line merge. The official language of church and school is in the Netherlands, Standard Netherlandic, in Germany, High German. Most of the province of Friesland forms an exception, for there Frisian is not only the language of colloquial intercourse but also that in which, to an ever increasing extent, higher intellectual discussion is carried on.

We explained in the Introduction how the term 'Holland' for the Kingdom of the Netherlands and 'Hollandic' for its language came into widespread use. In linguistic publications, however, 'Hollandic' is strictly limited to the dialect of Holland, which was formerly one province but is nowadays divided into South- and North-Holland.

In Belgium the present situation is more complicated than the map suggests. The treaty of Munster (1648) established a strict line of demarcation between the northern and the southern provinces, and in the latter French became more and more the dominant language in the higher social circles and the native language was restricted to the lower classes. During the years of French domination from 1795

to 1814 the position of French was strengthened still more. From 1815 to 1830 the Netherlands and Belgium were united in one kingdom, and in the Belgian part Netherlandic had a status equal to that of French. After the Belgian revolt of 1830 and the foundation of the Kingdom of Belgium, French regained its privileged position and it was only very gradually that Netherlandic freed itself from the



Fig. 1. Survey map. Scale 1:2 000 000.

neglect into which it had fallen. The Language Act of 1938 made Netherlandic the only official language in the northern part of Belgium but in reality its position is not at all the same as that of French. The form in which it is spoken all over the country is one of local dialects; civilized Netherlandic, phonetically based on 'Hollandic', is in use only among relatively small groups of philologists and better-

educated people, and even the latter often handle it rather clumsily.

The term 'Hollandic', which is somewhat ambiguous in general usage, is clear-cut in linguistic terminology. The same cannot be said of the names *Flanders* and *Flemish*, especially where the latter is concerned. 'Flanders' (Nthl. *Vlaanderen*) is sometimes used to indicate



Fig. 2. The Netherlands in the 16th century.

the whole northern part of Belgium that has Netherlandic as its native tongue; in a narrower sense it is the name given to the provinces of Flanders (in the Middle Ages a county). Similarly, 'Flemish' can signify broadly 'Netherlandic in Belgium' or, more narrowly, 'the dialect of the provinces of Flanders'. Another term in fairly wide-

spread use at present, in linguistic literature as well as elsewhere, is '*Flemish Belgium*' (Vlaams-België) for the Netherlandic-speaking part of Belgium. In linguistic matters, especially where older periods are concerned, we usually draw the line more sharply and denote by 'Flemish' (if necessary West- and East-Flemish) the dialect of Flanders in the narrow sense. In that case Flemish is opposed to Brabantic, the dialect of the area occupied by the mediaeval duchy of Brabant, a much larger region than that covered by the present-day Belgian province of the name. In the duchy of Brabant were situated, among other towns, Brussels, Antwerp, Louvain, Breda and Bois-le-Duc. To the east of Brabant in the wider sense lay the duchy of Limburg, occupying roughly the same territory as is now formed by the present Belgian province of Limburg and the southern part of Dutch Limburg. This political division provides the basis for distinguishing between three linguistic groups in Southern Netherlandic: Flemish, Brabantic and Limburgic.

As we have seen, the development of Common Standard Netherlandic is justification enough for the practice of calling that language 'Hollandic'. But we should not overlook the fact that in former times it was the southern provinces, first Flanders and then Brabant, that were culturally and economically in the forefront. It is in these provinces for example, that the oldest and most important documents in Netherlandic originated. In the 15th century Brabant was without a rival to the title of the most important region in the Low Countries and it was highly probable that the dialect of Brabant would eventually become the basis of the supra-dialectal common language. In the event, things took a different course, but down to our own days written Netherlandic exhibits many peculiarities, strange to spoken Hollandic, that serve to remind us of the time when Brabantic was looked upon as a model worth imitation. An example of the strength of this Brabantic influence on the written language is to be found in the 2nd person of the personal pronoun, where *gij* (you) was used almost exclusively in the written language until the second half of the 19th century whereas in Holland, now the Netherlandic cultural centre, it hardly occurs in the spoken language at all.

In contrast to the relatively weak position of cultivated Netherlandic in Belgium, the popular dialects have maintained themselves vigorously. This makes the Southern Netherlands of great importance for dialectological investigations and the historical studies associated with them

because, generally speaking, the southern dialects have remained more archaic than the northern ones and have been less levelled down by the influence of a superior standard language.

Until the 19th century the name 'Nederduits' was often given to Netherlandic, *Duits* (or the dialectal variant *Diets*) being the old designation of the national language, the 'language of the people' as opposed to Latin, the language of culture and scholarship. Nowadays 'Nederduits' is applied in linguistic works only to the language spoken in the northern part of Germany; thus it corresponds exactly to the English term 'Low German'. In this particular case linguistic terminology has been determined by political frontiers, and it cannot be denied that there has been a certain amount of nationalistic feeling involved here, for the frontiers are of comparatively recent date and the dialects on both sides merge without any sharp contrasts. For practical reasons, however, the distinction between 'Nederlands' and 'Nederduits' is necessary and is accepted by Germanists in Germany and elsewhere.

Chapter Two

Works of Reference and Periodicals

A. Lexicology

MATTHIAS DE VRIES (1820-1892) may be said to be the founder of modern Netherlandic philology. Originally a classicist, his aim was to raise the level of Netherlandics to that of classical philology as regards status and methods used. His work and influence are discussed in G. KARSTEN's *Honderd jaar Nederlandse Philologie; M. de Vries en zijn school* (Leyden, 1949), which also gives information about DE VRIES' most prominent pupils. We associate the name of DE VRIES, together with that of L.A. TE WINKEL (1809-1868), with the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (*W.N.T.*, 1882 ff.). After DE VRIES and TE WINKEL others, some of them pupils of DE VRIES, have cooperated; we mention the names of A. KLUYVER, A. BEETS, G.J. BOEKENOOGEN, J.W. MULLER, J. HEINSIUS, J.A.N. KNUTTEL. Regular progress was assured when, in 1917, the *Woordenboek* began to receive Government sponsorship. In 1929 JACOBA H. VAN LESSEN joined the editorial staff; from 1946 until her death, in 1951, she was chief editor. F. DE TOLLENAERE is a Belgian member of the staff.

The volumes vary in method as well as in quality, as a result of the changing linguistic views and of the divergence in the abilities and personal interests of the editors. Of late years the unity of the work has benefited from closer collaboration and a better system of crosschecking. But the large scope of the *Woordenboek* and the pecuniary difficulties experienced during the first few decades, had a retarding influence and accentuated the differences of opinion among the editors; the first volumes are now out of date. A *Supplement* to the letter A, started in 1942 by KNUTTEL and finished by one of his co-editors, C.H.A. KRUYSKAMP, in 1956, brings out the incompleteness of the original. For the time being, no further additions to the supplement are to be expected, the present staff are applying themselves in the first place to the completion of the main work.

As regards unity of conception and regularity in progress, the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* is surpassed by the *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* (*Mnl. Wb.*) by E. VERWIJS and J. VERDAM, of which the first volume was completed in 1885. By far the greater part

of the work was done by VERDAM, who, however, chose to keep the name of VERWIJS on the title-page, as the latter had co-operated with him during the preparations and had edited a part of the first volume. VERDAM did not live to see his immense undertaking completed: after his death in 1919 F.A. STOETT finished the work, using the material collected by his predecessor.

This lexicological inventory of Middle Netherlandic exceeds, in size, method and value, everything comparable in the field of Germanic language research. The stupendous accomplishment, mainly the work of one man, naturally has its shortcomings. In 1941 A.A. BEEKMAN edited *Aanvullingen en verbeteringen*, additions and corrections dealing with such typically Dutch matters as land and water, as the 11th volume of the work. The numerous text emendations suggested by VERDAM in the *Mnl.Wb.* were registered by W. DE VREESE in the 10th volume. The rest of this volume is taken up by *Bouwstoffen*, a carefully compiled list of the texts and editions used by VERDAM, roughly arranged according to their place of origin. After 1941 the *Bouwstoffen* were continued by G.I. LIEFTINCK, who finished his task in 1952.

The word-material collected by VERDAM covers the period up to about 1500, but in the later volumes we regularly come across quotations from the first half of the 16th century. The starting point for the material used in the *W.N.T.*, at least in the later volumes, is usually ca. 1550. It cannot be denied that, as far as lexicography is concerned, the 16th century, in many ways an important period in the history of Netherlandic, has been treated very inadequately. We shall revert to this in Ch. V.

The *Middelnederlandsch Handwoordenboek (Mnl. Handwb.)* by J. VERDAM (The Hague, 1911) is intended for a wider circle of readers, and was completed when the *Mnl.Wb.* had advanced as far as the word *sterne*. C.H. EBBINGE WUBBEN edited a *Supplement* (1929) based on the data of the later volumes of the *Mnl.Wb.*

A more concise dictionary of Modern Netherlandic, in one big volume, is *van Dale's Nieuw Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal*, the 7th edition of which was prepared by C.H.A. KRUYSKAMP and F. DE TOLLENAERE (The Hague, 1950). A new edition, revised and enlarged, has been appearing in instalments since 1958, and is intended to be complete in 1961.

The illustrated *Modern Woordenboek* by J. VERSCHUEREN (5th edition, 2 vols, Turnhout, 1945, 1950; 6th edition, n.d.) is not only an

explanatory dictionary but also a concise encyclopaedia, modelled on the *Petit Larousse illustré*, which it may be considered to have surpassed.

The *Etymologisch Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* by J. FRANCK has been excellently re-edited by N. VAN WIJK (The Hague, 1912). A *Supplement* (1936) by C.B. VAN HAERINGEN incorporates the publications that have appeared after 1912. J. VERCOULLIE composed a *Beknopt Etymologisch Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (3rd edition, The Hague, 1925).

Popular, but competently written, is the pocket *Etymologisch Woordenboek* by J. DE VRIES (2nd edition, Utrecht and Antwerp, 1959), which also contains Netherlandic toponyms.

B. History of the language

The *Geschichte der niederländischen Sprache* by J. TE WINKEL (2nd edition, Strassbourg, 1901) forms part of PAUL's *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*. It was translated into Dutch by F.C. WIEDER (Culemborg, 1901). In 1904 TE WINKEL followed this up with a work of wider scope, the *Inleiding tot de geschiedenis van de Nederlandsche taal* (Culemborg, 1904), an introduction to linguistics in general, and Indo-European and Germanic linguistics in particular. A similar work, but more suitable for didactic purposes, is the book by C. LECOUTERE, 6th edition by L. GROOTAERS, *Inleiding tot de Taalkunde en tot de Geschiedenis van het Nederlands* (Louvain and Groningen, 1948). Successive editions of this book have gradually been revised and brought up to date by GROOTAERS, so that the book as it is today, is virtually his own work.

The *Historische Grammatik der niederländischen Sprache* by M.J. VAN DER MEER, of which only the first part (*Einleitung und Lautlehre*, Heidelberg, 1927) appeared, was meant as a substitute for TE WINKEL's *Geschichte*, which was not reprinted after the 2nd edition. VAN DER MEER's extensive 'Einleitung' to 'Die Entwicklung der niederländischen Sprache' gives the 'external' history of Netherlandic, and the 'Lautlehre' is a history of sounds, working back from the present day. It was the author's aim to emphasize the individual character of Netherlandic as distinct from German, a distinction which he thinks is brought out especially by the very strong influence of French on Netherlandic; he deals separately with the sounds of

French loanwords. Both 'Einleitung' and 'Lautlehre' are provided with elaborate bibliographical notes.

Of modest size is the *Schets eener historische grammatica der Nederlandsche taal* by J. VERCOULLIE (4th edition, Ghent, 1922). From the 3rd edition onwards the book includes a section on word formation and one on syntax, while the use of forms is discussed in the section on morphology.

The codification *par excellence* of historical phonology and morphology and, since the 2nd edition, also of word formation, is M. SCHÖNFELD's *Historische Grammatica van het Nederlands*, the 5th edition of which (Zutphen, 1954) was compiled by A. VAN LOEY, assisted by SCHÖNFELD. After SCHÖNFELD's death in 1958 the 6th edition is to be the sole responsibility of VAN LOEY. This critical, comprehensive and carefully written book with its excellent bibliography forms the basis of all proper study of Netherlandic historical grammar. For didactical purposes, however, a shorter, more elementary book, like VERCOULLIE's, would be desirable.

C.G.N. DE VOOYS' *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taal in hoofdtrekken geschetst* (5th edition, revised and enlarged, Antwerp-Groningen, 1952) has a different object in view. This book does not enter into details of sound and form, but outlines the development of Netherlandic, paying much attention to the rise of a supra-regional language, the influence of important authors on general usage, grammatical views and earlier publications on grammar. It is not the smallest merit of the work that the author constantly makes us aware of gaps in our knowledge, and draws attention to subjects worthy of further investigation.

J. VERDAM's *Uit de geschiedenis der Nederlandsche taal* (4th revised edition by F.A. STOETT, Zutphen, 1923) does not give a systematic description, but consists of separate chapters on the history of Netherlandic. It is intended for a wider reading public.

Grammatical handbooks of Modern Netherlandic will be mentioned and briefly discussed in Ch. VIII.

C. Periodicals

The *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde*¹⁾ (Leyden; *Ts.*) started in 1881, is the Netherlandic counterpart of the German

1) The official orthography of Netherlandic has undergone a change, introduced in Belgium in 1946, in Holland in 1947. In the present book the authors' spelling has been retained in book titles. In the titles of periodicals that have conformed to the new spelling since 1947, the new orthography is also used for the older volumes. Up to 1947 the word *Nederlandse* in the title of the *Tijdschrift* was spelled *Nederlandsche*, but here the spelling with *s* has been adopted. Some steps towards a nationalized spelling of bastard words have been taken in the *Woordenlijst van de Nederlandse Taal*, published by the Dutch and Belgian Governments in 1954; this new spelling became operative in 1955. The somewhat hesitant character of the list, which aims at a compromise between tradition and reform, has met with objections, especially in educational circles.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur. Like the *Beiträge*, it appears at irregular intervals, and its contents are philological and literary, with the accent on philology. Beginning with the 55th volume, the *Tijdschrift* has distinguished itself from the *Beiträge* by giving reviews of books selected by the editors. The reviews are usually extensive and well worth reading. The *Tijdschrift*, a publication of the *Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde* (Leyden), is edited by a regularly changing committee from the *Maatschappij*.

The *Tijdschrift* being, like the *Beiträge*, a 'learned' periodical, it contributes to scholarly research. Alongside the *Tijdschrift* there is, therefore, room for a periodical that tries to promote the interests of study and teaching.

To a certain extent this want was supplied by the periodical *Noord en Zuid* (Culemborg, 1877 ff), edited by TACO H. DE BEER, intended especially for teachers in elementary and secondary schools. Of greater importance was *Taal en Letteren* (Zwolle, 1890-1906), of which J.H. VAN DEN BOSCH, F. BUITENRUST HETTEMA and R.A. KOLLEWIJN were the mainstays. This periodical set itself the task of making known, in the Netherlands and Belgium, the new linguistic methods as propagated in particular by the German school of neo-grammarians. Furthermore, the men of *Taal en Letteren* protested vigorously against the hegemony of a more or less artificial written language in education, and vindicated the rights of living spoken Netherlandic. They crusaded for the abolition of case-endings, till then rigorously maintained in the written, but long extinct in the spoken language, and for the simplification of some spellings based on etymological considerations but no longer corresponding to any real phonemic differences. The editor KOLLEWIJN drafted a new spelling system, much of which was incorporated in the spelling reforms of 1946 and 1947 (see p. 13 note).

De Nieuwe Taalgids (*N.Tg.*, Groningen, 1907 ff), founded by C.G.N. DE VOOYS and J. KOOPMANS, and after KOOPMANS' decease con-

tinued by DE VOOYS alone, may be looked upon as a continuation of *Taal en Letteren*. Just as the *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* may be compared with the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, the *Nieuwe Taalgids* is comparable with the *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*. No long-winded essays or detailed philological investigations are to be found in this periodical, both in size and in vocabulary the articles are designed for a fairly wide reading-circle. In theory, literary subjects have equal rights with linguistic ones, but in practice linguistic matters tend to prevail, especially since KOOPMANS' death. The more didactic kind of article has grown scarcer after DE VOOYS himself, in 1915, was appointed a professor and said farewell to secondary school teaching. The *N.Tg.* contains many book reviews and regular surveys of the contents of periodicals. After DE VOOYS' death in 1955 the *N.Tg.* has been edited by his two successors in the University of Utrecht, C.B. VAN HAERINGEN and W.A.P. SMIT. An Index to volumes I-L, compiled by L. KOELMANS, is coming out shortly.

Didactic aims are more directly pursued by the *Levende Talen* (*Lev. T.*, Groningen), which appears five times a year, and by the Belgian bilingual *Tijdschrift voor Levende Talen* (*Ts. v. Lev. T.*, Brussels, 1935 ff), but in these periodicals the space is shared equally between Netherlandic, French, German and English.

Originally, the *Leuvense Bijdragen* (*Leuv. Bijdr.*, Louvain), appearing since 1896, was devoted exclusively to dialect study, and this has continued to be one of its main subjects, first under the editorship of the dialectologist L. GROOTAERS, and after his death in 1956 under J.L. PAUWELS.

The *Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Taal- en Letterkunde* was founded in Belgium in 1886. The *Verslagen en Mededelingen* published by this society (*V.M.V.A.*) contains important contributions to Netherlandic linguistics.

The *Tijdschrift voor Taal en Letteren* (*T.T.L.*), published by the Rooms-Katholieke Leergangen ('Roman Catholic courses of instruction'), (Bois-le-Duc, 1913-1941), covered a wider range of subjects. The periodical contained literary and historical contributions, but also linguistic ones, by L.C. MICHELS (who for many years was one of the editors) and G. ROYEN, among others.

In the third and fourth decades of this century we find two short-lived but rather remarkable periodicals. The monthly review *Onze*

Taaltuin (*O. Tt.*; 'Our Language-garden'), edited by J. VAN GINNEKEN and G.S. OVERDIEP, later by VAN GINNEKEN alone, first appeared in 1932 and ceased publication in the course of its 10th year. It has many articles by VAN GINNEKEN, on a great variety of subjects within and outside the sphere of Netherlandics, personal, often provocative, but always fascinating and instructive. OVERDIEP contributed several essays dealing with syntactic-stylistic matters. If we may say of those Netherlandists who agreed with the endlessly disputed spelling-reform, that they belonged to the 'left' wing in linguistic politics, then *Onze Taaltuin* belongs to the 'right'.

Taal en Leven (*T. en Lev.*, 1937-1943), on the other hand, - edited by E. KRUISINGA and A.J. SCHNEIDERS - was extremely 'left'. KRUISINGA, a brilliant and original Anglicist, also showed a great interest in his native language. His lucid essays, often highly polemic and at times hostile, contain valuable material, particularly on Modern Netherlandic.

Chapter Three

Old Netherlandic

As we said in the introduction, Old Netherlandic texts of any length are very scarce. Mention must be made of the so-called 'Wachtendonck's' Old Low Franconian psalter fragments, edited by W.L. VAN HELTEN: *Die altostniederfränkischen Psalmenfragmente, die Lipsius' schen Glossen und die altsüdmittelfränkischen Psalmenfragmente*, with a grammar (2 vols, Groningen, 1902). A somewhat earlier grammatical description was made by A. BORGELD, *De Oudoostnederfrankische Psalmen. Klank- en Vormleer* (Groningen, 1899). These texts originated in the south-eastern corner of the present Netherlandic area. Their eastern origin is evident from phonological, and also morphological, peculiarities, though VAN HELTEN may have overstressed these eastern traits, and certainly was on thin ice when he emendated forms that did not accord with his views. VAN HELTEN's textual criticism is, indeed, a weak point in his edition, as was rightly observed by E. ROOTH, *Studien zu den altniederfränkischen und altwestfälischen Psalterversionen* (Uppsala, 1924), 1 ff, and by H.K.J. COWAN, *Ts. LXXI*, 161 ff. The latter, differing from VAN HELTEN, like ROOTH, in his explanation of several details, prefers to designate the texts as 'Eastern Old Netherlandic'; in an article in *Leuv. Bijdr. LXVIII*, 1 ff, he locates the fragments in the south of the Dutch province of Limburg. For the series *Textus Minores*, COWAN prepared a new edition, *De oudnederlandse (oudnederfrankische) psalmenfragmenten* (Leyden, 1957).

Apart from these fragments there are no texts of any length extant, and for our investigations in the field of Old Netherlandic we have to content ourselves with rather indirect conclusions drawn from proper names and incidental words occurring in Latin charters. In this indirect way, the most important work has been done by J. MANSION in his *Oud-Gentsche Naamkunde* (The Hague, 1924), based on Ghent charters anterior to 1100. MANSION has succeeded in sketching the phonological system of the Old Ghent language and the changes in it during the period investigated; he adds some remarks on morphology.

A considerably wider field is covered by the *Diplomata belgica ante annum millesimum centesimum scripta* (2 vols, Tongres, 1950) by M.

GYSELING and A.C.F. KOCH, a compilation of the entire charter material in Belgium and the Netherlands prior to 1100. The charters used by MANSION are included, and in some cases incorrect readings have been emended. GYSELING is preparing an Old Netherlandic grammar based on this material.

In an appendix to the *Diplomata*, some Old Netherlandic glosses have been added, and an Old Netherlandic sentence, first published in *Ts.* LII, 1 ff by M. SCHÖNFELD. On the evidence of an ultraviolet photograph, GYSELING proposes the following, slightly modified reading, *hebban olla uogala nestas bigunnan hinase hi[c] enda* (or: *anda*) *thu*. There is little disagreement as to the literal 'translation' and the grammatical construction of the sentence, opinions differ, however, as to its implications.

A critical résumé of the discussion on this subject (to which might be added J. VAN MIERLO's article in *V.M.V.A.* 1955, 545 ff) is given by SCHÖNFELD (*Ts.* LXXVI, 1 ff), who does not foresee a definite solution until a Latin original should, by some lucky chance, be discovered.

This is the rather poor harvest of Old Netherlandic texts. In the chapters X, XI and XIII we shall deal with other attempts at penetrating into the earliest history of the language with the help of historical data.

Chapter Four Middle Netherlandic

1. Text editions

We do not intend to enumerate the existing editions of medieval texts, for that would be encroaching on the domain of literary history. Moreover, earlier editors did not pursue purely linguistic aims in their work, as they were endeavouring, some of them quite single-mindedly, to make medieval literature accessible. Thus, in older editions of, for example, chivalric romances - most of which are translations from or adaptations of French works - we find discussions on the relation to their models, and on the question whether the medieval Netherlandic author proves himself to be a literary artist or merely a slavish and clumsy translator. The editors also frequently investigate the development of the epic tradition, starting from the stage represented by their texts.

Literary taste is reflected in the choice of texts. At first, rhyming texts were evidently preferred. These are, indeed, the oldest, but this preference may be accounted for by the 19th century's lack of appreciation of edifying prose.

As sources for linguistic research, many editions of older texts have the drawback of being 'critical', that is to say: the editors, by comparing and evaluating the data of their manuscripts, tried to get as close as possible to the author's original text. In practising this 'higher criticism' they did not scruple to reject large fragments as being later interpolations. A striking example of this practice is furnished by J. VERDAM's *Theophilus*-edition (Amsterdam, 1882), when we compare it with the edition by J. VAN MIERLO (Ledeberg-Ghent, 1941), which, as a result of recent changes in views and methods, shows a considerably greater deference to tradition.

But detailed textual criticism was also practised extensively, and editors took great liberties in their emendations. First they tried to 'understand' texts philologically, and then they let their own inventiveness come to the rescue when necessary. A scholar wanting to use the texts for grammatical research was therefore forced to unearth the old lines from their modern, 'restored' reading. Besides, spellings were often normalized, and differences of sound obscured in the

process. Without any hesitation, abbreviations were expanded, so that subtle nuances were disguised or normalized by the personal interpretation of the editor. The result was often misleading, as in the case of the very frequent abbreviation for *er*, *ar* or *aer*, and with the indication of a nasal by means of a dash over the preceding letter, representing *n* as well as *m*, important letters for a correct appreciation of flexion endings. The editors always supplied the texts with punctuation, thereby forcing their own ideas about sentence structures on the readers.

While these drawbacks apply to texts edited by philologists for philological aims, they weigh even more heavily on non-literary works such as editions of charters and accounts designed for historians. A favourable exception is formed by the carefully edited *De oudste Middelnederlandsche oorkonden*, by H. OBREEN and A. VAN LOEY, V.M.V.A. 1934, 329 ff (also published separately).

A new attitude is apparent in the *Middelnederlandse Marialegenden* edited by C.G.N. DE VOOYS (2 vols, Leyden, 1903). R. VERDEYEN and J. ENDEPOLLS broke even more radically with the old methods in their edition - with commentary on the theme from a literary and historical point of view - of *Tondalus' Visioen en St. Patricius' Vagevuur* (2 vols, Ghent-The Hague, 1914/17). In it, the versions are found printed side by side. Views on the methods used in text editing changed to such an extent that J.W. MULLER thought it necessary to defend at length the case of a critical edition, in his *Critische commentaar op Van den Vos Reinaerde* (Utrecht, 1917). G.G. KLOEKE brought out a fully diplomatic reprint of *Karel ende Elegast* (Leyden, 1948), in the series *Textus Minores*, and A. VAN LOEY did the same, in the same series, for *Die Borchgravinne van Vergi* (Leyden, 1949). A diplomatic edition - but for some punctuation marks - is also that of *Sint Servaes Legende* by G.A. VAN ES, in collaboration with G.I. LIEFTINCK and A.F. MIRANDE (Antwerp-Brussels-Ghent-Louvain, 1950); to MULLER's critical edition of *Reinaert* a diplomatic one, giving all the texts of all available manuscripts, was added by W. GS. HELLINGA, *Van den Vos Reinaerde, I. Teksten* (Zwolle, 1952).

The handsome editions of *Beatrijs* by A.L. VERHOFSTEDÉ (Antwerp, 1947), of *Esmoreit* by A. DE MAEYER and R. ROEMANS (Antwerp, 1948), and of *Mariken van Nieumeghen* by J. VAN MIERLO, LUC. DEBAENE and A.L. VERHOFSTEDÉ (Antwerp, 1951) give a photographic reproduction on every left-hand page, and the edited text,

with abbreviations expanded and punctuation marks put in, on the opposite page. The editions should be highly appreciated as a demonstration of the way in which photography allows the reader to see the texts as they were written down. They also contain explanatory notes, which in the third are better than in the other two volumes. A similar edition, though of somewhat earlier date, is that in facsimile with transcription, of *Die Haager Liederhandschrift* by E.F. KOSSMANN (The Hague, 1940), a collection of Netherlandic and German poems.

A recent publication of non-literary texts is the splendid book *De Oorkondentaal in Belgisch-Limburg van circa 1350 to 1400* by Joseph MOORS (Tongres, 1952), where the charters have been edited on wellconsidered principles, so as to combine readability with an accurate rendering of the texts.

The deficiencies of the earlier editions stand out clearly against these, unfortunately few, attempts at providing absolutely reliable text editions. In addition to their habit of emendating and making critical changes in the texts, the older editors also had shortcomings when it came to palaeography. The complaints voiced by W. DE VREESE in his *Paradox over den grooten nood der Nederlandsche philologie (Handelingen van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde 1932/33)* may seem somewhat paradoxically exaggerated, but there is no doubt that a good deal of work will have to be re-done if the justifiable demands of modern linguistic and historical research are to be met.

In striking contrast to the prevailing conservative attitude to the manuscript tradition stands a recent edition, prepared with admirable skill, a purposefully and radically critical one, namely that of *Sente Servas - Sanctus Servatius* by TH. FRINGS and Gabriele SCHIEB (Part I of *Die epischen Werke des Henric van Veldeken*, Halle-Saale, 1956). The editors have made an attempt to reduce the text of a 15th century ms. to the author's original, mainly by comparing fragments dating from ca. 1200.

W. DE VREESE has catalogued and described Netherlandic manuscripts in the possession of libraries, archives, museums and private owners all over Europe. This work, *Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta (B.N.M.)*, deposited in manuscript with the Leyden University Library, is invaluable but, as is only to be expected of such a gigantic work done by one man, it is of uneven quality and not fit for publication in its present state. G.I. LIEFTINCK is at present investigating

the overwhelming mass of DE VREESE's material, and its publication in a suitable form is being planned. P.J.H. VERMEEREN, in his Amsterdam doctoral thesis *De Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta van Willem de Vreese* (privately published, 1953), gives a complete inventory of the Bibliotheca, with suggestions as to how its material could be supplemented and brought up to date, so as to develop it into a fully reliable apparatus of documentation for Middle Netherlandic philology.

Meanwhile, LIEFTINCK, who had earlier, in the introduction to *De Middelnederlandsche Tauler-handschriften* (Groningen-Batavia, 1936), demonstrated his interest and skill in handling manuscripts, has described the manuscripts in the possession of the 'Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde' and preserved in the Leyden University Library, in Vol. V of the series *Codices Manuscripti*. In *Codicum in finibus Belgarum ante annum 1550 conscriptorum qui in bibliotheca universitatis asservantur*, part I, are treated *Codices 168-360 societatis cui nomen Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde* (Leyden, 1948).

2. Text interpretation. Anthologies

The need for glossaries decreased as VERDAM's *Mnl. Wb.* (see Ch. I) neared its completion. And so, OVERDIEP, in his edition of *Ferguut* (Leyden, 1924), omitted the glossary VERDAM had added to the previous edition (Leyden, 1910), and gave instead an extensive stylistic and syntactic introduction on 'de stijl van het gedicht'. The *Bloemlezing uit Middelnederlandsche dichters*, an excellent book for the study of Middle Netherlandic, first edited by E. VERWIJS, 4th edition by F.A. STOETT (Zutfen, 1924, 3 vols.), had for its 4th volume a comprehensive *Woordenlijst* (3rd edition by STOETT, Zutfen, 1915, reprinted in 1940). The completely revised edition, with the new title *Bloemlezing uit de Middelnederlandse dichtkunst*, by C.C. DE BRUIN (3 vols, Zutfen, 1956/57/58), will contain no glossary. C.C. DE BRUIN's collection *Middelnederlands geestelijk proza* (Zutfen, 1940, 1 vol.) has no annotations, nor has the *Middelnederlands Leerboek* by A. VAN LOEY (Antwerp-Groningen, 1947), which exemplifies the new methods of research by giving, not only literary texts, but also charters and other official and commercial documents. The *Bloemlezing* by A.C. BOUMAN (see under 3), provided with explanatory footnotes, deserves mention as a first introduction to the study of Middle Netherlandic.

However, even though VERDAM's *Mnl. Wb.* is now completed, there is room for annotated editions of difficult texts. A case in point is the mystic poetry and prose of Hadewijch, whose works have been edited by J. VAN MIERLO with an excellent commentary. His edition of Hadewijch's *Strophische Gedichten* (2 vols: *Inleiding* and *Text en Commentaar*, Antwerp-Brussels-Ghent-Louvain, 1942) has footnotes and a glossary. Hadewijch's *Brieven* (1948) and her *Mengeldichten* (1952) were prepared by VAN MIERLO in the same manner. Earlier editions by VAN MIERLO are those of *Theophilus* (V.M.V.A., 1941) and *Roelandslied* (V.M.V.A., 1935), both with annotations at the foot of the page.

The monumental edition of Jan van Ruusbroec's mystic prose by J.B. POUKENS, J. VAN MIERLO, D.A. STRACKE, L. REYPENS and M. SCHURMANS, *Jan van Ruusbroec. Werken* (4 vols, Malines-Amsterdam, 1932/34; 2nd edition, 1944/48), chiefly aims at an interpretation of the religious aspect; apart from that we find only short discussions of the mss. in the introduction to each volume, and a glossary.

The importance of C.C. DE BRUIN's edition *De Middelnederlandse vertaling van De Imitatione Christi* (Leyden, 1954), lies in the first place in his convincing refutation of the peculiar ideas J. VAN GINNEKEN had cherished, and ingeniously defended, as to the origin of the *Imitatio*. The book also deserves to be mentioned here as a fine specimen of competent editing: it has excellent notes and a glossary.

The poems by the 15th century 'rederijker' Anthonis de Roovere have been carefully edited and annotated by J.J. MAK, in his *De gedichten van Anthonis de Roovere* (Zwolle, 1955). C. KRUYSKAMP collected and annotated *De Middelnederlandse boerden*, with an index of the words explained in the notes (The Hague, 1957).

Of many medieval works of some literary importance we find annotated editions, intended for a wider public, especially for the use in schools. The fine edition of *Esmoreit* by R. VERDEYEN, in the series *Van alle tijden* (Groningen-Batavia, later Djakarta), has been reprinted many times, as have those of *Beatrijs* and *Reinaert*, both of them with extensive commentary by D.C. TINBERGEN. Future editions of the last two texts will be taken care of by L.M. VAN DIS. For the series *Lyceumherdrukken*, H.J.E. ENDEPOLS prepared *Elckerlijc*, and many school editions appeared, in the same series, of *Mariken van Nieumeghen*. In recent years the series *Klassieke Galerij* (Antwerp) has presented us with several texts, provided with introductions of

varying quality, and often with bibliographies. In this series we also find texts that are not among those ordinarily read in schools, such as the *Roman van Torec*, edited by A.F.W. BELLEMANS, and *De Borchgravinne van Vergi*, by P. DE KEYSER. Mention has already been made of the series *Textus Minores*, intended for use in universities.

That the existence of such an excellent dictionary as the *Mnl. Wb.*, with its copious quotations, does not render commentaries on texts superfluous was also proved by J.W. MULLER in his *Exegetische Commentaar* (Leyden, 1942) on a popular text of literary importance, the *Reinaert*, which has been the subject of widespread and penetrating study. Even the writings of Willem van Hildegarsberch and Dirck Potter, who do not belong to the oldest period and do not have the reputation of being particularly difficult, continually present cruces interpretum. We hope, and expect, that the text interpretation as shown by devoted philologists of the older generation, which for some time past has fallen into disuse owing to the urgent need for reliable editions, will come into its own again with the younger generation. Grammatical research in the proper sense cannot well be made without a penetrating study of the texts concerned, and a conscientious weighing of what the author wants to, and is able to express by means of his linguistic material. This applies especially to syntactical studies, but neither morphology nor purely phonic matters can be viewed apart from syntax.

We have to be grateful, therefore, for the series *Zwolse Drukken en Herdrukken voor de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde te Leiden*, the editors of which are professors W.J.M.A. ASSELBERGS, W.G.S. HELLINGA, G. KUIPER, P. MINDERAA and W.A.P. SMIT. This very active group has, in the course of only few years, enriched our bookshelves with several editions of medieval and later texts, most of them excellently annotated and provided with scholarly introductions; quite a few also have an extensive glossary. Of those belonging to the Middle Netherlandic period we might mention the following: *Lancelot en het Hert met de Witte Voet* by Maartje DRAAK (Zwolle, 1953); *Maerlant's Sinte Franciscus Leven* by P. MAXIMILIANUS O.F.M. Cap. (2 vols, 1954); *Het Spel vanden Heilighen Sacramente vander Nyeuwervaert* by W.J.M.A. ASSELBERGS and A.P. HUYSMANS (1955); *De Jeeste van Walewein en het Schaakbord* by G.A. VAN ES (2 vols, 1957, with a very worth-while chapter on the punc-

tuation used in the ms.); H e i n v a n A k e n , *Vierde Martijn* by W.E. HEGMAN (1958); *De fragmenten van de Tweede Rose* by K. HEEROMA (1958; in a lengthy chapter the editor tries to reduce the spellings of the mss. to their phonemic basis).

The same publishers and editors are responsible for a more popular series of texts, called *Klassieken uit de Nederlandse Letterkunde*, intended for a wider public of readers and for schools. The first numbers had modernized spelling, later on this practice was given up.

The Swedish scholar Lars HERMODSSON edited *Dat Boec van den Houte* (Uppsala-Wiesbaden, 1959), with an authoritative introduction, in which among other things the language of the mss. is discussed at length.

In the present book, text editions and text interpretation have been treated rather summarily, because to try for completeness here would be to step over the borderline between linguistic and aesthetic evaluation. There really are, of course, no sharp dividing lines between the two, an aesthetic appreciation of literary texts is impossible without a careful study of the raw material used by the author: language.

3. Grammatical handbooks

The first grammar of Middle Netherlandic was written by J. FRANCK. In this *Mittelniederländische Grammatik* (1883, revised edition 1910, Leipzig) an immense mass of material was incorporated, in the solid neo-grammarians manner. As a didactic work it has a great drawback in that it presupposes an extensive knowledge of Germanic, which makes it unsuitable for students. And the extremely precise phraseology has resulted in a very complicated sentence structure. The composition of the book, too, is open to justifiable criticism; the German FRANCK, while giving a clear outline of the development from Old Germanic to Middle Netherlandic, only rarely extends it to Modern Netherlandic. As characteristic both of the impression made by FRANCK on beginners and of SCHÖNFELD's modesty it may be mentioned that the latter designed the first edition of his *Historische Grammatica* (see Chapter II) as an introduction to FRANCK's *Mittelniederländische Grammatik*. Even for advanced students it was difficult to handle, and the professional man of research painfully felt the lack of references to the places the examples were taken from. In spite of these objections, FRANCK's book, never avoiding difficult questions, always careful and critical, is a standard work of the first order.

W.L. VAN HELTEN's *Middelnederlandsche Spraakkunst* (Groningen, 1887) has the great advantage that it supplies the sources of its quotations, thus enabling the user to date and localize sounds and forms. As regards system and composition, however, VAN HELTEN's book, which does not even contain a table of contents, is far inferior to FRANCK's. It is a rich but disorderly collection of details, in which even the specialist can only find his way with the greatest difficulty, however much he may appreciate the book as an indispensable complement to FRANCK.

Both FRANCK and VAN HELTEN confined themselves to phonology and morphology. Syntax was dealt with by F.A. STOETT in his *Middelnederlandsche Syntaxis* (3rd edition, The Hague, 1923). This book has serious shortcomings. It is written as a textbook, in which Middle Netherlandic is treated as a more or less 'foreign' language, and it especially elaborates those points in which that language differs from 'common' Netherlandic. Furthermore, its peculiarly static conception fails to do justice to the changes that took place during the three centuries of the Middle Netherlandic period. The abundant quotations are given without indication of the sources, an impediment that weighs more heavily in this book than in FRANCK. We must admit, however, that STOETT is useful for teaching purposes. The extensive index of words and subjects facilitates the looking up of syntactical facts in their context. STOETT, who had few predecessors in his field, and most of the time had to find his own way, has given us a useful book that has as yet not been surpassed. In view of the peculiar difficulties inherent in the study of Middle Netherlandic syntax, it is not likely that it will soon be replaced by a work conforming to the demands of present-day Netherlandics.

The *Middelnederlandse Grammatika* by the South Africans T.H. LE ROUX and J.J. LE ROUX (3rd edition, Pretoria, 1951) is based, as regards phonology and morphology, on SCHÖNFELD's *Historische Grammatica* and FRANCK's *Mittelniederländische Grammatik*, but also deals with syntactical matters. It is a practical handbook, not only for South African students; from a didactical point of view it is better than both FRANCK and VAN HELTEN.

A more original work is the *Vormleer van het Middelnederlandsch der XIIIe eeuw* by G.S. OVERDIEP, seen through the press by G.A. VAN ES (Antwerp, 1946). This book was to be the first part of a 'Stylistische grammatica' of Middle Netherlandic; a second volume,

on syntax, has not, so far, appeared. The author founded his grammar on a relatively small number of rhymed texts, wholly excluding the prose of the older charters, a restriction that can be objected to on good grounds. The *Vormleer* contains many interesting observations, but as a handbook for university students it is too subjective and uneven. The scholar can appreciate it as an interesting specimen of OVERDIEP's very personal methods.

A. VAN LOEY, in his concise *Middel nederlandse Spraakkunst* (I *Vormleer*, II *Klankleer*, 2nd edition, Groningen-Antwerp, 1955/7), tries to meet both didactic and scholarly demands. Taking the language of the 13th century as his basis, excluding as far as possible all historical knowledge of previous periods, VAN LOEY presents, in the main body of his work, the principal grammatical facts, and in his extensive notes he deals with the details, as well as with doubtful points requiring further investigation. Building on the study of charters, partly the work of others but mainly his own, he gives, within the small scope of his book, more concrete information about dialectal nuances in Mnl. than the older grammars, which contain only vague generalities on the subject. VAN LOEY's *Spraakkunst*, concise but thorough, is an excellent manual for beginners; it is also valuable for specialists, though the latter cannot do without FRANCK and VAN HELTEN because of the larger amount of material they contain and their historical treatment of the subject.

The short grammatical introduction given by A.C. BOUMAN in his *Middel nederlandse Bloemlezing met Grammatica* (2nd edition, Zutphen, 1948), mainly intended as a guide to the reading of the fragments in the anthology, can be of use for readers such as historians, who do not intend to make a profound study of Middle Netherlandic.

The very short *Introduction à l'étude du Moyen-Néerlandais* by A. VAN LOEY (Paris, 1951) gives grammar in compact form, and some literary and non-literary fragments for reading.

4. Language of individual authors and texts. Dialects. Syntax

Text editors often provide some linguistic data about the work they are dealing with: a description of the orthography of the ms., an attempt to localize the text and a survey of the principal grammatical, mostly phonological, peculiarities. In addition, there are monographs on the language of one author or of one special text.

A forerunner in this field of research was J.H. KERN, who pre-

ceded his edition of the *Limburgsche Sermoenen* by a *Klankleer der Limburgsche Sermoenen*, also published separately (Groningen, 1891). Other monographs of this kind are the Leipzig doctoral thesis *Lautund Flexionslehre der Sprache der St. Servatius-legende* by F. LEVITICUS (Haarlem, 1899) and E. DE NEEF's *Klank- en vormleer van het gedicht van den VII vroeden binnen Rome* (Ghent, 1896). H. MEERT wrote a *Vormleer van de taal van Jan van Ruusbroec* (Ghent, 1901).

E. EMONDS, in *De legende van Sinte Kunera in de middeleeuwen* (Leyden doctoral thesis, 1922, no place of publication mentioned), made some modest attempts to trace dialectal peculiarities in the mss. W.H. BEUKEN added a linguistic survey of *Van den Levene ons Heren* to his edition of that text (Purmerend, 1929). G.S. OVERDIEP, who had earlier published *De vormen van het aoristisch praeteritum in de Middelnederlandsche epische poëzie* (Rotterdam, 1914), prefaced his *Ferguut*, which we have already mentioned, with a discussion of 'de stijl van het gedicht'. The Swedish scholar J. HOLMBERG edited *Eine mittelniederfränkische Übertragung des Bestiaire d'Amour* (Uppsala, 1925). Although this text was written outside the Netherlandic linguistic area, HOLMBERG's book deserves mention here for its extensive comparison, from a grammatical point of view, of his text with Middle Netherlandic proper. In Vol. I - published in 1939- of his edition of Dirc van Delf's *Tafel van den Kersten Ghelove* (4 vols., Antwerp-Nimeguen-Utrecht, 1937-39), L.M. FR. DANIËLS discusses 'De taal der handschriften'. J.J. MAK, in the chapter 'Taal en vertaaltechniek' of *De Dietse vertaling van Gerlach Peters' Soliloquium* (Utrecht doctoral thesis, privately published, 1936), gives some examples of East Middle Netherlandic peculiarities, phonological and morphological, in two manuscripts; in addition, he wrote a noteworthy chapter on the Dutch translator's linguistic attitude towards his Latin original. J.M. WILLEUMIER-SCHALIJ gives a chapter on 'De localisatie van het hs. H', a survey of the vowel and consonant system, in her edition of *Dat Boec der Minnen* (Leyden, 1946).

J. JACOBS is credited with having been the first systematical investigator of dialectal variants in non-literary texts. His prize-winning essay *Vergelijkende Klank- en Vormleer der Middelvlaamsche dialecten*, of which only the *Klankleer* (Ghent, 1911) appeared, is a thorough and accurate study of spellings in Middle Flemish charters, with conclusions about the corresponding sounds.

The question *Werd de volkstaal gewijzigd in de loop der tijden?* (V.M.V.A., 1924, 163 ff) was answered in the negative for West Flemish by JACOBS. He tried to defend this proposition about the linguistic conservatism of Flemish in his historical dialect anthology *Het Westvlaamsch van de oudste tijden tot heden* (Groningen, 1927). In this volume we find a herbarium in a language which JACOBS, rather rashly, calls Old Flemish. The provenance of this herbarium was discussed by him in V.M.V.A. 1930, 189 ff, its date in V.M.V.A. 1931, 213 ff.

A valuable contribution is the study by A. VAN LOEY on *Zuid-West-Brabantsch in de XIIIe en XIVe eeuw* (Tongres, 1937), in which the author, basing himself on non-literary texts - accurately dated and localized - opened up new vistas on the historical phonology of Middle Netherlandic. J. VAN GINNEKEN, in collaboration with his pupils, described *De taalschat van het Limburgsche Leven van Jezus* (Maastricht, 1938). Both morphology and syntax were dealt with by VAN GINNEKEN's pupils ELIS. ALLARD, *Een grammaticaal onderzoek van het proza van Hadewych* (Amsterdam, 1937), and MARIA VAN DER KALLEN, *Een grammaticaal en rhythmisch onderzoek van Hadewijchs poëzie* (The Hague, 1938), a large section of which is devoted to the verse technique of the poetess.

A. KESSEN, editor of *Het Cancellierboek* (Leyden, 1931; with a chapter on 'De taal der Middelnederlandsche handschriften'), wrote an article *Over de taal der oudste Limburgse niet-literaire bronnen* (Ts. LIII, 280 ff). For Limburg, the painstakingly written 'lautliche und orthographische Untersuchung' of *Venloer Stadt-Texte* (Nimeguen, 1949) by S.G.W. VAN DER MEER, is of importance. J. MOORS, in his above-mentioned edition of charters from Belgian Limburg, *De oorkondentaal in Belgisch-Limburg van circa 1350 tot 1400*, deals thoroughly with their 'woordenschat en taal', pp. 341-439. In the same series (*Bouwstoffen en Studiën voor de Geschiedenis en de Lexicografie van het Nederlands*) appeared H. VANGASSEN's *Bouwstoffen tot de historische taalgeografie van het Nederlands; Hertogdom Brabant* (Tongres, 1954). For practical reasons, the author could not reproduce the numerous Brabant charters, so he made excerpts from them, giving instances of the styles of writing in the various towns and periods, thus preparing the way for future students of dialectological and historical phonology.

A short but very scholarly study of West Flemish charters, relating

particularly to some important phonological aspects, is P. VAN HAVERBEKE's prize-winning essay *De 13e-eeuwse Middelnederlandse Oorkondentaal te Brugge en Omgeving* (Ghent, 1955).

Two authors from the province of Holland were discussed in doctoral theses, one by miss S. HOFKER, *De taal van Melis Stoke* (Groningen, 1908), and one by W.F. TIEMEYER, *Klankleer der gedichten van Willem van Hildegarsberch* (Amsterdam, 1916). K. HEEROMA's *Hollandse dialectstudies*, which we shall discuss in a later chapter, covers the period down to the Middle Ages.

EDDA TILLE's *Zur Sprache der Urkunden des Herzogtums Geldern* (Bonn-Leipzig, 1925) shows the rivalry between western-Hollandic and eastern-German influences on the language of Guelders. J.J. MAK described *Het vocalisme in bekleemde syllaben van enige Oostmiddelnederlandse geschriften uit de kring der moderne devotie*, in *Ts.* LV, 67 ff. N. VAN WIJK aimed at promoting the dialectology of the Middle Ages with his edition of *Het Getijdenboek van Geert Grote* (The Hague, 1940). It is on this edition that B. VAN DEN BERG based his article *Geert Grote's psalmvertaling*, *Ts.* LXI, 259 ff.

One of the earliest publications on Mnl. syntax is the doctoral thesis by G. ENGELS, *Over het gebruik van den conjunctief en de casus bij Maerlant* (Groningen, 1895), an instructive study on the great influence of rhyme on the use of the conjunctive. A.C. BOUMAN's thesis *Bijdrage tot de syntaxis der 'dat'-zinnen in het Germaansch* (Utrecht, 1918) restricts itself almost entirely to the Mnl. period. J. JACOBS wrote an essay on *De regeering der voorzetsels in de Middelnederlandsche teksten* in *V.M.V.A.* 1922, 1924 and 1925.

More recent works, deriving from the syntactic school of OVERDIEP, are those by L.I.H. ALBERING, *Vergelijkend-syntactische studie van den Renout en het Volksboek der Heemskinderen* (Groningen, 1934), in which the first thousand lines of the *Renout*-fragments are compared with the corresponding prose in the chap-book; and the doctoral thesis by OVERDIEP's successor to be, G.A. VAN ES, *De attributieve genitief in het Middelnederlandsch* (Assen, n.d. [1938]), based on a number of fragments from Mnl. texts, both rhymed and in prose, with varying contents. G. STELLINGA's study *De abele spelen: zinsvormen en zinsfuncties* (Groningen, 1955) is similar to ALBERING's in conception and outline. In so far as the syntactic observations of OVERDIEP and his pupils are based on rhymed texts, they should be accepted with some reserve.

C. MINIS wrote a lengthy article on the *ἀπό χοινοῦ*-construction, especially in the *Ferguut*, for *Ts.* LXII, 161 ff. His principal views on this construction in general, not only in Middle Netherlandic, are to be found in a shorter article in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache* LXXIV, 285 ff. Other noteworthy contributions to the study of Mnl., and partly to that of 17th century and Modern Netherlandic syntax, are those by G.A. VAN ES, *Oorsprong en functies van het voegwoord al*, in the periodical *It Beaken* 1949, 106 ff, and, connected with it, but of wider scope, *Syntactische vormen van de concessieve modaliteit in het Nederlands*, *Ts.* LXVIII, 253 ff. VAN ES recently continued and expanded these syntactical investigations, in his excellent article *Voegwoordelijke verbindingen ter uitdrukking van de conditionele (hypothetische) modaliteit in het Nederlands*, *Ts.* LXXI, 1 ff. This study, based on historical principles, starts from Mnl., dealing especially with that period, but also sketches the development through later centuries up to present-day Netherlandic. A pupil of VAN ES, G. SCHMIDT, labels his Groningen doctoral thesis *De concessieve voegwoordelijke bijzin in het Nederlands van de middeleeuwen en de zeventiende eeuw* (1958) an extension of the above-mentioned articles by VAN ES. Later studies by VAN ES, on *Voegwoordelijke verbindingen voor aspectische functies der simultaneïteit* (*Ts.* LXXII, 241 ff), *de progressiviteit (doe en als)* (*Ts.* LXXIII, 16 ff), and *concurrenten van doe en als* (*Ts.* LXXIV, 20 ff, 189 ff) are limited to the Mnl. period.

A syntactic study, based exclusively on prose-texts, is that by J.A.M. PULLES, *Structuurschema's van de zin in Middelnederlands geestelijk proza* (Nimeguen, 1950); its material has been taken from C.C. DE BRUIN's anthology *Middelnederlands geestelijk proza*, mentioned earlier. J. HEEMSTRA, in *Über den Gebrauch der attributiven Partizipialkonstruktionen in der niederländischen und hochdeutschen Prosa* (Haarlem, 1925), devoted one chapter to 'Die älteste niederländische Prosa'.

From the Swedish school of J. HOLMBERG comes the highly interesting inquiry by L. HERMODSSON, *Reflexive und intransitive Verba im älteren Westgermanischen* (Uppsala, 1952), in which Middle Netherlandic plays an important part; it shows the author to be well acquainted with Netherlandic and linguistic research in the Netherlands. A special section is devoted to the penetration of the High German reflexive pronoun *sich* into later Netherlandic.

Several articles by L.C. MICHELS, dealing with different aspects of Middle Netherlandic, have been collected in his *Filologische Opstellen I* (Zwolle, 1957).

5. Lexicology

In this field we have the *Bijdragen tot de middelnederlandse woordgeografie en woord-chronologie*, articles by DE VOOYS published in *Ts.* The vocabulary of Dutch mystics is discussed by the same scholar in an article *Meister Eckart en de Nederlandse mystiek*, published in *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* III, 8 ff, and in *Johannes Ruusbroec en de Duitse mystiek* by A.C. BOUMAN, *Ts.* XLI, 1 ff and XLII, 81 ff. A.A. VERDENIUS wrote *Lexicologische aantekeningen bij stichtelijk proza uit de Middeleeuwen*, *Ts.* XL, 193 ff, XLI, 115 ff and XLII, 131 ff. S. AXTERS included a chapter on 'De zichzelfwording van de Nederlandsche scholastieke vaktaal' in the excellent introduction to his *Scholastiek Lexicon* (Antwerp, 1937). C.C. DE BRUIN's doctoral thesis *Middelnederlandse vertalingen van het Nieuwe Testament I* (Groningen-Batavia, 1934) also deserves to be mentioned because of his comparison of several bible translations with regard to their choice of words. DE BRUIN not only considered lexicological facts, but also discussed general grammatical characteristics of his texts.

Another aspect of lexicology is dealt with by J.W. MULLER in his article *Over ware en schijnbare gallicismen in het Middelnederlandsch*, *N.Tg.* XIV, 1 ff, 65 ff.

A first attempt at producing an ideological dictionary of Louvain charters is L. DE MAN's *Bijdrage tot een systematisch glossarium van de Brabantse oorkondentaal, Leuens archief van circa 1300 tot 1550*, Part I, (Tongres, 1956).

Chapter Five

The 16th Century. Transition from Middle to New Netherlandic

The 16th century is a crucial period in the history of Netherlandic. As a result of political events, the economic and political centre moved from South to North. Within a very short time, Amsterdam developed from a provincial town into the foremost commercial city in Europe. The Brabant dialect, well on its way to becoming the basis of the standard language, had to cede its position to Hollandic, not, however, without leaving its traces in received New Netherlandic.

At the same time, partly because of these events, major changes in sound and form took place, some of which are to be found recorded in contemporary publications: in the 16th century, Renaissance ideas obtained a firm footing in the Netherlands, manifesting themselves in a growing interest in the national language, among other things. Grammatical treatises were written and, if used with discretion, they can yield valuable information about 16th century Netherlandic. Among the lexicographical works that were published, that by Kili a a n (see below) is of great value for the history of Netherlandic vocabulary.

Hitherto, this important period of transition has not been thoroughly studied. This is especially obvious in the field of lexicology: the excellent *Mnl. Wb.*, discussed in Chapter II, contains but little 16th century material, and the great *W.N.T.* takes its sources, especially in the early volumes, chiefly from the time after 1600. Editions of 16th century texts, such as those prepared by pupils of DE VOOYS, are therefore of great significance. Many of them have explanatory notes, and in some the words explained are collected in a register, in such a way as to simplify the compilation of a dictionary of 16th century Netherlandic. The most important of these editions are as follows.

H.F. GRONDIJS, *Een spul van sinnen van den siecke stadt* (Borculo, 1917).

J.W. MULLER and L. SCHARPÉ, *Spelen van Cornelis Everaert* (Leyden, 1920); the second volume, which was to have contained a glossary, did not appear.

G.A. BRANDS, *Tspel van de Cristenkercke* (Utrecht, 1921).

- F.A. STOETT, *Drie kluchten uit de zestiende eeuw* (Zutphen, 1932).
 B.H. ERNÉ, *Twee zestiende-eeuwse spelen van de hel* (Groningen, 1934).
 W. VAN EEGHEM, *Drie schandaleuse spelen* (Antwerp, 1937). Handsome edition, but without glossary and grammatical notes.
 M. DE JONG, *Drie zestiende-eeuwse esbatementen* (Amsterdam, 1934).
 E. ELLERBROEK-FORTUIN, *Amsterdamse rederijkersspelen in de zestiende eeuw* (Groningen-Batavia, 1937). No glossary or grammatical notes.
 L.M. VAN DIS, *Reformatorische rederijkersspelen uit de eerste helft van de zestiende eeuw* (Haarlem, 1937).
 N. VAN DER LAAN, *Uit het archief der Pellicanisten: vier zestiende-eeuwse esbatementen* (Leyden, 1938).
 C. KRUYSKAMP, *De refreinenbundel van Jan van Doesborch* (2 vols, Leyden, 1940).
 E.G.A. GALAMA, *Twee zestiende-eeuwse spelen van de Verlooren Zoone door Robert Lawet* (Utrecht-Nimeguen, 1941).
 G. DEGROOTE, *Jan van den Dale, gekende werken* (Antwerp, 1944).
 H. MEIJLING, *Esbatementen van de Rode Lelije te Brouwershaven* (Groningen, 1946).
 C. KRUYSKAMP, *Dichten en spelen van Jan van den Berghe* (The Hague, 1950).
 G.J. STEENBERGEN, *De bekeeringe Pauli* (in the series *Zwolse Drukken en Herdrukken*, Zwolle, 1953).

A discussion of the grammatical aspects of the texts is to be found in most of these editions. L.M. VAN DIS and B.H. ERNÉ edited *De Spelen van Sinne vertoond op het Landjuweel te Gent van 12-13 Juni 1539*, of which only Part I (Text) has appeared (Groningen-Batavia, 1939). Hardly any notes are provided by F. LYNA and W. VAN EEGHEM in their edition of *Jan van Stijevoorts Refereinenbundel* (2 vols, Antwerp, n.d. [1929-30]), no notes at all by B. BECKER, editor of *Coornhert's Zedekunst dat is Wellevenskunste* (Leyden, 1942), very few by P. VAN DER MEULEN in *De comedies van Coornhert* (Assen, 1945), but here we find a, mainly stylistic, chapter on 'De taal van den comediedichter'. VAN DER MEULEN also edited *Het Roerspel en de Comedies van Coornhert* (Leyden, 1955), with fairly extensive commentary. *Coornhert's Dolinge van Ulysse*, edited by Th. WEEVERS (Amsterdam, 1939) in the series *Bibliotheek der Ne-*

derlandse Letteren, and transcribed, in accordance with the principles of that series, in modern orthography, has short notes at the foot of the page. There is not much difference of treatment in N. VAN DER LAAN's edition, for the same series, of *Noordnederlandse Rederijkers-spelen* (Amsterdam, 1941).

The handsome edition of *Een Schoon Lièdekens-boeck genaamd Het Antwerpsch Liedboek van 1544* by W. Gs. HELLINGA (The Hague, 1941) is designed for a wider public, and has brief but competent annotations.

Jan van der Noot's *Het Bosken en het Theatre* was edited by W.A.P. SMIT (Amsterdam and Antwerp, 1953), with extensive footnotes (some comments on it by J.J. MAK in *Ts.* LXXV, 65 ff.). SMIT also edited a lesser work of Van der Noot's, *Epitalameon (off Houwelyckx Sanck voor Otto van Vicht en Cornelia van Balen)* for the series *Zwolse Drukken en Herdrukken*, with a remarkable Appendix on the 'drukgeschiedenis', the printing history of the text, by W. Gs. HELLINGA.

Also worthy of mention is *Het Geuzenliedboek* (2 vols, Zutphen, 1924-25), by E.T. KUIPER, after his death seen through the press by P. LEENDERTZ Jr. A good deal of interest has been paid to the 'Geuzenlied' *Wilhelmus van Nassouwe*, now the national anthem of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. J.B. DREWES devoted a separate study to it (Amsterdam, 1946), attempting a synchronic-stylistic interpretation. In the work, earlier studies are discussed.

The very few editions dating from before 1920 are not mentioned here, nor are some recent editions of farces and 'esbatementen' published in periodicals. They are enumerated in the excellently annotated edition of *Vier excellente kluchten* (in the series *Klassieke Galerij*) by J.J. MAK (Antwerp, 1950). A great contribution to our knowledge of 16th-century vocabulary is MAK's *Rhetoricaal Glossarium* (Assen, 1959). Several *Lexicologische Kanttekeningen* by the same author, published in instalments in recent numbers of the *Ts.*, testify to his competence in this field.

Separate grammatical studies on 16th century Netherlandic are small in number, and therefore, three earlier publications deserve to be mentioned here, doctoral theses from the school of W.L. VAN HELTEN, namely A.E. LUBACH, *Over de verbuiging van het werkwoord in het Nederlandsch der zestiende eeuw* (Groningen, 1891); I.B. KOLTHOFF, *Het Substantief in het Nederlandsch der 16e eeuw*

(Groningen, 1894), and B. VAN HALTEREN, *Het Pronomen in het Nederlandsch der zestiende Eeuw* (Wildervanck, 1906). These books, very hard to obtain today, are based on scanty material, and little account is taken of dialectal and individual differences.

R. VERDEYEN gave a preliminary survey of Marnix' usage in the memorial volume *Marnix van Sinte Aldegonde* (Brussels, 1939), 175 ff, mentioning what had been done and stressing the urgent need of further linguistic research into the works of this very productive author, whose literary, theological and political publications have given rise to a steadily growing output of literature. A discussion in accordance with the principles of OVERDIEP and VAN ES, of syntax and style in *De zin in het Nederlands proza en de poëzie van Philips van Marnix*, was brought out by W.A. ORNÉE (Zutphen, 1955). Marcel GOVAERT's *La langue et le style de Marnix de Sainte-Aldegonde dans son 'Tableau des Differens de la Religion'* (Brussels, 1953) is only important with regard to Marnix as a writer of French.

M.J. DE VRIENDT-DE MAN, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het gebruik en de flexie van het werkwoord zullen in de 16e eeuw* (Ghent, 1958), gives a survey of the forms of the auxiliary *zullen* in various texts.

Part II of L.C. MICHELS' *Filologische Opstellen* (Zwolle, 1958) contains much useful information on 16th (and 17th) century philology in the widest sense.

16th century lexicology

At the end of the 16th century appeared the excellent dictionary of Cornelis van Kiel. Van Kiel is perhaps better known as Kiliaan, from his assumed Latin name, Cornelius Kilianus Dufflaeus (from Duffel, a town between Antwerp and Brussels). Kiliaan's *Etymologicum teutonicae linguae* is nowadays most easily accessible in the edition by G. VAN HASSELT (Utrecht, 1777). An inhabitant of Antwerp, Kiliaan took the Brabant dialect as his basis, giving geographical indications for regional words. His work is on the whole conscientious and reliable, he carefully defines his meanings in Latin.

Since A. KLUYVER published his *Proeve eener kritiek op het woordenboek van Kiliaan* (The Hague, 1884), some other critical studies have appeared. K. FOKKEMA tested *De Friese woorden bij Kiliaan*, Ts. LIV, 210 ff, and found at least half of them to be correct. L. GOEMANS wrote about the term 'Lovaniense' in Kiliaan, *Album-Vercoullie*

(Brussels, 1927), 147 ff. C.G.N. DE VOOYS discussed the *Duitse woorden in Kiliaan*, V.M.V.A. 1943, 727 ff, and *De 'Hollandse' woorden bij Kiliaan*, Ts. LXIII, 265 ff; LXIV, 142 ff. The influence of Hadrianus Junius on Kiliaan, already pointed out by KLUYVER, has been the subject of a detailed study by G. DE SMET, see *Handelingen van de Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis* VIII (1954), 1 ff; Ts. LXXIV, 44 ff; *T. en Tongv.* VIII, 1 ff; *Album Edgard Blancquaert* (Tongres, 1958), 197 ff.

One of Kiliaan's sources, the *Naembouck* by Joos Lambrecht, an inhabitant of Ghent (Ghent, 1562), has been re-edited by R. VERDEYEN (Liege and Paris, 1945). In chapters VII and VIII we find an interesting discussion of Kiliaan's relation to this and other sources, and also of the value of his indications 'fland.' (Flemish) and 'vetus'. References are also found to older studies on this subject, such as L.C. MICHELS' *Kiliaen en Pelgrom*, for *T.T.L.* XXVIII, 215 ff, reprinted in MICHELS' *Filologische Opstellen* II, 87 ff.

Another important contribution to the study of 'lexicography and humanism' is VERDEYEN's paper on Petrus Dasypodius and Antonius Schorus, V.M.V.A. 1939, 967 ff. Plantijn's *Thesaurus theutonicae linguae* (Antwerp, 1573), a dictionary with French and Latin equivalents, has not the interest for the modern investigator as Kiliaan's *Etymologicum*. Kiliaan, who was employed in Plantijn's printing-office, contributed to Plantijn's book. R. VERDEYEN deals with its relation to the *Naembouck* in the introduction to his above-mentioned edition.

The *Teuthonista of Duytschlender* by Gert van der Schueren (Cologne, 1477) belongs to the last period of Middle Netherlandic; it is a dictionary of the Lower Rhineland dialect just outside the present border of the Netherlands. Part I gives the Latin translations of native words, Part II vice versa. The first part was re-edited in 1804, by C. BOONZAJER and J.A. CLIGNETT (Leyden); J. VERDAM reorganized the whole work (Leyden, 1896), arranging the lemmata in alphabetical order, and trying to model them on western Middle Netherlandic. In doing this, VERDAM aimed at serving lexicological purposes, but the practical advantages of his edition should not blind us to the drawbacks of his procedure for objective research. D.H.G. BELLAARD wrote a monograph on *Gert van der Schuren's Teuthonista of Duytschlender* (Bois-le-Duc, 1904).

16th century works on grammar

Under the influence of the Renaissance, several grammatical studies were written in the 16th century, aiming at a regulation of orthography and usage. In his *Nederlandsche Spellinghe* (Ghent, 1550), Joos Lambrecht, mentioned earlier, takes the dialect of his native town as a basis. His book contains valuable observations on phonetics. The facsimile edition by J.F.J. HEREMANS and F. VAN DER HAEGHEN (Ghent, 1882) gave occasion to a discussion of it by J.W. MULLER in the periodical *Onze Volkstaal*, III, 184 ff. There is also an article on the same subject by P. DE KEYSER in *Revue Belge* (1928), but I have not seen it.

In an article for *Leuv. Bijdr.* III, 167 ff, L. GOEMANS dealt with Antonius Sexagius' *De orthographia linguae belgicae* (Louvain, 1576).

The important *Nederduitse Orthographie* by Pontus Heuterus (Pontus de Heuter, Antwerp, 1581) was the subject of an article by C.G.N. de Vooy, *N.Tg.* XI, 1 ff, reprinted in de Vooy's *Verzamelde Taalkundige Opstellen* I, 225 ff. There are supplementary remarks to this article by J. HEEREN, *N.Tg.* XI, 144 ff.

The *Twe-spraack van de Nederduitsche Letterkunst* (Amsterdam, 1584), a work of great authority, was re-edited by K. KOOIMAN (Groningen, 1913) with an excellent introduction, in which older grammatical works were discussed, namely the *Exercitium puerorum* (1st edition, Antwerp, 1485); Erasmus' *De recta latini graecique sermonis pronuntiatione dialogus* (Paris, 1528), usually referred to as the *Pronunciatio*; *Den Schat der Duytscher Talen* by Jan van der Werve (Brussels, 1552), who gives Netherlandic translations of foreign words; the *Origines Antwerpianae* by Johannes Goropius Becanus (Antwerp, 1569). The merits of the *Twe-spraack* were duly assessed by G. KUIPER in his inaugural address *De waardeering van Spiegels Twe-spraack* (Harderwijk, 1947); he is now preparing a new edition of the work in the series *Trivium* (see Ch. VI, 3).

In a series of articles, most of them published in the *N.Tg.*, C.G.N. DE VOOYS has dealt with old grammars, especially those after 1600. In the introductory article 'Uit de jeugd van onze spraakkunst', some 16th century grammarians are also discussed. The contents of 16th century grammars, especially those of the *Twe-spraack*, have been made use of by several scholars, such as G.G. KLOEKE, K. HEEROMA, W. GS. HELLINGA, in their discussion of the diphthongization of

î and *û*, further particulars of which will be found in Ch. XIII. L.P.H. EIJKMAN had a rather low opinion of the phonetical value of these works, see *N.Tg.* XVII, 225 ff, so had DE VOOYS and most of the other scholars just mentioned. W.J.H. CARON, in his noteworthy doctoral thesis *Klank en teken bij Erasmus en onze oudste grammatici* (Groningen-Batavia, 1947), contested this opinion, pointing out that Erasmus was not a stickler for spelling. CARON also, quite convincingly, defends *van Heule* against DE VOOYS' criticisms.

P.A. DE PLANQUE, in his doctoral thesis *Valcooch's Regel der Duytsche Schoolmeesters* (Groningen, 1926), gives a picture of 16th century school education, with remarks on *Valcooch's* usage, and he provides extensive explanatory notes and a glossary: A number of worth-while remarks about this edition were made by A.A. VERDENIUS, *N.Tg.* XXI, 239 ff, and L.C. MICHELS, *T.T.L.* XV, 170 ff (reprinted *Filologische Opstellen II*, 122 ff).

Many biographical and bibliographical data about 16th century grammarians and linguistic purists are to be found in L. VAN DEN BRANDEN's *Het streven naar verheerlijking, zuivering en opbouw van het Nederlands in de 16e eeuw* (Ghent, 1956).

Chapter Six

The 17th Century.

It is not without reason that, in the period of New Netherlandic, a special place is assigned to the 17th century language: for quite a long time much attention has been paid to this century, especially the first half of it. Philological interest, in the sense of careful text interpretation and of purely linguistic study, is often accompanied by literary interests: scholars are attracted to texts of literary value, and philological interpretation aims primarily at making the literary production of an earlier period accessible to modern readers. From a political and economic point of view, the 17th century was for the Northern Netherlands - the Republic of the Seven Provinces - and especially for the powerful province of Holland, their Golden Age. Material prosperity encouraged cultural progress, painting and literature flourished, and though the latter may not nearly have soared so high as the former, we are justified in speaking of a literary Golden Age, too. The existence of authors such as H o o f t , V o n d e l , B r e d e r o , H u y g e n s and the popular didactic poet C a t s , to mention only those who were born in the 16th century, make the 17th an important period in Netherlandic literature.

1. Text editions and lexicology

Several dramas by V o n d e l and H o o f t , especially those that are suitable to be read in secondary schools, have appeared in handy editions with more or less extensive annotations. They cannot all be enumerated here. We shall restrict ourselves to mentioning the standard edition of *De werken van Vondel* (10 vols, Amsterdam, 1927-37), the commentary to which was written by J.D. MEERWALDT, L.C. MICHELS, B.H. MOLKENBOER, H.W.E. MOLLER, A.A. VERDENIUS and C.G.N. DE VOOYS.

De werken van G.A. Bredero were edited with commentary by J. TEN BRINK, G. KALFF, R.A. KOLLEWIJN, H.E. MOLTZER, J.H.W. UNGER and J. TE WINKEL (3 vols, Amsterdam, 1890), and later by J.A.N. KNUTTEL (3 vols, Amsterdam and Leyden, 1921-1929),

with brief annotations. The latter edition was no improvement on the former, which itself was not first-rate.

The standard edition of *De gedichten van Constantijn Huygens* by J.A. WORP (9 vols, 1st vol. Arnhem, n.d., other vols Groningen, 1893-99) is not annotated.

Cats' works, often reprinted, most recently in the very luxurious edition by J. VAN VLOTEN (Zwolle, 1862), has not aroused sufficient literary interest in the 20th century to justify a new complete edition.

Some editions of separate texts deserve mention here for their good commentaries. There are those of Hooft's *Granida*, edited by J.H. VAN DEN BOSCH (5th edition, Zwolle, 1931), and by A. ZIJDERVELD and A.A. VERDENIUS (Zutphen, 1940; 2nd revised edition by C.A. ZAALBERG, Zutphen, n.d. [1957]). F.A. STOETT produced a carefully edited and fully annotated edition of Bredero's *Moortje* (Zutphen, 1931) and, on a smaller scale, of Coster's *Boere-klucht van Teeuwis de Boer* (Zutphen, 1935). Of the same high standard is A.A. VAN RIJNBACH's *De kluchten van Gerbrand Adriaensz. Bredero* (Amsterdam, 1926). TH.H. D'ANGREMOND edited *P.C. Hooft's Achilles en Polyxena* (Assen, 1943).

H.J. EYMAEL brought out an edition of Huygens' *Hofwyck* (2nd impression, Zutphen, 1920) and *Trijntje Cornelisdr. klucht* (Zutphen, n.d. [1912]). Supplementary and critical remarks on EYMAEL's *Hofwyck* were made by F. BAUR in *Leuv. Bijdr.* XIX, 99 ff, to which EYMAEL responded in *Leuv. Bijdr.* XX, 138 ff. As a result of further criticism, EYMAEL supplied some supplements and corrections to his *Hofwyck*-edition in *Ts.* XLII, 72 ff. In an earlier publication, *Huygens-studiën* (Kuilenburg, 1886), EYMAEL had provided a series of 'nalezingen met critische aantekeningen op uitgaven van C. Huygens' werken'. Similar notes by EYMAEL to more recent editions, such as *Costelick Mal* and *Cluys-werck*, are to be found in *Ts.* XXXIII, 40 ff and *ibid.*, 191 ff resp. Further, EYMAEL took care of the 2nd edition of the anthology *Koren-bloemen* I and II, revised and more copiously annotated by J. HEINSIUS (Zutphen, 1925). HEINSIUS also edited parts III and IV of *Koren-bloemen* (4th edition, Zutphen, 1924). Shorter contributions on Huygens, not all of them strictly philological, appear in MICHELS' *Filologische Opstellen* II (Zwolle, 1958).

In the series *Zwolse Drukken en Herdrukken*, which we mentioned in Ch. IV, 2, the 17th century is represented by, among others, Hooft's *Baeto*, in a very fine edition by F. VEENSTRA (Zwolle,

1954), and *Poësy van Six van Chandelier*, edited by G.A. VAN ES (1953); a 'nader commentaar' to it was written by L.C. MICHELS, *Ts. LXXIV*, 263 ff.

Also worthy of mention is the separate edition of V o n d e l's *Leeuwendalers* by ANTON VAN DUINKERKEN, pseudonym of W.J.M.A. ASSELBERGS, (Utrecht-Brussels, 1948).

The biography of Joannes Stalpart van der Wielen, written by G.J. HOOGWERFF, with an anthology of his lyrical poems (Bussum, 1920), has led L.C. MICHELS to publish several studies on the poet and his work, which have now been collected, in a somewhat revised form, in MICHELS' *Filologische Opstellen* II, 173 ff.

The handsome edition of the song-book *Den Bloemhof van de Nederlantsche leught* (1608 and 1610) by L.M. VAN DIS and Jac. SMIT (Amsterdam-Antwerp, 1955), which is of interest especially for the literary historian, has short notes at the foot of the page. In the series *Zwolse Drukken en Herdrukken* O. DAMBRE edited J u s t u s d e H a r d u y n's *De Weerliicke Liefden tot Roosemond* (Zwolle, 1956).

No complete, or even nearly complete, discussion of the vocabulary of any of the above-mentioned 17th century authors has appeared in the last few decades. Their works have been extensively excerpted for the *W.N.T.*, where, especially in the earlier volumes, numerous quotations are to be found. A systematic description of the usage of H o o f t and H u y g e n s, however, would be rewarding, both authors having, each in his own way, consciously constructed and improved their language. The *Uitlegkundig Woordenboek op de werken van Pieter Korneliszoon Hooft* (4 vols, Amsterdam, 1825-1838), compiled by 'de tweede klasse van het Koninklijk-Nederlandsche Instituut voor Wetenschappen, Letterkunde en Schoone Kunsten', each of the twelve members taking care of one or more letters, is antiquated and inadequate. Nor does its supplement, A.C. OUDEMANS' *Taalkundig Woordenboek op de werken van P.C. Hooft* (Leyden, 1868), useful as it is in some respects, come up to our present-day expectations of such a special dictionary. The same must be said of OUDEMANS' *Woordenboek op de gedichten van G. Az. Bredero* (Leyden, 1857).

A.A. VERDENIUS has written many enlightening articles on 17th century usage, especially that of B r e d e r o, most of which were collected in the volume *Studies over Zeventiende Eeuws* (Amsterdam, 1946), presented to him on his 70th birthday. The excellent doctoral

thesis by L.C. MICHELS, *Bijdrage tot het onderzoek van Vondel's werken* (Nimeguen-Utrecht, 1941), also contains several chapters on questions of lexicological interpretation.

Lydia DE PAUW-DE VEEN has devoted a study to one special part of the vocabulary, painters' jargon: *Bijdrage tot de studie van de woordenschat in verband met de schilderkunst in de 17e eeuw* (Ghent, 1957).

2. Grammatical studies

A useful general introduction to 17th century Netherlandic grammar is A. WEIJNEN's *Zeventiende-eeuwse Taal* (2nd edition, Zutphen, 1956), which is chiefly intended to serve the didactical aims of text-interpretation, and is for that purpose prefaced by a survey of 17th century grammar and idiom, where special attention is paid to points of difference between old and modern usage.

Purely grammatical descriptions of the usage of 17th century authors are mostly of earlier date. A useful book, giving solid and reliable material, is W.L. VAN HELTEN's *Vondel's taal* (2 vols, Rotterdam, 1881), dealing chiefly with morphology and syntax. The grammatical standards adhered to by V o n d e l in his later works are dealt with in the book by J.L. WALCH, *De varianten van Vondel's Palamedes* (The Hague, 1906), where the author discusses, in the 'eerste Hoofdafdeling' (pp. 17-98), 'veranderingen om eene reden van taalkundigen aard.' F. KOSSMANN devoted a similar study to *De varianten van Hoofts Granida*, Ts. XXXVI, 97 ff, analysing the results of two subsequent revisions of *Granida* undertaken by the author. Inferior to VAN HELTEN's book are that by G.A. NAUTA on the phonology and morphology of B r e d e r o , *Taalkundige aantekeningen naar aanleiding van de Werken van G.A. Bredero* (Groningen, 1893), and that on his syntax by J.O.S. VAN DER VEEN, *Het taaleigen van Bredero* (Amsterdam, 1905), because these two writers were dealing with a rather special problem: that of Bredero's attempts both to imitate sophisticated speech and to render genuine popular speech. A short characterization of Bredero's usage is to be found in C.G.N. DE VOOYS' introduction to his edition of Bredero's *Spaenschen Brabander* (Groningen-The Hague, 1920).

H. SMOUT, *Het Antwerpsch Dialect* (Ghent, 1905), discusses the rendering of the 17th century Antwerp dialect by H u y g e n s in *Trijntje Cornelisdr.* J. TE WINKEL has studied *De tongval van Delf-*

land (the region round The Hague) *bij Huygens*, *Ts.* XVIII, 161 ff, using the passages where Huygens obviously tried to render that dialect.

B. VAN DEN BERG, *N.Tg.* XXXVII, 242 ff, traces the relationship between *Boers en Beschaafd in het begin der 17e eeuw* as it emerges from the works of such authors as Huygens and Bredero. In his article *Naar aanleiding van de o's by P.C. Hooff*, *Ts.* LXXV, 181 ff, he examines the phonetic value of Hooff's distinction between *o*, *oo* and *ó*, *óó*.

The language of Cats has so far elicited as little commentary as the interpretation of his poetry, both being fairly easy to understand. The only contribution is that by A. OPPREL, *De zachte en scherpe e en o bij Cats*, *Ts.* XIV, 154 ff.

The very complicated usage of Hendrik Laurenszoon Spiegel has been made more accessible by A.C. DE JONG, *Spiegels Hertspiegel I* (Amsterdam, 1930), who also gives a phonology. Spiegel's *Lieden op 't Vader Ons* has been edited by G. DEGROOTE in the series *Zwolse Drukken en Herdrukken* (Zwolle, 1956), with notes and a complete facsimile of the author's manuscript.

A considerable part of Roemer Visscher's poetry was edited by N. VAN DER LAAN, *Uit Roemer Visscher's Brabbeling* (2 vols, Utrecht, 1918-23).

W.A.P. SMIT edited and annotated Jacobus Revius' *Overyssele Sangen en Dichten* (2 vols, Amsterdam, 1930-35). Several passages of these poems are discussed by CHR. STAPELKAMP, *Reviusstudien* (Assen, 1954).

P.E. MULLER rightly gave his doctoral thesis on *De dichtwerken van Philibert van Borssele* (Groningen-Batavia, 1937) the subtitle 'een bijdrage tot de studie van zijn (Van Borssele's) taal en stijl'.

A.C. CRENA DE LONGH, in his edition of *G.C. van Santen's Lichte Wigger en snappende Siitgen* (Assen, 1958), has examined Van Santen's two farces as specimens of the 17th century dialect of Delft; he gives an extensive phonology and a concise grammar, with good notes in the text, and a glossary.

For the usage of the popular Brabant poet Poirters we have A. WEIJNEN's *Opmerkingen over de taal van Pater Poirters*, published in the periodical *Vondelkroniek* 1939, 324 ff.

The *Zeventiende-eeuwse Syntaxis* by G.S. OVERDIEP (3 parts,

Groningen-The Hague-Batavia, 1931-35) is based on twelve 17th century fragments of about 1000 lines each, representing different types of usage. OVERDIEP tries, by way of an inductive inquiry, to demonstrate the personal and general elements in these specimens of 17th century Netherlandic. The work has both the typical attractions and drawbacks of OVERDIEP's so-called 'stylistic' methods. His stressing of the individual traits in each separate author and context in a way brings his material to life, but on the other hand this sometimes obstructs the view of the main lines and the grammatical limits which each author is bound to accept.

An earlier syntactic study by OVERDIEP, solely concerned with 17th century Netherlandic, is *De zinsvormen in Vondels Pascha en Lucifer* (in *Stilistische Studiën* I, Leyden, 1926); in his article *Over het Nederlandsche participium praesentis*, *Ts.* XLIV, 119 ff, on the other hand, he uses both modern and 17th century data. This article has been reprinted in *Verzamelde opstellen over taal- en letterkunde II* (Antwerp, 1948), 183 ff.

A specimen of the style of 17th century officials has been examined by J.A. VERHAGE, in *'n Sintakties-stilistiese studie van die Dagregister van Jan van Riebeeck* (Amsterdam and Cape Town, 1952); in general, though not throughout, its method is rather like OVERDIEP's in his 17th century syntax.

L. KOELMANS is investigating the usage of Admiral Michiel de Ruyter in the latter's handwritten logbooks and letters. The first part, *Teken en klank bij Michiel de Ruyter*, has already appeared (Assen, 1959); the morphology is to follow shortly, and the syntax is also to be reviewed.

A work that attained great authority on matters of usage was the translation of the Bible undertaken by order of the 'Staten-Generaal der Vereenigde Nederlanden', the States-General of the Republic of the Seven United Provinces, as a result of a resolution passed by the Synod of Dordrecht (1618-19). Twenty-four prominent scholars contributed to this great work, conscientiously aiming to forge a generally acceptable, supra-dialectal language. Many of the collaborators came from the Southern Netherlands, and they exercised their influence in the case of many disputed points, and through the so-called 'Statenbijbel' introduced some Southern Netherlandic peculiarities that are still found in the written language of the Northern Netherlands. The phonology and morphology of this Bible-translation

(which appeared in 1637), a work of the utmost importance for the linguistic history of the Netherlands, have been accurately described by J. HEINSIUS, *Klank- en buigingsleer van de taal des Statenbijbels* (Groningen, 1897). A history of Bible-translations in the Netherlands, terminating with the 'Statenbijbel', is to be found in C.C. DE BRUIN's *De Statenbijbel en zijn voorgangers* (Leyden, 1937). The decisions taken by the translators in matters of usage were incorporated in the *Resolutiën*. These 'resolutions', together with other documents concerning the language of the 'Statenbijbel', were edited by F.L. ZWAAN: *Uit de geschiedenis der Nederlandsche spraakkunst* (Groningen-Batavia, 1939), 195 ff. A discussion of these documents appears in the same work, 40 ff. An earlier separate edition is that by J. HEINSIUS, *De 'resolutiën' betreffende de taal van de Statenbijbel* (Groningen-The Hague, 1919).

3. 17th century philology

Interest in the national language, and attempts at correctness in using it, originating in the 16th century (see Ch. V), were continued on a larger scale in the 17th. The poets Hooft and Vondel held discussions with Anthonis de Hubert and Laurens Reael on spelling, flexions and other aspects of the written language, see ZWAAN, *Uit de gesch. der Nederl. spraakkunst*, 3 ff. De Hubert prefaced his translation of *De Psalmen des Propheeten Davids* (Leyden, 1624) by a 'Noodige Waarschouwing', discussed in ZWAAN, *op. cit.*, 13 ff and reprinted *ibid.*, 121 ff with annotations 257 ff. Later on, Hooft himself, in the spirit of the 'Letterkundig Besluit' drafted in the discussions mentioned above and intended as a supplement to it, composed his *Waarnemingen op de Hollandsche Tael*, reproduced in ZWAAN's book, 235 ff, discussed and annotated 107 ff and 360 ff.

Christiaan van Heule wrote a *Nederduytsche Grammatica ofte Spraeckonst* (Leyden, 1625), discussed by C.G.N. DE VOOYS, *N. Tg.* XI, 273 ff, which article was reprinted, with additions and corrections, in his *Verz. Taalk. Opst.* I, 293 ff. A new edition of Van Heule's grammar appeared in the series *Trivium* Nr. I, Part 1 (Groningen-Djakarta, 1953), edited, introduced and annotated by W.J.H. CARON. The same scholar undertook the new edition of Van Heule's *De Nederduytsche Spraeckonst ofte Tael-beschrijvinghe* (Leyden, 1633), which appeared in *Trivium* Nr. I, Part 2 (Groningen-Djakarta, 1953). The series *Trivium* aims at making early

grammatical works available, it was founded by J. WILLE, who stimulated the study of 16th and 17th century grammar among his pupils. One of these pupils, F.L. ZWAAN, edited Jacob van der Schuer's *Nederduydsche Spellinge* (1612) as number II of *Trivium* (Groningen-Djakarta, 1957). Number IV is the edition of Petrus Leupenius' *Aanmerkingen op de Nederduitsche Taale* (1653) and *Naaberecht* (1654) by W.J.H. CARON (Groningen, 1958).

The *Beschrijvinge ende Lof der Stad Haerlem* (Haarlem, 1628) by Samuel Ampzing is prefaced by a *Nederlandsch Tael-bericht*. There is an article on this publication by C.G.N. DE VOOYS in *N.Tg.* XI, 276 ff (reprinted *Verz. Taalk. Opst.* I, 299 ff). F.L. ZWAAN reedited it in *Uit de gesch. der Nederl. Spraakk.*, 133 ff, with discussion 21 ff and notes 273 ff.

Other grammatical writings of the 17th century are dealt with, rather disparagingly, by C.G.N. DE VOOYS in his articles *Uit en over oude spraakkunsten* for *N.Tg.* XIV, 44 ff, 142 ff, and XV, 94 ff. These articles have also been reprinted in *Verz. Taalk. Opst.* I.

In his articles DE VOOYS mentions, briefly but with admiration, the *Spreeckonst* by Petrus Montanus (Delft, 1635). This book was later discussed at greater length but with equal admiration by L.P.H. EIJKMAN, in *N.Tg.* XVII, 231 ff; his article forms part of the series *Geschiedkundig overzicht van de klankleer in Nederland*, *N.Tg.* XVII and XVIII. In EIJKMAN's terminology 'klankleer' means 'phonetics', and Montanus' book is, indeed, a handbook of phonetics. In his analyses of the formation of speech-sounds, Montanus was far ahead of his time, as was shown in the monograph devoted to his remarkable book by A. VERSCHUUR, *Een Nederlandsche uitspraakleer der 17e eeuw* (Amsterdam, 1924). A new edition of the *Spreeckonst*, prepared by W.J.H. CARON, is to appear in the series *Trivium*.

The great mathematician Simon Stevin (born in Bruges, ca. 1548) was not a philologist, but his name deserves to be mentioned here because of his serious puristic attempts, the results of which are still to be seen in modern Netherlandic mathematical terminology. 'Het purisme van Simon Stevin' is discussed by K.W. DE GROOT in *N.Tg.* XIII, 161 ff.

A good deal of work has yet to be done on this important period of the linguistic history of the Netherlands. Very little attention has so far been paid to the usage of scholars and scientists, who were numerous in the young and prosperous Republic. There is some lite-

ature on the usage of the biologist Anton van Leeuwenhoek. Miss S. JONGEJAN treated *Van Leeuwenhoek's brieven en de Nederlandse schrijftaal in de zeventiende eeuw* in *N.Tg.* XXXIV, 300 ff. She was encouraged to undertake this study by C.G.N. DE VOOYS, who, in his article *Wensen en wenken voor een 'Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taal'* (*N.Tg.* VII, 65 ff and 113 ff), had pointed out the importance of the language used by scientific authors. In answer to questions raised by G. VAN RIJNBERK in the *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde* LXXVII, 209 ff, Miss Judy MENDELS treated Van Leeuwenhoek's language and style: *Over de stijl van Antoni van Leeuwenhoek*, *N.Tg.* XL, 27 ff; *Leeuwenhoek's taal*, *N.Tg.* XLI, 123 ff. Van RIJNSBERK's questions were also answered, somewhat more critically, by G.S. OVERDIEP in *O.Tt.* II, 247 ff.

We have some publications dealing with non-literary language as used in correspondence. J.H. KERN wrote an article *Over de taal van de brieven van Huygens' zusters en Dorothea van Dorp*, for *Ts.* XLVIII, 49 ff, and J.J. BORGER described, in *Ts.* LXIX, 49 ff, *Haags uit de tweede helft van de 17e eeuw*, basing his conclusions on some deviations and peculiarities in the *Briefwisseling tussen de Gebroeders Van der Goes* (edited by C.J. GONNET), a correspondence carried on during the years 1659-1673.

As may be gathered from the preceding pages, the interest of linguists has so far been focused chiefly on the first half of the 17th century, the period when some of our best-known authors were active. The remarkable dissimilarity, however, between the linguistic usage at the beginning of the century and the comparatively 'modern' usage found by the end of it, would lead one to suppose that a radical change had taken place, but although this has been pointed out by some scholars, it has not yet been explained or even studied in detail. What might be done here is indicated in the article by C.G.N. DE VOOYS, *Omgangstaal in het begin en tegen het einde van de zeventiende eeuw*, *N.Tg.* XLIII, 129 ff, regarded by the author as a 'reconnoitring expedition'.

A valuable lexicographical work from the second half of the 17th century is W. à Winschooten, *Seeman* (Leyden, 1681), which gives, as the title implies, especially maritime words, but also mentions curious dialectal traits of Southern Hollandic. These traits have been listed and discussed by F.A. STOETT, *N.Tg.* XIII, 97 ff.

Chapter Seven

The Period 1675-1880.

The limits of this period are somewhat vague and arbitrary. There is some justification for taking 1650 as a starting point because, as was stated in the preceding chapter, the study of 17th century Netherlandic has been focused on the first half of the century. The striking difference in usage between the beginning and the end of the century, also mentioned in chapter VI, is another possible reason for a division into two equal halves.

The terminal point chosen is also a rather arbitrary one, but it can be defended. About 1880 a new literary movement started, which led, on the one hand, to a prose impressionism that tended to alienate literary usage from the spoken language, and on the other, to a realism that, much more so than before, made use of the spoken language in writing. This realism gradually narrowed the gap, in the Northern Netherlands, between written Netherlandic with its Southern peculiarities, and spoken Netherlandic. A vindication of the rights of the spoken language may be seen in the attempts made to obtain a spelling reform, attempts which eventually led to the abolition of some orthographical and morphological distinctions that were based on historical differences and were no longer necessary (cf. p. 14).

Moreover, this limit of 1880 has, especially in a book dealing with linguistic activity, the practical advantage that it conforms to the present practice of basing grammatical handbooks on the post-1880 language. And, apart from a few forerunners, the systematic study of dialects, too, does not get under way until after 1880.

There has been little study of the period of Netherlandic we have delimited. It falls between the first half of the 17th century - which has attracted both philological and literary interest - and Modern Netherlandic, which requires a different approach from the historical one. Besides, the period from about 1675 till about 1775 is not of great importance in Netherlandic literature, so that scholars felt little inclined to re-edit works by authors of that time. Moreover, for a modern reader they are relatively easy to understand: works considered to be

attractive to a modern public required no annotation. In anthologies, all that was needed was a few notes to the texts selected.

And so, true linguistic studies are not numerous. G.G. KLOEKE's article on *Haagse volkstaal uit de achttiende eeuw*, *Ts.* LVII, 15 ff, 233, is based on a small dictionary of the Hague dialect, K. HEEROMA's *Goois uit het midden der 18e eeuw*, *N.Tg.* XXXI, 164 ff, on a letter written in the dialect of Het Gooi - a region south-east of Amsterdam -, occurring in the review *De Denker*. C.G.N. DE VOOYS wrote *Opmerkingen over de taal van Justus van Effen's Hollandsche Spectator*, for *N.Tg.* XLIV, 75 ff. The language of individual authors has also been little studied. The works by J.J.B. ELZINGA and H.J. VIEU-KUIK, dealing with French words in the writings of Van Effen and Wolff-Deken, will be mentioned in chapter IX. Of earlier date is the book by A. DE JAGER, *Proeve over den invloed van Bilderdijk's dichtwerken op onze taal* (Leyden, 1847), and even the Bilderdijk-glossary by A. BOGAERS, *Woordenboek op de dichtwerken van Willem Bilderdijk* (Haarlem, 1878), which, in an appendix, gives some peculiarities of Bilderdijk's usage, appeared long before the period covered by this book. Since then, Bilderdijk's language, in some ways original and in any case remarkable, has had little attention paid to it. In the recent edition of his epic *De Ondergang der eerste Wereld* by J. BOSCH (Zwolle, 1959), the linguistic aspect is only presented in explanatory notes in the text. The curious linguistic and grammatical ideas of Bilderdijk himself were discussed in 1906 - the 75th anniversary of his death - by J. TE WINKEL, *Bilderdijk als taalgeleerde*, in the *Gedenkboek*, edited with the authorization of the Bilderdijk-committee (Pretoria-Amsterdam-Potchefstroom, 1906), p. 109 ff, and by A. KLUYVER, who, in the periodical *Onze Eeuw* for the year 1906, published an article entitled *Bilderdijk en de taalwetenschap*. Bilderdijk was not very highly regarded as a philologist, until C.C. DE BRUIN, in *Bilderdijk en de studie van het Middelnederlands*, *N.Tg.* XLVIII, 1 ff, had something more pleasant to say of his activities in the field of Middle Netherlandic.

The life of the learned poet Bilderdijk covers the second half of the 18th, and the first three decades of the 19th century.

An important figure in the Northern Netherlandic literature of the 19th century was E.J. Potgieter, born in 1808, an essayist, poet and novelist with a very individual and quite archaistic style, inspired by the great 17th century classic authors. Jac. SMIT wrote a *Bijdrage*

tot de kennis van Potgieter's stijl (Groningen-Batavia, 1937), to which Miss G.M.J. DUYFHUIZEN made some additions in her edition of Potgieter's poem *Florence* (Santpoort, 1942). In a number of articles written by G.S. OVERDIEP, *O.Tt.* IV, *Over Potgieter's litteraire vormen* (reprinted as a whole in OVERDIEP's *Verzamelde Opstellen* III, 19 ff), several points of syntax are discussed.

The 18th century exhibited a lively interest in grammatical studies. One important linguist was Lambert ten Kate (1674-1731), whom A. VAN DER HOEVEN discussed in his doctoral thesis (The Hague, 1896), *Lambert ten Kate. De 'Gemeenschap tussen de Gottische spraeke en de Nederduytsche' en zijne onuitgegeven geschriften over klankkunde en versbouw*, describing Ten Kate chiefly as a scholar of comparative Germanic. A recent but shorter publication on the same subject is that by T.A. ROMPELMAN, *Lambert ten Kate als germanist* (Amsterdam, 1952). Ten Kate's merits in the field of Netherlandic proper were duly appreciated by C.G.N. DE VOOYS, *De taalbeschouwing van Lambert ten Kate*, *N.Tg.* XVII, 65 ff, reprinted *Verzamelde Taalkundige Opstellen* I, 374 ff.

A philologist of great authority in his day was Balthazar Huydecoper (1695-1778), who aimed at devising strict rules for the written language. This side of his activities was vigorously attacked by R.A. KOLLEWIJN in his article *Een taaldespoot uit de pruiketijd*, for *T. en L.* XVI, 1 ff, reprinted in KOLLEWIJN's *Opstellen over spelling en verbuiging* (³ Groningen, 1916), 159 ff. Huydecoper deserves a more favourable judgment for his studies on Middle Netherlandic, and he is accorded such a judgment in the first two chapters of H. DE BUCK's *De studie van het Middelnederlandsch tot in het midden van de negentiende eeuw* (Groningen-The Hague, 1931). In this book, other 18th century philologists are also discussed, for example Isaac le Long and Frans van Lelyveld. The most important grammarians of the century are dealt with by C.G.N. DE VOOYS in his articles *Achttiende-eeuwse spraakkunstbeschouwing*, in *N.Tg.* XVI, 273 ff, and *Van Ten Kate tot Siegenbeek*, in *N.Tg.* XXII, 12 ff, the former of which has been reprinted in DE VOOYS' *Verzamelde Taalk. Opstellen* I, 354 ff, the latter *ibid.* III, 11 ff. DE VOOYS pays attention to, among others, David van Hoogstraten, whose *Aanmerkingen over de geslachten der Zelfstandige Naamwoorden* first appeared in 1700, and was reprinted several times, after

1723 under the title of *Lijst der gebruikelijkste Zelfstandige Naamwoorden, betekent door hunne geslachten*. This *Geslachtslijst*, which from 1759 onward appeared under the supervision of Adriaan Kluit, was held in great respect throughout the 18th century. A critical discussion of Van Hoogstraten's list is to be found in R.A. KOLLEWIJN's *Opstellen over spelling en verbuiging*, 54 ff. DE VOOYS also deals with the *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst* by Arnold Moonen, first edited in 1706, the *Spraakkunst* by Arnold Séwel, and the works of Adriaan Verwer.

An outline of Moonen's life and work, paying regard also to his philological activities, has been drawn by J. LINDEBOOM, *Arnold Moonen* (Amsterdam, 1958). A study on Verwer as a philologist is that by J.F. VANDERHEYDEN, in *V.M.V.A.* 1957, 617 ff.

Chapter Eight

Modern Netherlandic (since 1880)

1. The position of the standard language

In the introduction we explained how in the 15th century chances were favourable for the Brabant dialect to develop into the supra-provincial standard language, but how in the 16th century, political events changed the situation and gave Holland the leadership among the Seven Provinces. Brabantic influence is to be found in Hollandic texts as early as the later Middle Ages, and in modern times the fabric of written Netherlandic, though based on the Hollandic dialect, still shows traces of a Brabantic weft. This is one of the reasons for the gap between spoken and written Netherlandic, a gap which, however, has been diminishing rapidly during the last few decades. The differences between *Spreektaal en schrijftaal in het Nederlandsch* are discussed in an article published in 1891, but still deserving of study, by J.W. MULLER, *T. en L.* I, 196 ff, reprinted in MULLER's *Verspreide Opstellen* (Haarlem, 1938), 1 ff.

Brabantic influence has also been assumed in some important facets of sound development, especially in the diphthongization of Old Germanic *î* and *û* into *ij* [ɛi] and *ui*. We shall discuss this subject more at length in Chapter XII.

Moreover, as in all civilized countries, the influence in the Netherlands of written and literary language on the spoken language can be shown up to the present day. This is dealt with in some publications such as E. KRUISINGA's *Taal en Maatschappij* (Utrecht, 1909); C.B. VAN HAERINGEN's *Spelling pronunciations in het Nederlands, N.Tg.* XXXI, 97 ff and 152 ff, reprinted in his collection of scattered papers *Neerlandica*, 37 ff; G.G. KLOEKE, *Gezag en norm bij het gebruik van verzorgd Nederlands* (Amsterdam, 1951).

Where lexicology, morphology and syntax are concerned, a rather high degree of uniformity in the usage of educated people has been reached in the Kingdom of the Netherlands. In the case of spoken sounds regional differences do exist, but even here they are steadily diminishing. For the position of Standard spoken Netherlandic in the Northern Netherlands see: C.G.N. DE VOOYS, *Het gezag van een*

Algemeen Beschaafd, N.Tg. VIII, 1 ff and 65 ff, reprinted *Verz. Taalk. Opst.* I, 99 ff; C.B. VAN HAERINGEN, *Eenheid en nuance in beschaafd-nederlandse uitspraak*, N.Tg. XVIII, 65 ff, reprinted *Neerlandica*, 9 ff. The social and individual differences are stressed rather strongly by KLOEKE, in *Gezag en norm*, passim. KLOEKE also dealt with north-eastern peculiarities in *Provincialismen*, in the periodical *Driemaandelijksche Bladen* III, 109 ff.

As we said in Chapter I, Received Netherlandic has not yet, in Flemish Belgium, gained a position equal to that of the other language of the country, French, due to the latter's age-long superiority. Although French and Netherlandic are officially equal - Netherlandic being the language of education and government in the Flemish regions - French is spoken, even in the Flemish parts, by a high proportion of the upper classes; and always and anywhere in Belgium, in a company consisting of Walloons and Flemings, French is the language of conversation. Many Flemings only speak their local dialect or a strongly dialect-coloured Netherlandic, and usually a person speaking correct Received Netherlandic in Flemish Belgium is taken for a 'Hollander'. So, a plea for *Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands in België*, such as was advanced by A. VAN LOEY (Brussels, 1945), certainly has its uses. The social and practical difficulties caused by the monolingual education in the Flemish half of Belgium were described objectively by this author in *Le sort du flamand en Belgique*, in the Swiss periodical *Hesperia*, number 6/7, 1951.

In Flemish Belgium the written language, too, shows many deviations from Northern usage in lexicology and even in syntax. In this respect we must distinguish sharply between intentional dialectisms and generally accepted Southern Netherlandic traits, a difference that was not always duly observed by J.A. DAMAN in his *Het Algemeen Beschaafd in Vlaanderen* (Ghent, 1946): cf. J.L. PAUWELS' essay with the same title in N.Tg. XLII, 21 ff. A danger Netherlandic tends to be exposed to particularly in Belgium is that of literal translations from French. A good many *Gallicismen in het Zuidnederlandsch* have been pointed out by W. DE VREESE (Ghent, 1899). The *Nederlandsche Taalgids*, by Const. H. PEETERS (Antwerp, 1930, 2nd impression 1934), is an attack on 'belgicisms' in general. A concise edition of PEETERS' book was prepared by Paul VAN GESTEL, *ABN-Gids* (Antwerp, 1949), 'ABN' being the abbreviation of 'Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands', i.e. 'Common Civilized Netherlandic'. The

periodical *Nu Nog*, published by the enterprising 'Vereniging voor Beschaafde Omgangstaal (V.B.O.)', appears every two months in one printed sheet and gives regular information about pure and correct usage.

2. Grammatical handbooks and monographs

There is, and it is not true of the Netherlands alone, a remarkable uncertainty as to the methods to be used in the composition of a synchronic grammar of modern language. We are relatively well equipped with handbooks of historical grammar, and also with grammars of Middle Netherlandic, at least as far as phonology and morphology are concerned, but in the case of the grammatical description of Modern Netherlandic we cannot say we have found our bearings.

Historical linguists used, as a rule, to regard grammar as being in a state of constant movement and change, and the situation of the present was looked upon and described as resulting from the past. In so doing, scholars ran the risk of projecting an earlier grammatical stage into the present, while on the other hand they tended to undervalue the static and normative side of grammar. The new, so-called structural trend in linguistics, aiming at considering the present exclusively from the viewpoint of the present, has not as yet led to a really synchronic grammar of Modern Netherlandic being written. So far we have only seen some interesting attempts to treat separate parts of grammar. There is still a good deal of uncertainty and divergence of opinion about the basic principles, and even about such a fundamental question as what belongs to grammar and what does not. The dividing line between morphology and syntax remains a source of difficulties for grammatical praxis. Serious reflections on grammatical principles were given by M.J. LANGEVELD, *Taal en Denken* (Groningen, 1934).

We possess a venerable piece of work from an older period in *De Nederlandsche Taal* by C.H. DEN HERTOOG (2 vols, 2nd edition by H.J. DEN HERTOOG, Amsterdam, 1903-05), a book that still deservedly enjoys great authority. Larger in scope, and intended as a grammar for University students, was DEN HERTOOG's unfinished *Nederlandsche Spraakkunst*, of which 3 volumes appeared (2nd edition by H.J. DEN HERTOOG, Amsterdam, 1903). One of the objections raised by the younger generation against DEN HERTOOG, was that the author used the regulated written language for his working material,

and did not do justice to the spoken language, which, especially in the Northern Netherlands, has its own characteristics. However much we may agree with this objection, we have to admit that DEN HERTOOG, in his clear, profound and richly documented expositions, was an observer and analyser of the first order. In all that has appeared since DEN HERTOOG, numerous points of grammar, especially of syntax, are passed over in silence even though they had been dealt with by DEN HERTOOG.

De Nederlandsche Taal by N. VAN WIJK appeared first in 1906, and to the later editions the name of W. VAN SCHOTHORST was added (6th edition, Zwolle, 1931). The book was meant as a grammar for secondary schools, but it deserves mention here because, in the absence of a grammar designed for the use in Universities, it has served other purposes as well and because, owing to its original approach, it marks a new stage in the description of Modern Netherlandic. The book can be characterized most simply as a Netherlandic grammar inspired by PAUL's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*.

The *Handboek der Nederlandsche Taal* by J. VAN GINNEKEN was planned as a large scale work, but was never completed: only two parts appeared (Nimeguen, 1910-11), Part I was reprinted almost unchanged (Bois-le-Duc, 1928). We do not know whether the book was going to contain a grammar in the strict sense, the existing volumes deal with dialects and the usage of several social groups, and the whole is illustrated by texts and word-lists.

The *Moderne Nederlandsche Grammatica* by G.S. OVERDIEP (Zwolle, 1928) was, like VAN WIJK's book, intended for secondary schools, but turned out to be too 'difficult' for that purpose. The recast *Stilistische Grammatica van het moderne Nederlandsch* (Zwolle, 1937, reprint with a few alterations by G.A. VAN ES, 1949) presents itself as a grammar for University students. Its combination of stylistics and grammar - though not unimpeachable as regards method - makes it a very remarkable book, of new and attractive design. A serious drawback, however, is its preponderance of syntax and stylistics over the form-element. Furthermore, we meet the reverse side of the author's very personal and lively way of presenting things in his weakness for enlarging on certain points that have his interest, while others receive relatively scant attention. A clear and interesting exposition and defence of OVERDIEP's principles and their practical application in grammatical research has been given by VAN ES in *Ts*.

LXX, 207 ff: *Principes en toepassing van de stilistische grammatica*.

The authoritative *Nederlandse Spraakkunst* by C.G.N DE VOOYS, in collaboration with M. SCHÖNFELD (4th revised edition by SCHÖNFELD, Groningen-Djakarta, 1957), is based on a series of lectures on historical grammar, and is consequently arranged historically: grammatical facts are traced back to Middle Netherlandic. The book is very clear in exposition and systematic in structure, but the purely synchronic approach is deliberately rejected. One is inclined to judge DE VOOYS' syntax, in which he applies a synchronical standard, the best part of the book, as there its historical character is less evident. Rather peculiar and contestable as regards method is DE VOOYS' insertion of a section on semantics and semantic changes into his grammar.

A remarkable attempt at writing a grammar on strictly synchronical principles is the *Structurele Syntaxis* by A.W. DE GROOT (The Hague, 1949) which, in spite of its general linguistic tendencies, may be looked upon as a Netherlandic syntax. This original and exciting book, containing many debatable points, but always provoking, demonstrates clearly that we are still seeking our bearings in grammar.

Het Nederlands van nu by the Anglicist E. KRUISINGA (Amsterdam, 1938) was not planned as a systematic grammar, but contains original and accurate observations, designed to provide laymen with some commonsense ideas about their mother tongue. In the new edition by H. GODTHELP (1951) the book has been enlarged and has somewhat changed in character. KRUISINGA's *A Grammar of Modern Dutch* (London, 1924) was written for Englishmen desiring a practical knowledge of Netherlandic.

B. VAN DEN BERG's *Beknopte Nederlandse Spraakkunst* (2nd edition, The Hague, 1957), though in the first place written for secondary schools, deserves mention here as an application of the author's grammatical views, which he had already expounded in a number of short articles, most of them to be found in the *N.Tg.* Some of these articles will be referred to in this chapter, under 3 e.

P.C. PAARDEKOOPER, who is of the opinion that grammatical synthesis can only result from a scrupulous observation and an exact formulation of details, has dealt with some aspects of grammar in a series of short articles in the *N.Tg.* In *Syntaxis, Spraakkunst en Taalkunde* (Bois-le-Duc, 1956), the first 13 chapters of which are identical with his doctoral thesis *Syntactische Verkenningen* (1955), he has set forth, and applied, his grammatical principles, in his own rather abstract

and theoretical manner which does not contribute to the readability of the book. This work, which was looked upon by the author as a preparatory study for the 'ABN'-grammar, has been continued in *ABN-Spraakunst. Voorstudies. Tweede deel* (Bois-le-Duc, 1958).

H.F.A. VAN DER LUBBE's *Woordvolgorde in het Nederlands* (Assen, 1958) is an important contribution to modern syntax. The author's method, like DE GROOT's and PAARDEKOOPER's, is strictly synchronic, though he clearly dissociates himself from the views of the other two scholars.

3. Aspects of Grammar

a. Sounds.

Handbooks of phonetics.

For quite a long time, the need was felt of an adequate phonetical description of Modern Netherlandic. P. ROORDA, in his book *De klankleer en haar praktische toepassing* (6th edition, Groningen-The Hague, 1927), gave general considerations of phonetics and a phonetical appreciation of sound changes, which take up a large portion of the book; his treatment of the phonetic peculiarities of Netherlandic itself is rather concise.

The large *Leerboek der Phonetiek* by H. ZWAARDEMAKER and L.P.H. EIJKMAN (Haarlem, 1928) supplied the long-felt want, although ZWAARDEMAKER's share, the instrumental aspect, is not particularly attractive to the average linguist, and rather detracts from its merits as a handbook of linguistic studies. The more concise *Phonetiek van het Nederlands* (Haarlem, 1937), written by EIJKMAN alone, is purely 'linguistic', accurate and very detailed in its description of Netherlandic sounds. The new edition by M. KNOOP (Haarlem, 1955) is practically unchanged, but contains many serious misprints.

A short but matterful and highly individual introduction to both phonetics and phonemics is B. VAN DEN BERG's *Foniek van het Nederlands* (The Hague, 1958).

The *Praktische Uitspraakleer van de Nederlandse taal* by E. BLANCQUAERT (5th edition, Antwerp, 1955), an important contribution to general phonetics, which gave evidence of an acute and unbiased observation of Netherlandic pronunciation, was in the first place designed to help Southern Netherlandic readers to get rid of their dialectal phonetic habits.

Special Phonetic Subjects; Monographs.

In the present survey, the instrumental aspect of phonetics will not be given much attention. L.P.H. EIJKMAN has worked in this field: several publications from his hand are mentioned in the bibliography at the end of his *Phonetiek van het Nederlands*. Louise KAISER, who was one of the editors of the *Archives Néerlandaises de Phonétique Expérimentale*, published a *Biological and Statistical Research concerning the Speech of 216 Dutch students* in vols XV and XIX of that periodical. Her *Phonotypologische beschrijving van de spraak der Wieringermeerbevolking* (2 vols, Amsterdam, 1940-49) was published separately. The Wieringermeer was the first of the great polders reclaimed from the former Zuyder Zee, and its population was recruited from different parts of the country. Miss KAISER's *Phonetiek* (The Hague, 1950) is a general physiological introduction to speech formation, with some short discussions of Modern Netherlandic sounds.

The characteristic Netherlandic assimilation of voiced and voiceless consonants was studied by L.P.H. EIJKMAN, see *N.Tg.* XXVII, 315 ff, and the contents of his article provided the basis for his *Phonetiek*. Forms of assimilation have been recorded with the aid of instruments under the supervision of Miss Louise KAISER; the results were published in *O.Tt.* VIII, 97 ff and *Album Edgard Blancquaert* (Tongres, 1958), 31 ff.

A much disputed point of Netherlandic phonetics is the organic difference between *v* and *w*, both being - at least in Northern Netherlandic - labio-dental consonants, but phonetically clearly distinct. A short review by C.B. VAN HAERINGEN of the various opinions on this subject appears in *N.Tg.* XXXVIII, 238 ff.

Another interesting point is the decline of the difference between two short *o*-sounds, as in *dof* as distinct from *pot*, a difference of phonematic value, though functionally not very important, preserved by the older generations, and by the younger in so far as they come from the eastern parts of the country. Miss Branco VAN DANTZIG, teacher of elocution, reviewed the state of affairs in *De korte o-klanken van het Nederlandsch* (Groningen, 1940), pleading for a preservation of this difference in cultivated speech.

Some aspects of the history of sounds that have been dealt with in the last few decades will be mentioned in Chapter XIII.

Phonemics.

A.W. DE GROOT gave a basic introduction to Netherlandic phonemics in his article *De wetten der phonologie en hun betekenis voor de studie van het Nederlands*, *N.Tg.* XXV, 225 ff, with a supplement, *ibid.* 298 ff. J. VAN GINNEKEN applied the phonematic treatment of the sound system to Netherlandic, in two articles, *De phonologie van het algemeen Nederlandsch* and *Het phonologisch systeem van het algemeen Nederlandsch*, for *O.Tt.* II, 321 ff and 353 ff. N. VAN WIJK's *Phonologie* (The Hague, 1939), subtitled 'een hoofdstuk uit de structurele taalwetenschap', is an essay on phonemics in general, containing many phonematic particulars of Netherlandic, from which language most of the examples were taken. We are promised a revision of this book, an outstanding one in its day, by A. REICHLING, but it has not, so far, appeared. More recent phonematic publications have been worked into VAN DEN BERG's concise *Foniek*, mentioned above. [The latest work in this field is *Fonologie van het Nederlands en het Fries* by A. COHEN, C.L. EBELING, P. ERINGA, K. FOKKEMA and A.G.F. VAN HOLK (The Hague, 1959).] Separate aspects of phonemics were treated by, among others, P.C. PAARDEKOOPEL, *De lettergreep en z'n begrenzing*, *N.Tg.* XLII, 232 ff and 290 ff, *De foneemwaarde van de svarabhaktivocaaal*, *N.Tg.* XLII, 74 ff. E. KRUISINGA, though not an orthodox practiser of the 'phonematic' discipline, ought to be mentioned here for his articles *Begin en Eind van Nederlandse Woorden*, *T. en Lev.* II, 65 ff, dealing with syllable structure in Modern Netherlandic, and *De Medeklinkers in de Bouw van onze Woorden*, *ibid.* III, 92 ff. In these two essays he restricts himself to stems. In a third article, *De Fonetiese tegenstelling tussen onze Stamwoorden en de Verbogen, Afgeleide en Samengestelde* (for *T. en L.* IV, 161 ff), he discusses consonant groups at the junction of stems and flexion endings or derivative suffixes. VAN GINNEKEN's article *De Nederlandsche consonantgroepen*, in *O.Tt.* VII, 33 ff, is restricted to what KRUISINGA would call stems.

b. Stress. Intonation.

Since the useful book by J.H. GAARENSTROOM, *De klemtoon in de Nederlandse taal* (Culemborg, 1897), no comprehensive monograph on word stress has appeared. The characteristic shift of stress in place names and street names was treated by J. SCHRIJNEN, in *N.Tg.* X, 142 ff and XI, 19 ff, the latter article being a reply to objections made

by Z. STOKVIS and A.S. BIJL in *N.Tg.* X, 288 ff. Shifting of stress in polysyllabic words, especially in compounds and derivatives, is a related phenomenon in Netherlandic. This subject was discussed by K. HEEROMA in *Klemverschuiving bij samengestelde woorden*, *N.Tg.* XLII, 65 ff and by B.H. ERNÉ in *Eenheidsklemtoon in samenstellingen*, *N.Tg.* XLII, 140 ff. B. VAN DEN BERG, in *De accentuatie van Nederlandse samenstellingen en afleidingen*, *N.Tg.* XLVI, 254 ff, tries to evaluate word stress in compounds and derivatives as a means to expressing functional opposition.

L.J. GUITTART's *De Intonatie van het Nederlands, met inbegrip van een Vergelijking met de Engelse Intonatie* (Utrecht, 1925), is a first attempt at a systematic treatment of sentence stress. Else and Willem PÉE compared Northern and Southern Netherlandic sentence stress in their *Beitrag zum Studium der niederländischen Intonation*, printed in vols VII and VIII of *Archives Néerlandaises de Phonétique Expérimentale*.

A.W. DE GROOT discussed *De Nederlandse zinsintonatie in het licht der structurele taalkunde* in *N.Tg.* XXXVII (special number dedicated to DE VOOYS), 30 ff. In his *Structurele Syntaxis*, which we mentioned before, DE GROOT also pays much attention to sentence stress. Finally, there is a short monograph by G. ROYEN, entitled *Intonatie en grammatische functie in het Nederlands* (Amsterdam, 1952).

c. Morphology.

We will mention here some publications, of which the greater part have a historical approach and may not be considered strictly synchronic, but as the accent in them is on Modern Netherlandic, we feel justified in discussing them in this chapter.

One point of morphology is the peculiar conflicts occurring especially in Northern Netherlandic written language with old case-endings and personal and possessive pronouns like *hij*, *zij*, *haar* and *zijn*. These conflicts arise from the fact that the written language preserves, or at any rate tries to preserve, the tradition of three genders and the corresponding use of personal and possessive pronouns, whereas spoken Northern Netherlandic actually has no more than two genders, namely the old neuter, and a 'common' gender, resulting from the merging of the former masculine and feminine genders. The pronominal difficulties become still more complicated by the fact that in references to names of persons the difference of sex is strictly observed in the

use of personal and possessive pronouns. The layman mixing up the notions of gender and sex falls a victim to curious derailments in writing. These 'pronominal problems' have repeatedly been dealt with by G. ROYEN, in a number of entertaining articles, such as *De kerfstok van de term 'geslacht'*, *N.Tg.* XXIII, 180 ff; *Haar-kultuur*, *N.Tg.* XXVII, 298 ff; *Aanwas van hij c.s.*, *N.Tg.* XXVIII, 33 ff; *Seksualisering en seksualitis*, *N.Tg.* XXVIII, 206 ff, and others, all of them based on adroitly grouped cuttings from newspapers and weeklies. Books by the same author are *Pronominale problemen in het Nederlands* (Tilburg, 1935); *Grammatiese kategorieën bij het naamwoord* (Amsterdam, 1936); *Bijgedachten en botsingen in taal* (Boisle-Duc, 1939). C.B. VAN HAERINGEN investigated the relation between gender and sex in spoken Northern Netherlandic, in his *Genus en Geslacht* (Amsterdam, 1954), stressing the marked difference in matters of gender between this language on the one hand and Southern Netherlandic and the written language on the other. A wider field is covered by ROYEN's great work *Buigingsverschijnselen in het Nederlands* (4 vols, Amsterdam, 1947-48-52-54).

De meervoudsvorming in het Nederlands has been discussed by C.B. VAN HAERINGEN (Amsterdam, 1947, reprinted in the collected papers *Neerlandica*, 186 ff). The same author attempted a strictly synchronic treatment of *De hoofdvormen van het nederlandse werkwoord*, *N.Tg.* XLIII, 20 ff.

K. HEEROMA wrote about numerals in *N.Tg.* XLI, 242 ff, to which D.C. TINBERGEN, *N.Tg.* XLII, 65 ff made some corrections and additions.

d. Word formation.

The important and original study by W. DE VRIES, *Iets over woordvorming*, was published as a 'treatise included in the programme of the municipal grammar-school of Groningen' for the years 1920-21 and 1921-22, and for that reason it is very scarce and hard to come by. In it, DE VRIES discusses points of Standard Netherlandic, and also several phenomena of his mother tongue, the dialect of the province of Groningen. The thorough and critically written doctoral thesis of Jacoba H. VAN LESSEN, *Samengestelde naamwoorden in het Nederlandsch* (Groningen, 1928) is based on historical principles, but also uses much material from Modern Netherlandic.

In addition to these monographs, many short articles on details of

word formation have appeared, only a few of which can be mentioned here.

The type of verbal compounds, of the *knarsetanden*, *knikkebollen* kind, consisting of a verbal stem plus the name of a part of the body, is placed in a historical perspective by J. VAN GINNEKEN, *O.Tt.* VIII, 132 ff. On compounds originating from a desire for conciseness see G.S. OVERDIEP's article in *O.Tt.* I, 363 ff, reprinted *Verzamelde Opstellen* II, 241 ff. The same tendency in the formation of verbs is discussed by W. DE VRIES in *Invloed van neiging tot beknoptheid op vorming en betekenis van verba*, *N.Tg.* XIX, 82 ff. On compounds of the *groothandel*, *sneltrain* type, see W.H. STAVERMAN, *N.Tg.* XXXIII, 29 ff.

For prefixes and suffixes we have in the first place the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*, where these elements of word formation are generally treated under separate heads. Further, on *-loos*: D.C. HESSELING, *N.Tg.* II, 249 ff; on the unvoicing of consonants before the suffixes *-lijk*, *-loos* and *-nis*: G. ROYEN, *T. en L.* V, 49 ff and VI, 10 ff; on *-schap*: E.E.J. MESSING, *Neophilologus* II, 185 ff, 272 ff; on the conditions for the use of *-aar* or *-er*: C.B. VAN HAERINGEN, *N.Tg.* XLIV, 260 ff. The lengthy discussion on the origin of the suffixes in diminutives will be reviewed in Chapter XIII. For the stylistic and affective value of the diminutives, and also for their form we possess a treatise by E. KRUISINGA, *Diminutieve en Affektieve Suffixen in de Germaanse Talen* (Amsterdam, 1942), chiefly dealing with Netherlandic, but also with other Germanic languages, notably English. Other articles are those by William Z. SHETTER, *The Dutch diminutive*, published in *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* LVIII, 75 ff, in which lucid summary he stresses the semantic aspect; A. COHEN, who provides what he calls 'een morfonologische proeve' in *Het Nederlands diminutiefsuffix*, *N.Tg.* LI, 40 ff; and a short one by L.C. MICHELS on *Woordwording van affixen*, *N.Tg.* L, 79 ff.

e. Syntax. Stylistics.

When we enter the field of Netherlandic syntactical studies, the first name that springs to mind is that of G.S. OVERDIEP. His two articles *De studie der Nederlandsche Syntaxis*, *N.Tg.* XIX, 182 ff (*Verz. Opst.* II, 5 ff) and *De stilistische methode in de Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde* (Groningen, 1929, *Verz. Opst.* II, 23 ff), both

originally lectures, are in essence programmes for historical and synchronic syntactical research. His *Over het Nederlandsche participium praesentis*, Ts. XXXVI, 198 ff and XLIV, 119 ff (*Verz. Opst.* II, 126 ff) is based on the literary language of recent times. *Over woordschikking in modern proza* (Leyden, 1927) takes its examples from the impressionist author Jacobus van Loo (1855-1930) and from Augusta de Wit (1864-1939), whose style is of a rather classic simplicity. Shorter syntactic essays by OVERDIEP appeared mostly in *Onze Taaltuin*, and were reprinted in the 2nd volume of his *Verzamelde Opstellen*.

F. JANSONIUS brought out *Over woord en zin in het proza van L. van Deysse* (Assen, 1942). L. van Deysse, pseudonym of K.J.L. Alberdingk Thijm, was in some of his prose works an extreme impressionist. The stylistic research of impressionist literature continued to occupy JANSONIUS, who aired his views in *De beeldende omschrijving*, N.Tg. XLI, 193 ff; *Jacques Perk als impressionist*, N.Tg. XLII, 134 ff; *Impressionistische taal- en stijlvormen*, N.Tg. XLVI, 86ff; *Impressionistische en andere aspecten van Mei*, N.Tg. LII, 157ff.

A highly individual work, full of accurate observations, but weak in composition, is W. DE VRIES' *Dysmelie; opmerkingen over syntaxis*, dealing with deviations from the normal sentence pattern in colloquial language. The term 'dysmelie' was coined by DE VRIES, and may be translated as 'mis-speech'. Not long before he had treated similar colloquial phenomena in an article *Opmerkingen over Nederlandsche syntaxis*, Ts. XXIX, 122 ff, where he called them 'usurpations'. Another syntactic publication by W. DE VRIES is *De typen der mededeeling*, included in the programme of the Groningen grammar school for 1914-15. His *Dysmelie* appeared in the programme for 1910-11, so that both these important publications had, like his *Woordvorming*, a regrettably ephemeral existence, and never really found their way into the bookshops. DE VRIES' *Opmerkingen over ontleding*, N.Tg. XVI, 19 ff, is also of chiefly syntactic value.

Comparable with DE VRIES' *Dysmelie*, to a certain extent, is Miss B.J. UIJLINGS' doctoral thesis *Syntactische verschijnselen bij onvoorbereid spreken*, which appeared for sale under the title *Praat op heterdaad* (Assen, 1956); the material for this study was taken from taperecordings of fragments of spontaneous speech.

Joh. HEEMSTRA, in his doctoral thesis *Ueber den Gebrauch der attributiven Partizipialkonstruktionen in der niederländischen und hoch-*

deutschen Prosa (Haarlem, 1925), which we mentioned in Chapter IV, took part of his material from modern prose-writers. H. ANNEMA, *Die sogenannten absoluten Partizipialkonstruktionen im Neuhochdeutschen* (Groningen, 1924), also pays attention to such constructions in Netherlandic.

A short article by J. VAN ALPHEN, *N. Tg.* VIII, 86 ff, deals with *De vraagzin*. The interrogative sentence and its intonation is also dealt with by C.F.P. STUTTERHEIM, *N. Tg.* XLVI, 129 ff, with general reflections on the grammatical value of intonation. These and other questions were touched on by C.B. VAN HAERINGEN in his lecture *Vragen over de Vraag* (Utrecht, 1958).

One of the 'usurpations' discussed in W. DE VRIES' above-mentioned article *Opmerkingen over Nederlandsche syntaxis*, was the conversion of a 'dative' into the subject of a passive sentence (*Ik word opengedaan*). The same point was treated by J. KOOISTRA in *Twee Hollands-Engelse parallellen in de syntaxis*, *N. Tg.* XIII, 183 ff, and this elicited a reply from DE VRIES, *ibid.*, 251 ff, to which KOOISTRA in his turn replied *ibid.*, 304 ff. E. WELLANDER reverted to this matter in his article *Over den datief als subject van een passieve constructie*, *N. Tg.* XIV, 291 ff. Recently, G. ROYEN discussed these and similar *Passieve wendingen* in his above-mentioned *Buigingsverschijnselen* III, I, 110 ff, with copious quotations. *Over ongemotiveerde inversie* (the placing of the subject after the finite verb without preceding adjunct or other part of the sentence) is the title of an article by A.C. BOUMAN in *N. Tg.* XVI, 65 ff.

B. VAN DEN BERG, *N. Tg.* XLII, 120 ff and 205 ff, wrote on *De zinsbouw in het Nederlands*, in which he deals especially with the practice of separating parts of a sentence that logically belong together, called 'tangconstructies' by C.B. VAN HAERINGEN in *N. Tg.* XLI, 1 ff. This way of building up a sentence is considered typically Netherlandic by VAN DEN BERG. A new approach to sentence analysis was suggested by VAN DEN BERG in his article *Sanering van de zinsontleding*, *N. Tg.* L, 19 ff (comment by Th. VINDEVOGEL, *N. Tg.* LI, 269 ff, reply by VAN DEN BERG, *N. Tg.* LII, 36 ff).

The small, useful book by J.L. PAUWELS, *Les difficultés de la construction de la phrase néerlandaise* (5th edition, Liege, 1959), was inspired by practical experience in teaching Netherlandic to Walloon students.

The subtleties in the use of the particle *er* in Netherlandic have been

admirably discussed by the Danish scholar GUNNAR BECH, *Ueber das niederländische Adverbialpronomen er* (*Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague*, Vol. VIII, Copenhagen and Amsterdam, 1952).

W. KRAMER's *Inleiding tot de stilistische interpretatie van literaire kunst* (³, Groningen-Djakarta, 1950), as the title implies, serves mainly aesthetic aims, but does not neglect 'fonetische, morfologische en syntactische waarden' (22 ff), 'zinsritme en zinsbouw' (36 ff). Of KRAMER's *Litterair-stilistische studiën* (Groningen-Djakarta, 1950) may be mentioned *Syntactische verschijnselen in het lyrische vers*, a reprint of the article with the same title in *N.Tg.* XLI, 261 ff.

Grammar and stylistics are strictly delimited in their mutual relationship by W. Gs. HELLINGA, who regards stylistics as the analysis of grammatical elements in so far as they are activated by, and applied to, what he calls the 'taal-situatie'. HELLINGA's principles and methods were briefly outlined in his inaugural address *De Neerlandicus als taalkundige* (Amsterdam, 1946); an expanded version, with examples of their application, is found in W. Gs. HELLINGA and H. VAN DER MERWE SCHOLTZ, *Kreatiewe Analise van taalgebruik* (Amsterdam-Pretoria, 1955). HELLINGA's article *Taal en tekst* in *Museum* LXIII (1958), 1 ff may also be looked upon as a sort of programme. The principles were applied in H. VAN DER MERWE SCHOLTZ' doctoral dissertation *Sistematiese verslag van 'n stilistiese analise* (Amsterdam-Cape Town-Pretoria, 1950), where the stylistic analysis and evaluation of one short poem (by the South African poet Eugène Marais) takes up a whole book. A similar operation was performed by Elisabeth LINDES in *Veelheid en Binding* (Amsterdam, 1955), also on a South African poem. Another work from HELLINGA's school is the thesis by F. LULOFS, *Verkenning door Varianten* (The Hague, 1955), a stylistic examination of Martinus Nijhoff's poem *Het uur U*. The subject of C.J.M. NIENABER's book, originally a Pretoria thesis, *Die Taal as Tolk* (Pietermaritzburg-Durban, 1956), appears from the subtitle, *'n Stilistiese analise van Elisabeth Eybers se Maria*.

HELLINGA's linguistic approach to poetry, though highly interesting as a carefully thought-out system of putting literary criticism and evaluation on a rational basis, cannot really be considered completely convincing; its application involves the risk of over-interpretation. The 'linguistic-stylistic' method of evaluation has met with a fair amount

of approval, but also with serious opposition, so far mostly from South African scholars.

A linguistic approach to stylistics in general, and to prosody in particular, is to be found in several articles by A.W. DE GROOT, such as *Naar een nieuwe versleer*, *N.Tg.* XXVI, 241 ff; *Vers, voordracht, muziek*, *N.Tg.* XXIX, 49 ff; *De structuur van het vers*, *N.Tg.* XXX, 197 ff; *De Rhythmus*, *Neophil.* XVII, 81 ff, 177 ff, 241 ff, and finally in a synthesis *Algemene Versleer* (The Hague, 1946). Another scholar who studies stylistics and prosody from a structural linguistic standpoint is C.F.P. STUTTERHEIM, who wrote a useful compendium *Stijlleer* (The Hague, 1947). M. RUTTEN, in his article *Dichtkunde en phonologie* (*Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* XXVIII, 871 ff), discusses the views of DE GROOT and STUTTERHEIM, and endeavours to give a specimen of 'word-phonemic analysis of verse', worth attention as a serious, though not in every detail convincing, attempt at a purely linguistic analysis of poetry.

f. Children's language.

Children's language can be looked upon as grammar in statu nascendi. Studies on this subject, covering all fields of grammar, therefore have their place here.

The very remarkable *Roman van een kleuter* by J. VAN GINNEKEN (Nimeguen, 1917), intended as a grammar for secondary schools, but certainly a failure as such, gives a lively, fascinating description of the growth of speech in the first years of life, based on accurate notes made by a mother. Fr. S. ROMBOUTS elaborated the data of the *Roman* in his *De psychologie der kleutertaal* (Nimeguen, 1918).

C.G.N. DE VOOYS wrote *Iets over woordvorming en woordbetekenis in kindertaal*, *N.Tg.* XI, 209 ff and 273 ff (reprinted *Verz. Taalk. Opst.* II, 373 ff), using as a basis his own children's speech when they were a little older than 'Keesje' in VAN GINNEKEN's *Roman*. D.C. TINBERGEN, in his article '*Kinderpraat*', *N.Tg.* XIII, 1 ff and 65 ff, tells about a child of about the same age as 'Keesje', and compares the linguistic behaviour of his 'test object' with that of VAN GINNEKEN's.

W. KAPER's *Kindersprachforschung mit Hilfe des Kindes* (Groningen, 1959) first appeared as an Amsterdam doctoral thesis entitled *Einige Erscheinungen der kindlichen Spracherwerbung erläutert im Lichte des vom Kinde gezeigten Interesses für Sprachliches*, which

was added as a subtitle to the public edition. The book is based on detailed observation of the author's own children; it is, bearing in mind the limitation implied by its subtitle, an interesting contribution to the study of children's language in general and to Netherlandic children's language in particular.

Chapter Nine

Netherlandic and Foreign Languages

Ever since the earliest written tradition, and continuing up to our days, Netherlandic has shown the very strong influence of F r e n c h . The standard work on this influence is that by J.J. SALVERDA DE GRAVE, *De Franse woorden in het Nederlands* (Amsterdam, 1906), to which J.J.B. ELZINGA made an alphabetical word index (Amsterdam, 1920). SALVERDA DE GRAVE classifies the loanwords according to the semantic and social spheres they belong to, thus giving a picture of the way in which French culture and education have influenced Netherlandic. As for the purely grammatical side, he chiefly restricts himself to the phonology and morphology of the words borrowed, since he is, somewhat rashly, of the opinion that syntactical influence by a foreign language is impossible or at any rate negligible. In an earlier publication, *Essai sur quelques groupes de mots empruntés par le néerlandais au latin écrit* (Amsterdam, 1900), SALVERDA had discussed the formal criteria for distinguishing Latin loanwords from French ones. In a more concise and popular form he dealt with *L'influence de la langue française en Hollande d'après les mots empruntés* (Paris, 1913), an elaboration of a series of lectures he gave in the Université de Paris. SALVERDA DE GRAVE also devoted a special study to *Franse woorden uit de achttiende en negentiende eeuw*, *N.Tg.* XXVIII, 289 ff, XXIX, 295 ff, XXX, 149 ff, in which he paid special attention to the semantic groups and the social circles in which French loanwords entered Netherlandic in the 18th and 19th century.

In SALVERDA's works, Netherlandic, as far as the later centuries are concerned, is almost exclusively Northern Netherlandic. The more complicated situation in Flemish Belgium, with French dominant among the upper classes, even now accentuates the influence of French on Netherlandic. In the first part of Chapter VIII we mentioned some publications whose authors made their stand against gallicisms in Southern Netherlandic.

J.W. MULLER in his article *Over ware en schijnbare gallicismen in het Middelnederlandsch*, *N.Tg.* XIV, 1 ff and 65 ff, which we mentioned in Chapter IV, pays attention to syntactical influences also, as

SALVERDA DE GRAVE had not. EMIL OEHMANN wrote on *Die mittelniederländische Lehnprägung nach altfranzösischem Vorbild* in the Finnish periodical *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 1953, 144 ff, and in the Swedish *Studia Neophilologica* XXIX, 3 ff.

J.J.B. ELZINGA composed a study *Les mots français et les gallicismes dans le Hollandsche Spectator de Justus van Effen* (Leyden, 1923): Justus van Effen, in his periodical *De Hollandsche Spectator* 1731-35, gave specimens of spoken language in different social circles, especially the higher ones. In the last decades of the 18th century falls the activity of the novelists Mrs. Betje Wolff and Miss Aagje Deken, who in their novels, written in epistolary form, convey a good idea of the natural, educated language of their day. The French words in their letters were the subject of an article by C.G.N. DE VOOYS in *Mélanges Salverda de Grave* (Groningen-The Hague-Batavia, 1933), 365 ff. A study of wider scope is the doctoral thesis by H.J. VIEU-KUIK, *Het gebruik van Franse woorden door Wolff en Deken*, where loanwords are considered as signposts in social history. The first part (Arnhem, 1951) deals with 'words referring to man in the relation to his fellow-men', the second (Arnhem, n.d. [1957]) with 'words defining man in his religious, intellectual and cultural development'.

C.B. VAN HAERINGEN, in *Herverfransing* (Amsterdam, 1957), shows the continuing influence of French, manifesting itself in the phonetic 're-French-ification' of words that had been more or less adapted to the Netherlandic sound system.

The influence of German on Netherlandic is to be perceived, not so much in words directly borrowed from German and recognizable as 'foreign', as in peculiarities of word formation and semantic nuance where Netherlandic follows or imitates German in a way contrary to its own idiom, the so-called germanisms. As the two languages are so closely related, criteria for germanisms are often doubtful, and throughout the campaign that has been conducted since the beginning of the 19th century against the corruption of our language by these impurities, an exaggerated fear of imitation has often manifested itself. Certain types of word formation and derivation, usual in Netherlandic as well as in German, were sometimes rejected because German had employed them first. Hypersensitivity on this point was the cause of a large number of publications being written by all sorts of people, in period-

icals and newspapers. Most of these publications we shall have to leave out of consideration. A lucid survey of the varying opinions held in the 19th and 20th centuries is to be found in C.G.N. DE VOOYS' *Duitse invloed op de Nederlandse woordvoorraad* (Amsterdam, 1946), in the 5th chapter; the preceding chapters trace the German influence in earlier periods. A preparatory study was the lecture which DE VOOYS delivered in the Amsterdam Academy of Sciences, *Nedersaksische en Hoogduitse invloeden op de Nederlandse woordvoorraad* (Amsterdam, 1936). DE VOOYS' attitude towards germanisms is moderate and well thought-out, even in his earlier publication *Hoe zijn germanismen te beschouwen?*, which he wrote under the pseudonym K. VEENENBOS for the *N.Tg.* III, 190 ff and 225 ff, and which was reprinted under his own name, with the title *Duitse invloed op het Nederlands*, in *Verz. Taalk. Opst.* II, 39 ff.

A. MOORTGAT's *Germanismen in het Nederlandsch* (Ghent, 1925) was a prize-winning essay; the prize had been offered for a counterpart to W. DE VREESE's *Galicismen in het Zuidnederlandsch*, the period of investigation being restricted to that after 1880. The book deals chiefly with Southern Netherlandic.

An inquiry into the influence of German on professional language was made by J. LEEST in his doctoral thesis *Duitsche invloed op het Nederlandsch der Protestantsche theologen sedert het begin der 19e eeuw* (Groningen-The Hague, 1929). G. KLOEKE, in *Ts.* LXXV, 81 ff, points out transpositions of German words into Netherlandic through bible translations.

On the attitude to be taken by Netherlandic towards foreign influence in general, the studies by C.G.N. DE VOOYS, *Purisme* (*Verz. Taalk. Opst.* II, 3 ff) and by G. ROYEN, *Ongaaf Nederlands* ('Unsound Netherlandic'; 3rd edition, Amsterdam, 1946) are of importance. Many original remarks on this subject are to be found in an essay by W. DE VRIES, *Het oneigene*, a private publication, undated (1925).

We ought to mention here, for the sake of balance, the Berlin thesis by Gerd LABROISSE, *Zum Charakter der niederländischen und deutschen Hochsprache* (1956). This book, called a *Studie zur Eigenständigkeit des Niederländischen* by the author, was never printed, but appeared in a small number of stencilled copies. For a survey of its contents see C.B. VAN HAERINGEN, *N.Tg.* L, 96 ff.

The influence of English is first observable in the 18th century, it increases steadily in the 19th century, and has become stronger than ever before since 1945. The first study that deserves mentioning in this connection is that by W. DE HOOG, *Studiën over de Nederlandsche en Engelsche Taal en Letterkunde en haar wederzijdschen invloed* (2 vols; 2nd edition, Dordrecht, 1909), the first part of which is devoted to the influence of English on Netherlandic. This work, with its excellent collection of material, but on the whole rather unsystematic, was taken as a basis by C.G.N. DE VOOYS for his article *Hoe zijn anglicismen te beschouwen?* in *N.Tg.* VIII, 124 ff, 161 ff, 225 ff, reprinted in his *Verz. Taalk. Opst.* II, 71 ff under the title *Engelse invloed op het Nederlands*. In the post-war volumes of the *N.Tg.*, DE VOOYS has regularly published notes on recent English loans and the snobbery sometimes associated with their use. The material for these articles, together with that for earlier studies, was incorporated in DE VOOYS' larger treatise *Engelse invloed op de Nederlandse woordvoorraad* (Amsterdam, 1951).

Der englische Einfluss auf das Niederländische, a Leipzig doctoral thesis by G. WORT, has never appeared in print. C.G.N. DE VOOYS discussed it in *N.Tg.* XLIX, 3 ff, giving suggestions as to how this important work might be published.

The *Oudengelse invloeden in het Nederlands* assumed by HEEROMA, *Ts.* LXX, 257 ff, are for the greater part debatable.

C.B. VAN HAERINGEN's *Nederlands tussen Duits en Engels* (The Hague, n.d. [1956]) is intended for a wider public, and compares the development and present-day structure of the three languages.

De Spaanse woorden in het Nederlands is the title of an essay which C.F.A. VAN DAM wrote for the *Bundel opstellen van oud-leerlingen, aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. C.G.N. de Vooys* (Groningen-Batavia, 1940), 86 ff. Emil OEHMANN wrote *Ueber den italienischen Einfluss auf das Niederländische* for *V.M.V.A.* 1955, 131 ff. *De invloed van het Nederlands op het Deens* was traced by L.L. HAMMERICH in *V.M.V.A.* 1948, 105 ff.

In contrast to the very strong influence Netherlandic has undergone in the past, and is still undergoing, from the great languages of the world, the influence of Netherlandic on other languages is only slight. It is, for a great part, restricted to maritime terms, owing to

the fact that in the 17th and 18th centuries the merchant navy of Holland dominated the seas. Remarkably numerous are maritime loanwords from Netherlandic, in this case Hollandic, in Russian, as was shown by R. VAN DER MEULEN in *De Hollandsche Zee- en Scheepstermen in het Russisch* (Amsterdam, 1909). Now, fifty years later, he has provided a supplement, *Nederlandse Woorden in het Russisch* (Amsterdam, 1959), which is not restricted to nautical terms alone. Other Netherlandic influences on Russian were discussed by VAN DER MEULEN in his articles *Hollando-Russica* for *Ts.* XXVIII, 206 ff and XXIX, 249 ff.

M. VALKHOFF wrote an *Étude sur les mots français d'origine néerlandaise* (Amersfoort, 1931), and J.F. BENSE compiled a *Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary* (The Hague, 1939). In both works, especially the latter, the limits of linguistic influence are drawn rather broadly.

We are promised a work on Netherlandic words in Spanish, Catalan and Portuguese by M. VALKHOFF and B.E. VIDOS. Research prospects and new facts were given in the inaugural address of B.E. VIDOS, *Nieuwe onderzoekingen over Nederlandsche woorden in Romaansche talen* (Nimeguen-Utrecht, 1947). Earlier, VALKHOFF, in a book *De Expansie van het Nederlands* (² Brussels, 1943), destined for a wider reading public, had devoted a chapter to *Het Nederlands in de Romaanse talen*. An article on Netherlandic words in Spanish is that by VALKHOFF in *Neophilol.* XXXV, 65 ff. The article by W. MITZKA, *Das Niederländische in Deutschland*, for *Niederdeutsche Studien, Festschrift C. Borchling* (Neumünster in Holstein, 1932), 207 ff, inspired J.W. MULLER to write on *Het Nederlandsch in Duitschland* for *N. Tg.* XXVII, 77 ff, which he followed up with a monograph, *De uitbreiding van het Nederlandsch taalgebied, vooral in de zeventiende eeuw* (The Hague, 1939), in which he outlined the position of Netherlandic as a means of spoken and written communication especially across the eastern border of the Netherlands.

The surviving traces of Netherlandic in Brandenburg, where it was introduced by colonists, were discussed by H. TEUCHERT in *Niederfränkisches Sprachgut in der Mark Brandenburg* for the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Mundarten* XVIII, 174 ff, and more extensively in his book *Die Sprachreste der niederländischen Siedlungen des 12. Jahrhunderts* (Neumünster, 1944).

An interesting special field of study is the mutual influence of

Flemish and Walloon dialects on both sides of the Belgian language boundary. Several Flemish scholars have occupied themselves with this penetration of Flemish into Walloon and vice versa. L. GROOTAERS discussed *Quelques emprunts entre patois flamands et wallons* in *Leuv. Bijdr.* XVI, 43 ff; *Woordmigratie over de Vlaams-Waalse taalgrens* in *Handelingen van het 17e Nederl. Philologencongres* (Groningen, 1937), 60 ff; J. GRAULS several times made *Een uitstapje naar het Walenland*, in *Hand. Top. Dial.* VI, VII, VIII, IX and X. An alphabetical index to GRAULS' 'trips' was made by J. JAQUET in *Hand. Top. Dial.* XII, 119 ff. J. LEENEN pointed out the *Franse taaluitzetting over Limburg* in *Hand. Top. Dial.* XII, 118 ff. A. VAN DOORNE studied *De Franse woorden in het dialect van Wingene*, for *Hand. Top. Dial.* XIII, 297 ff. R. VERDEYEN put the question *Comment connaître les éléments flamands dans les dialects wallons?* at the 19th session of the 'Fédération archéologique et historique de Belgique', and his lecture was published in the report of that session (Liege, 1932), it also appeared as a separate offprint (Liege, 1934).

A man who has done much for the study of the mutual Flemish-Walloon infiltration is the Walloon linguist Jean HAUST, to whom we are indebted for the *Dictionnaire Liégeois* (Liege, 1933) and the *Dictionnaire français-liégeois* (Liege, 1948; prepared for the press by Elisée LEGROS). To the *Mélanges de linguistique offerts à M. Jean Haust* (*Mélanges Haust*, Liege, 1939) several Flemish linguists contributed, thus J. GESSLER, *Notes de lexicologie comparée (limbourgeoise et liégeoise)*; L. GROOTAERS, *À propos des noms wallons du 'fruit tapé'*; R. VERDEYEN, *De neppe à nozé et nifeter*.

The activities of HAUST and other Walloon scholars will not be further reviewed here. Much about this subject is to be found in the bibliography which the North Netherlandic linguist L. GESCHIERE added to his comprehensive work *Éléments néerlandais du wallon liégeois* (Amsterdam, 1950). Netherlandic elements in the Walloon dialect of Liege had earlier been discussed by M. VALKHOFF in his *Notes étymologiques* for *Neophilol.* XXI, 198 ff. In it, VALKHOFF deals with the pejorative prefix *ca-* and its variants, which before him had been discussed by J.J. SALVERDA DE GRAVE in his study *Sur un préfixe français 'réel'* (Amsterdam, 1926). Another contribution by VALKHOFF to the study of the influence of Netherlandic on French, especially Walloon and Northern French, is *Sur un suffixe flamand en français, en picard et en wallon*, in *Neophilol.* XIX, 243 ff. The

question of syntactic influence is discussed by the same author in his article *Waaals en Germaans* for *Leuv. Bijdr.* XXVIII, 1 ff. The political and practical consequences of the language boundary in Belgium were reviewed by VALKHOFF in his inaugural address *Geschiedenis en actualiteit van de Frans-Nederlandse taalgrens* (Amsterdam, 1950). An earlier treatise on *Ontstaan en betekenis van de Frans-Nederlandse taalgrens* forms Ch. II of VALKHOFF's above-mentioned book *De Expansie van het Nederlands*.

The influence of Malay and other Indonesian languages on Netherlandic has been little studied since F. PRICK VAN WELY wrote *Neerland's taal in 't verre Oosten* (Semarang-Surabaia, 1906), laying special stress on the native substratum and its effect on Netherlandic as spoken by Indonesians. Indonesian words in European Netherlandic are numerous enough to have led VAN DER MEER, in his *Historische Grammatik* (cf. Ch. II B), to devote some paragraphs to 'die Laute der indischen Wörter'. Since Indonesia became independent, however, the mutual influence of Netherlandic and Indonesian has gradually diminished, and will probably disappear completely in future. So the interesting article by K. HEEROMA in *N.Tg. L.*, 96 ff, on the position of Netherlandic in Indonesia during the first few years after the separation, is likely to have been the last on this subject. Likewise, M.C. VAN DEN TOORN's description of *De taal van de Indische Nederlanders* in *N.Tg. L.*, 218 ff, will shortly be a historical document.

We are fairly well informed about the peculiar creolization of Netherlandic in the West Indian archipelago. There is an essay by D.C. HESSELING, *Het Negerhollands der Deense Antillen* (Leyden, 1905); H. SCHUCHARDT wrote an article *Zum Negerholländischen von St. Thomas* for *Ts.* XXXIII, 123 ff, and J.P.B. DE JOSSELIN DE JONG prepared an Academy-paper *Het Negerhollands van St. Thomas en St. Jan* (Amsterdam, 1924).

The linguistic situation in Surinam has recently been investigated by W. GS. HELLINGA and W. PÉE. One result of their inquiries, PÉE's *De klanken van het Neger-Engels* (published in *Taal en Tongval* III, 180 ff), has already appeared. *The linguistic structure of Taki-Taki* (Negro-English) had been treated earlier, by R.A. HALL, in the periodical *Language* XXIV, 92 ff. HELLINGA's book *Language Problems in Surinam* (Amsterdam, 1955), with many diagrams and statistical data, has the teaching of Netherlandic as its main subject.

HELLINGA's pupil J.J. VOSKUIL investigated the special difficulties met with in *Het Nederlands van Hindoestaanse kinderen in Suriname* (Amsterdam, 1956). J. VOORHOEVE, another of HELLINGA's pupils, composed *Voorstudies tot een beschrijving van het Sranan Tongo* (Negro-English of Surinam) (Amsterdam, 1953), while L.L.E. RENS dealt with *The Historical and Social Background of Surinam's Negro-English* (Amsterdam, 1953).

A description of the Papiamento of the island of Curaçao, mentioned with much appreciation by W. Gs. HELLINGA in *Taal en Tongval* III, 136 ff, is R. LENZ' *El Papiamento. La lengua criolla de Curazao* (Santiago de Chile, 1926-28). An article in Spanish on the origin and development of Papiamento was written by H.L.A. VAN WIJK for *Neophilol.* XLII, 169 ff.

That most interesting form of simplified Netherlandic, the *Afrikaans* of South Africa, has in this century developed into an independent language, used for all cultural, literary and practical purposes. Mention will be made here of only a few works, dealing with the origin and causes of the conversion of Netherlandic into Afrikaans. Afrikaans itself will not be discussed, it has been described in many good handbooks, and is the subject of systematic study, on an increasingly large scale, in the Union of South Africa.

The theory of D.C. HESSELING, set forth in *Het Afrikaans* (Leyden, 1899; 2nd edition, revised and brought up to date, Leyden, 1923), was that the contact with Malay-Portuguese, the lingua franca in African ports, was responsible for the curious and remarkably rapid transformation of Netherlandic at the Cape. Objections to HESSELING's hypothesis were made by E. KRUISINGA in *Taal en Letteren* XVI, 417 ff, and later on by others, especially South African scholars. D.B. BOSMAN, in *Oor die ontstaan van Afrikaans* (Amsterdam, 1923; 2nd, slightly altered edition Amsterdam, 1928), partly considers the change as a degeneration or corruption of Netherlandic as it was spoken by the numerous strangers of different nationalities, and partly assumes a spontaneous development. The latter possibility especially is stressed by S.P.E. BOSHOFF in *Volk en taal van Suid-Afrika* (Pretoria-Cape Town, 1921). W. PREUSLER, in *Taal en Leven* VI, 20 ff, tackles *Das Problem des Afrikaans* from a point of view similar to that of BOSMAN and KRUISINGA.

The most recent work on Afrikaans, G.G. KLOEKE's *Herkomst en*

groei van het Afrikaans (Leyden, 1950), does not pay much attention to grammatical changes, but tries to demonstrate that the Southern Hollandic dialect was the basis of Afrikaans, a hypothesis that cannot be regarded as duly proved. Objections were raised by J. DU P. SCHOLTZ in *Oor die herkoms van Afrikaans* (Cape Town, 1950; a separate issue of a long review in the South African periodical *Die Huisgenoot*), and by E. BLANCQUAERT in *Bij Prof. Kloeke's 'Herkomst en groei van het Afrikaans'*, written for *Tijdschrift voor Levende Talen* XVII, 10 ff. J.L. PAUWELS, too, expressed his doubts as to the validity of KLOEKE's conclusions, in *Leuv. Bijdr.* XLI. But whatever our opinion about his conclusions, KLOEKE's book should be thankfully welcomed for its detailed information on Southern Hollandic, a dialect hitherto little explored on account of its complicated situation among the great centres of culture.

The question of loans from Netherlandic to Afrikaans, a very intricate subject in view of the close kinship of the two languages, was touched on very expertly by J. DU P. SCHOLTZ in his inaugural address *Nederlandse invloed op die Afrikaanse woordeskat* (Cape Town-London-New York, 1951). The same author dealt with two very important respects in which the grammatical structure of Afrikaans has been simplified: the verbal system, in *Tydskrif vir Wetenskap en Kuns* XVIII (1958), 61 ff, and the disappearance of the nominal two-class system, *ibid.*, 160 ff.

S.A. LOUW, *Dialekvermenging en taalontwikkeling, Proewe van Afrikaanse taalgeografie* (Amsterdam, 1948), tackles the development of Afrikaans from the standpoint of dialect geography. He comes to no definite conclusions about the origin of Afrikaans, but clearly attributes great influence to the mixing of many dialects at the Cape.

J.L. PAUWELS has added an interesting appendix to his description of *Het Dialect van Aarschot en omstreken* (Tongres, 1958), to be mentioned in Ch. X, entitled *De expletieve ontkenning nie(t) aan het einde van de zin in het Zuidnederlands en het Afrikaans*. In it, he puts forward, rather convincingly, the theory that the double negation *nie...nie*, a much discussed, typical feature of Afrikaans, did not originate in South Africa, but already existed in the European Netherlandic of the colonists.

Chapter Ten

Dialectology

A historical survey of dialect research up to about 1925 is to be found in the *Handleiding bij het Noord- en Zuid-Nederlandsch dialectonderzoek* by L. GROOTAERS and G.G. KLOEKE (The Hague, 1926), the first volume in the series *Noord- en Zuid-Nederlandsche Dialectbibliotheek*, edited under the direction of these two scholars. In the *Handleiding* KLOEKE gives an account of Northern Netherlandic activities in the field of dialect research, while GROOTAERS does the same for Flemish Belgium.

Having referred to this survey, we can restrict ourselves, for the period before 1925, to broad outlines.

A. Dialect research until about 1920

The first attempt at depicting the whole linguistic area of the Low Countries, including Low German and Frisian, was that by J. WINKLER, who, in his *Algemeen Nederduitsch en Friesch Dialecticon* (2 vols, The Hague, 1874), included the Parable of the Prodigal Son in many dialect versions. The book by JOH. A. LEOPOLD and L. LEOPOLD, *Van de Schelde tot de Weichsel, Nederduitsche dialecten in dicht en on dicht* (3 vols, Groningen, 1881-82), has a different plan, and is more of a dialect reader. WINKLER's book has the advantage that it always renders the same text, although there is the risk that the versions are coloured by their biblical origin. LEOPOLD's has the attractions and drawbacks of its literary framework. WINKLER's is the more useful for scholars.

The name of the polyhistor Taco H. DE BEER is connected with a serious attempt at organizing dialect research, in the periodical *Onze Volkstaal*, of which three volumes appeared (1882-1890). The standard of scholarship was assured by the collaboration of such scholars as P.J. COSIJN, J.H. GALLÉE, H. KERN, B. SIJMONS, J. BECKERING VINCKERS and the Fleming J.F.J. HEREMANS. It was also demonstrated by the extensive *Proeve eener Bibliographie der Nederlandsche* [i.e. Northern Netherlandic] *dialecten* by L.D. PETIT, published in the first volume. This periodical also contained contributions by interested laymen. Noteworthy publications in it are the *Spraakleer van*

het Westvlaamsch Dialect by J. VERCOULLIE in the second volume, and the contributions by H. VAN DEN BRAND, partly published under the pseudonym BRABANTIUS, on the dialect of the eastern regions of the province of Noord-Brabant.

The ideal DE BEER had in mind was an 'idioticon', which he probably visualized as a dictionary comprising all the Netherlandic dialects. Idiotica were also the first results of Flemish dialectological activities. The oldest of this type is the *Algemeen Vlaamsch Idioticon* by L.W. SCHUERMANS (Louvain, 1865-70; with *Bijvoegsel*, Louvain, 1882), which was not so much an objective consideration of dialectal data as a collection, from Flemish dialects, of elements that would fit in a supra-dialectal language. A certain particularistic intention also underlay L.-L. DE BO's *Westvlaamsch Idioticon* (Bruges, 1873, 2nd edition by J. SAMYN, Ghent, 1892), to the preparation of which contributions were made by the poet Guido GEZELLE, who himself had collected peculiarities of different kinds in his periodical *Loquela*. The material worked into this periodical was edited in the form of an alphabetical dictionary by J. CRAEYNEST (Amsterdam, 1907, 2nd impression, unchanged, 1946).

The work of these scholars was continued by A. RUTTEN, *Bijdrage tot een Haspengouwsch Idioticon* (Antwerp, 1890); J.F. TUERLINCKX, *Bijdrage tot een Hagelandsch Idioticon* (Ghent, 1886) with a *Bijvoegsel* by D. CLAES (Ghent, 1904); J. CORNELISSEN and J.B. VERVLIEET, *Idioticon van het Antwerpsch Dialect* (Ghent, 1899-1903) with *Aanhangsel* (Ghent, 1906) and *Supplement* (3 vols, Turnhout, 1936-38); A. JOOS, *Waasch Idioticon* (Ghent and St.-Niklaas, 1900). IS. TEIRLINCK'S *Zuid-Oostvlaandersch Idioticon* (3 vols, Ghent, 1908-23), by far the best of its kind, has for its fourth volume a *Klank- en Vormleer van het Zuid-Oostvlaandersch dialect* (Ghent, 1924).

In the Kingdom of the Netherlands appeared the important study by G.J. BOEKENOOGEN, *De Zaausche Volkstaal* (Leyden, 1897), in the first place an idioticon, but also containing a grammatical description of the dialect in its extensive introduction. Especially worth mentioning is the chapter on 'Zaausche eigennamen', proper names and toponyms.

It was purely geographical considerations that, in 1879, led the 'Koninklijk Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap' (Royal Dutch Geographical Society) to circulate a questionnaire, composed by H. KERN. J. TE WINKEL, who was charged with the editing of

the answers, considered the material collected insufficient, and a fresh list of questions was circulated in 1895. The result of this inquiry was TE WINKEL's publication *De Noordnederlandsche tongvallen*, two parts of which appeared (Leyden, 1898-1901, with two maps).

Before this, some monographs had been published on Northern Netherlandic dialects - mostly the authors' own - with phonologies on a historical-germanistic basis; such books, when they did not consist merely of a phonology, also contained a short morphology, but little or no syntax. Further, they also as a rule had glossaries of varying size. The doctoral thesis of W. DE VRIES, *Het vocalisme van den tongval van Noordhorn* (Groningen, 1895) and that of A. OPPREL, *Het dialect van Oud-Beierland* (The Hague, 1896), are the oldest representatives of this type. Shortly after the turn of the century appeared successively the theses of M. BRUYEL, *Het Dialect van Elten-Bergh* (Utrecht, 1901); A. VAN DE WATER, *De Volkstaal in het Oosten van de Bommelerwaard* (Utrecht, 1904); M.A. VAN WEEL, *Het dialect van West-Voorne* (Leyden, 1904); W. VAN SCHOTHORST, *Het dialect der Noord-West-Veluwe* (Utrecht, 1904), the best of its kind; J.J.H. HOUBEN, *Het dialect der stad Maastricht* (Maastricht, 1905); J. GUNNINK, *Het dialect van Kampen en omstreken* (Kampen, 1908). A. VERSCHUUR's *De klankleer van het Noord-Bevelandsch* (Amsterdam, 1902) devotes much space to experimental observations on phonetics.

Different in pattern were the Southern Netherlandic dialect publications emanating from Louvain on the initiative of L. GOEMANS and PH. COLINET, published in the *Leuvense Bijdragen*. These dialect-grammars, intentionally non-historical, were based on the situation at that time. The series was started by COLINET with *Het dialect van Aalst* (*Leuv. Bijdr.* I, 1896). GOEMANS followed with *Het dialect van Leuven* (*Leuv. Bijdr.* II, 1897-98); L. GROOTAERS with *Het dialect van Tongeren* (*Leuv. Bijdr.* VIII and IX, 1908-11); J. DUPONT with *Het dialect van Bree* (*Leuv. Bijdr.* IX, XII and XIV, 1910-22), which was never completed. Composed in the same way was the *Klankleer van het Hasseltsch Dialect* by L. GROOTAERS and J. GRAULS, published in Louvain in 1930, though it had been completed in 1914 as a prize-winning essay. Other publications on local Southern dialects are H. SMOUT, *Het Antwerpsch Dialect, met eene schets van de geschiedenis van dit dialect in de 17e en de 18e eeuw* (Ghent, 1905), and J.B. BOSSCHERIJ, *De Gentsche Tongval* (V.M.V.A. 1907, 613 ff).

It was chiefly from these older southern and northern dialect grammars that N. VAN WIJK gathered the material for several most important articles, published between 1905 and 1916 in *Ts.*, on subjects of the history of sounds, in particular the development of vowels before *r* plus consonant.

B. Dialect research from about 1920

We may say that after about 1920 the geographical method has become generally accepted for dialect studies, though we do meet with some specimens of linguistic geography as early as the 19th century, and accounts of local dialects have been appearing also after 1920.

The Rhineland dialectologist TH. FRINGS, in collaboration with J. VANDENHEUVEL, had the sentences used by WENKER for the *Deutscher Sprachatlas* translated by Belgian prisoners of war into their own dialects. The result was *Die südniederländischen Mundarten*, of which only the first part, *Texte*, was published (Marburg, 1921). The second part was to have contained maps, but did not appear. In his article *Zur Geschichte des Niederfränkischen in Limburg* - for the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Mundarten*, 1919, 97 ff - FRINGS showed that Cologne's influence as a cultural centre, which had already been observed of the Rhineland, was also apparent in isoglosses of the Dutch province of Limburg. J. SCHRIJNEN extended *De Isoglossen van Ramisch in Nederland* (Bussum, 1920) also to the Dutch province of Limburg. J. RAMISCH, in his *Studien zur niederrheinischen Dialektgeographie* (Marburg, 1908), had covered the adjacent part of the Rhineland.

In the early decades of the century, the Northern Netherlandic scholar G.G. KLOEKE started publishing articles on north-eastern dialects, based on personal observation, and in a series of these articles he expounded his opinion that Holland, and especially Amsterdam, had been the starting point of linguistic movements from west to east. Later on he worked out his views in more detail, in his 'proeve eener historisch-dialectgeographische synthese', *De Hollandsche Expansie in de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw en haar weerspiegeling in de hedendaagsche Nederlandsche dialecten* (The Hague, 1927). On the one hand he made *uu* [y.] instead of older *oe* [u.] move eastward and northward from the lower social circles of 17th century Amsterdam, where the diphthong *ui* was not yet used; on the other, he explained the diphthongization of former *î* and *û* into *ij* and *ui* as an imitation

of the language spoken by the numerous immigrants who had come from the Southern Netherlands for political and economic reasons. Going still further back in history, he also explained *uu* as a southern import, and even found traces of older *oe* in Holland. KLOEKE's views called forth a lively discussion, to which we shall revert in Chapter XII.

The collaboration between North and South is of long standing. A map of the entire Netherlandic linguistic area, drawn by KLOEKE for purposes of research into dialect geography, was accepted by L. GROOTAERS and used in the publications of the 'Zuidnederlandse Dialectcentrale' established in 1920 by GROOTAERS in Louvain. This 'Centrale', which sets itself the task of collecting data from contributors by correspondence, has published several word-maps covering the Southern Netherlandic area. These maps are accompanied by short explanations by the authors. Similar treatment of single words from the standpoint of dialect geography has been made by L. GROOTAERS, J.L. PAUWELS, V. VERSTEGEN, R. VAN DE KERCKHOVE, P. D'HAENE, M. CARÈME and P.J. MOET. The activities of the Centrale have for a number of years been reported upon by GROOTAERS in the *Mededelingen van de Zuidnederlandse Dialectcentrale*, usually published in the *Bijblad* to the *Leuv. Bijdr.*

GROOTAERS and KLOEKE were the editors of the series *Noord- en Zuid-Nederlandsche Dialectbibliotheek*, of which the *Handleiding*, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, was the first volume, and KLOEKE's *Hollandsche Expansie* the second. Other volumes are *Die niederfränkischen Mundarten im Nordosten der Provinz Lüttich* by W. WELTER (The Hague, 1933); *Enkele Bloemnamen in de Zuidnederlandsche dialecten* by J.L. PAUWELS (The Hague, 1933), and *Een tegenstelling Noord-Zuid in de praeterita en participia van de sterke werkwoorden* by A.R. HOL (The Hague, 1937)¹⁾.

Another centre of dialect research is that in Ghent, founded by E. BLANCQUAERT, whose methods are somewhat different. In short, the system adopted is to send into carefully delimited areas investigators familiar with the dialect, who then put to the inhabitants a number of questions. A large number of small sentences are translated by the local inhabitants into their own dialect, and their versions written down in a strictly phonetic transcription. BLANCQUAERT's *Reeks*

1) Two volumes in the series deal with Frisian, J.J. HOF's *Friesche Dialectgeographie* (The Hague, 1933) and T. VAN DER KOOY's *De taal van Hindeloopen* (The Hague, 1937).

Nederlandse Dialectatlassen, when finished, will cover the whole Netherlandic area. This great enterprise is making steady progress: investigations of all Southern Netherlandic areas have either been completed or are in preparation, and areas across the frontier have also been covered. Works that have already appeared in this series are the *Dialect-atlas van Klein-Brabant* by BLANCQUAERT himself (Antwerp, 1925; 2nd edition with supplements by FR. VANACKER, 1952); *Dialect-atlas van Noord-Oost-Vlaanderen en Zeeuwsch-Vlaanderen*, also by BLANCQUAERT (1935); id. *van Vlaamsch-Brabant* by H. VANGASSEN (1938); *van de Zeeuwsche eilanden* by BLANCQUAERT and P.J. MEERTENS (1940-41); *van West-Vlaanderen en Fransch-Vlaanderen* by W. PÉE, assisted by BLANCQUAERT (1946); *van Noord-Brabant* by A. WEIJNEN (1952), and *van Antwerpen* by W. PÉE (1958). The Frisian speech area has also been included, in the *Dialectatlas van Friesland* (1955) by K. BOELENS and G. VAN DER WOUDE, assisted by K. FOKKEMA and BLANCQUAERT.

In his pamphlet *Na meer dan 25 jaar Dialectonderzoek op het terrein* (Tongres, 1948), BLANCQUAERT gives a survey of methods and achievements. He also refutes the objection his procedure does not yield concrete, easily surveyable results.

Dialectological and toponymical research in Belgium was officially recognized by the establishment of the 'Koninklijke Commissie voor Toponymie en Dialectologie' in 1926. This Committee consists of a Flemish and a Walloon section. In the *Handelingen*, L. GROOTAERS for a number of years gave annual surveys of dialect research in the widest sense. Later, J.L. PAUWELS took over his task, devoting more space in the bibliography to appraisal and criticism. The scope of the work, moreover, has been widened since 1956, as can be gathered from the new title *De Nederlandse Taalkunde in 1955* (1956), which takes the place of *De Nederlandse Dialectstudie in...* The survey for 1957, which was published in number XXXII of the *Handelingen*, was the work of F. VAN COETSEM. Some noteworthy publications to have appeared in the *Handelingen* are *De Nederlandsche Dialectnamen van de Spin, den Ragebol en het Spinneweb* by E. BLANCQUAERT and his students (III and VII); *De Nederlandse Benamingen van de Uier* by K. HEEROMA (X); *Van '*slut-ila' naar 'sleutel'* by Miss C. VEREECKEN (XII); *Tussen 'Oud', 'Old' and 'Alt'* by J. LEENEN (XV), and *De n na de toonloze vocaal in werkwoordsvormen* by Miss A.R. HOL (XXI).

In the Kingdom of the Netherlands the institution, in 1928, of the 'Dialectencommissie' in the Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences was a first attempt at some form of organization. To this committee P.J. MEERTENS was appointed permanent secretary. The activities of the 'Dialectencommissie' have gradually expanded. The *Bijdragen en Mededelingen* appear irregularly and contain either reports of the proceedings, called 'symposia', which were started at the initiative of J. VAN GINNEKEN (the first president of the Dialectencommissie after J.H. KERN), or other, independent contributions. VAN GINNEKEN, from 1923-1945 professor in the University of Nimeguen, started a fourth centre of dialect research there. Several maps, mostly word-maps, covering the entire Netherlandic area, appeared in VAN GINNEKEN's periodical *Onze Taaltuin*, which, since its 7th year, has been the official organ of the Dialectencommissie.

The *Taalatlas van Noord- en Zuid-Nederland* was started independently by G.G. KLOEKE and his pupils at Leyden University, and the maps appearing in it are of admirable quality. The first issue appeared at Leyden in 1939; after the third issue (1943) the work has been carried out in co-operation with the Dialectencommissie. That issue carried maps forming part of both the 'Akademie-reeks' and of the 'Leidse Taalatlas', whereas the contents of the fourth issue (1948) consisted entirely of maps of the 'Akademie-reeks', prepared by P.J. MEERTENS and Johanna C. DAAN. Two more issues appeared, in 1952 and 1956 respectively.

The *Taalatlas* uses a different system from that of BLANCQUAERT. It contains maps of single words or forms of the whole Netherlandic area, based on written information obtained by means of questionnaires. The maps, executed in bright colours, are excellent from a technical point of view, but as yet they still need to be accompanied by explanatory articles like those of GROOTAERS' Zuidnederlandse Dialectcentrale.

K. HEEROMA, who occupies the chair of Low Saxon Language and Literature in the University of Groningen, is building up a new centre for research into dialect geography. As the language of the eastern part of the Netherlands has much in common with that of the Low German area to the east of the frontier, HEEROMA has included the latter area in his investigations. The first instalment of a *Taalatlas van Oost-Nederland en aangrenzende gebieden*, containing 10 maps with commentary, appeared in Assen, 1957. The explanatory part, like many of

HEEROMA's dialect-publications, is very 'expansiological'. The plan of the atlas required collaboration with German dialect centres, an earlier result of which had already appeared in the form of *Westfaalse en Nederlandse expansie* by W. FOERSTE and K. HEEROMA (Amsterdam, 1955). Some earlier publications by HEEROMA, partly also dealing with the East of the Netherlands, will be mentioned in Chapter XIII under 'Ingwaemonic'. In the report of the *Akademiedagen* (annual congresses organized by the Royal Dutch Academy for Sciences together with regional societies), VIII (1955), 80 ff, HEEROMA described *Het Westoverijsselse taallandschap*. For the periodical *Driemaandelijkse Bladen* see below.

One of VAN GINNEKEN's prominent pupils, A. WEIJNEN, has concentrated mainly on the dialects of the province of Noord-Brabant and adjacent regions. His doctoral thesis *Onderzoek naar de dialectgrenzen in Noord-Brabant* (privately published, Fijnaart, 1937) had been preceded by some articles in *Onze Taaltuin*, and was followed by several other publications such as *Studies over het Achthuizens dialect* (Amsterdam, 1946; in the series *Bijdragen en Mededelingen van de Dialectencommissie*). A general survey of the questions cropping up in dialect research is WEIJNEN's *De Nederlandse dialecten* (Groningen-Batavia, 1941). Later, it was replaced by *Nederlandse Dialectkunde* (Assen, 1958), which, however, must not be regarded as a revision of the 1941 edition. *Nederlandse Dialectkunde* sets out to give a complete survey of the present situation of, and the methods used in, the whole field of dialect research. Because of its argumentative tone and the rather extensive knowledge that is presupposed, it is more suitable as a book of reference for the expert than as an introductory handbook for the student. One of WEIJNEN's earlier publications was a summary entitled *De dialecten* (especially those within the Kingdom of the Netherlands), with extensive bibliography, which formed one chapter of Part II of the *Handboek der Geografie van Nederland*, edited by G.J.A. MULDER (Zwolle, 1951). A short but comprehensive general survey of *De dialecten van Noord-Brabant*, also by WEIJNEN, was published under the auspices of the 'Provinciaal Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen in Noord-Brabant' (1952). - WEIJNEN's teacher VAN GINNEKEN wrote a book about dialect research in general, *De studie der Nederlandsche Streektalen* (Amsterdam, 1943), a highly individual, at times rather bold piece of work, like so many of this brilliant linguist's writings.

Another member of the school of VAN GINNEKEN and SCHRIJNEN is W. ROUKENS, author of *Wort- und Sachgeographie Südost-Niederlands und der umliegenden Gebiete* (Nimeguen, 1937) - containing an excellent apparatus - of which only the volumes I A, 'Text', and I B, 'Atlas', appeared. ROUKENS does not only deal with the purely linguistic aspect, he pays special attention to folklore, too. Another of VAN GINNEKEN's pupils, J.C.P. KATS, made an attempt at a phonemic dialect description, in *Het phonologisch en morphologisch systeem van het Roermondsch dialect* (Roermond-Maaseik, 1939). F.J.P. PEETERS, in *Het klankkarakter van het Venloos* (Nimeguen, 1951), adopts an unusual plan in trying to characterize his dialect not only phonemically but also acoustically, constantly stressing points of difference between it and 'Hollandic'. In Willy DOLS' book *Sittardse Diftongering* (posthumous edition by J.C. VAN DEN BERGH, Sittard, 1953), the accent is on historical development.

Some of the above-mentioned works show that dialect research since 1920 has not been exclusively geographical. Nor is it only in Nimeguen that theses have appeared which resemble the useful type of dialect publications current before 1920. F.G. SCHURINGA described *Het dialect van de Veenkoloniën* (Groningen-The Hague, 1923), linking it up with the other dialects in the province of Groningen. - At about the same time a *Klankleer van den tongval der stad Deventer* by P. FIJN VAN DRAAT appeared in *Ts.* XLII, 194 ff. - H.L. BEZOEN, in his thesis *Klank- en Vormleer van het dialect der gemeente Enschede* (Leyden, 1938), took a stand against dialect geography, as can be seen from some of his 'stellingen'. - BEZOEN's *Taal en Volk van Twente* (Assen, 1948), scholarly but more popular in tone, tells about diverse lexicological and folkloristic matters in the district of Twente. - G. KARSTEN described *Het dialect van Drechterland*, supplying in Part I (Purmerend, 1931) a phonology and morphology, with some remarks on syntax, and also giving the first letters of a vocabulary, the remaining letters of which are to be found in Part II (Purmerend, 1934). The structure of this idioticon recalls BOEKENOOGEN's *Zaansch Idioticon*, but it is on a smaller scale. - In Belgium, G. MAZEREEL brought out a *Klank- en Vormleer van het Brusselsch dialect* (Louvain, 1931), in the style of the older Flemish dialect grammars that appeared in *Leuv. Bijdr.*, but more concise than them. - Another work to have appeared in Belgium is the most extensive dialect study we have, *Het Dialect van Aarschot en omstreken* by J.L. PAUWELS (I. Text, II. Maps;

Tongres, 1958). In this handsomely produced book we find a discussion of the phonology and morphology and, briefly, of the word formation of the dialect, while points of syntax are dealt with in the morphology. A very important Appendix to this was mentioned at the end of chapter IX. - J. BROEKHUYSEN, in *Studies over het dialect van Zelhem in de Graafschap Zutfen* (Groningen-Djakarta, 1950), gives only the vocalism of grammar in the pure sense, but geographically expands his project with maps covering the whole 'Achterhoek' (Graafschap Zutfen). The author also shows the growing influence of the standard language by comparing the usage of the older and younger generations. - H.C. LANDHEER, in *Klank- en Vormleer van het dialect van Overflakkee* (Assen, 1951), differs from the last two authors by discussing the sound system of his dialect phonemically, too. His book was later enlarged by the addition of an extensive glossary, and appeared in its new form under the title *Het dialect van Overflakkee* (Assen, 1954). - Though his treatment is on a smaller scale, W.G.J.A. JACOB also gave phonemics its due in *Het dialect van Grave* (Bois-le-Duc, 1937). - A. DE VIN, in his thesis *Het dialect van Schouwen-Duiveland* (Assen, 1952), in some respects a parallel to LANDHEER's book, leaves phonemics undiscussed, as does Th.W.A. AUSEMS in *Klank- en Vormleer van het dialect van Culemborg* (Assen, 1953). - The *Phonologie des Dialektes von Tilligte in Twente* takes rather a special place among dialect studies, nor is it, as its title would suggest, an ordinary phonemic description. The subject of the first volume, by P.Th. RIBBERT, is *Wortformvorstellungen* (Nimeguen, 1933), that of the second, by Th. BAADER and P.Th. RIBBERT, *Morphologie, Phonetik und Phonemenlehre* (Nimeguen, 1938). The third, by Th. BAADER, is entitled *Historisch-dialektgeographische Einordnung* (Nimeguen, 1939).

K. TER LAAN's *Proeve van een Groninger Spraakkunst* (Winschoten, 1953) stands by itself, it may be characterized as a description of the *χοινη* of the province of Groningen.

J. VAN GINNEKEN projected a series of historical dialect publications, presenting specimens of regional dialects from the Middle Ages up to the present day. Of this series, *De Nederlandsche dialecten van de oudste tijden tot heden*, only one volume appeared, J. JACOBS' *Het Westvlaamsch van de oudste tijden tot heden* (Groningen, 1927), which was mentioned in Ch. IV.

We have a guide to phonemic dialect research in the 'phonologische

vragenlijst voor de dialecten in Nederland' with examples, by N. VAN WIJK and K. HEEROMA, *Onze Taaltuin* IX, 77 ff.

B. VAN DEN BERG put forward his doctoral thesis *Oude tegenstellingen op Nederlands Taalgebied* (Leyden, 1938) as 'een dialectgeografisch onderzoek', but in so far as he brings out points where 'oude tegenstellingen' are still manifest, his work should really be considered as a reaction against the sort of picture, so often drawn by dialect geographers, in which all is fluid, and where dividing lines are continually being blurred.

A little different from the usual type of dialect studies is that by Johanna C. DAAN of the former island of Wieringen, *Wieringer land en leven in de taal* (Alphen a/d Rijn, 1950), where grammar proper is granted relatively little space, and much attention is paid to vocabulary, grouped according to profession, family and social position. This book also contains a list of place and field names of Wieringen. C.C.W.J. HIJSZELER's *Boerenvoortvaring in de Oude Landschap* (Assen, 1940), a description of the farming vocabulary of Drente, reminds one a little of Miss DAAN's book.

Another attempt at a systematic description of a dialect vocabulary was made by J. VAN GINNEKEN. In the years 1942-43, together with a group of students, he conducted investigations in loco into the dialects of Volendam, Monnikendam and Marken, fishing-villages on the former Zuyder Zee. At the time of his death, in 1945, the results had not yet been fully worked up. They were made ready for the press by A. WEIJNEN, who took care of the part 'grammatica-phonologie-klankleer', and Mrs M. VAN DEN HOMBERG-BOT, who prepared the second and more extensive part, 'de structuur van de woordenschat', after she had edited some chapters from it as her Nimeguen thesis: *Structuur in de woordenschat van drie Waterlandse dialecten* (Alphen a/d Rijn, 1954). The whole work was published, rightly, under VAN GINNEKEN's name, *Drie Waterlandse dialecten* (2 vols, Alphen a/d Rijn, 1954). The book is typical of this brilliant scholar: its scope is impressive, its presentation attractive, but its details not unfrequently leave something to be desired.

After having published some short articles on the dialect of Drente in *Onze Taaltuin*, J. NAARDING wrote *Terreinverkenningen inzake de dialectgeografie van Drente* (Assen, 1947; also published under the title *De Drenten en hun taal*), dealing more with historical aspects than with the present situation.

A.P. KIEFT's doctoral thesis *Homonymie en haar invloed op de taalontwikkeling* (Groningen-Batavia, 1938), though dealing with a matter of general linguistic interest, should be mentioned here because the author bases his theories partly on data furnished by Netherlandic dialect geography. This work induced C.G.N. DE VOOYS to sound a warning note against overestimating the influence of 'homonymophobia', in *N.Tg.* XXXIII, 1 ff, reprinted in his *Verz. Taalk. Opst.* III, 184 ff.

G.G. KLOEKE returned to the area in which he started his dialect research, with *Het taallandschap van onze noordoostelijke provinciën* (Amsterdam, 1955). His book *Een oud sjibboleth: de gewestelijke uitspraak van 'heeft'* (Amsterdam, 1956) covers the whole Netherlandic speech area, but especially the eastern and the neighbouring Low German parts. In his article *De overgang van Hollands naar noordoostelijk Nederlands*, *N.Tg.* XLVII, 1 ff, he is, in his own words, 'op zoek naar een aanvaardbare taalscheiding in Nederland-boven-derivieren (searching for an acceptable linguistic division in the part of the Netherlands north of the great rivers)'.

Since 1920, several dialect dictionaries have appeared, of which we have already mentioned those by G. KARSTEN on Drechterland and by H.C. LANDHEER on Overflakkee. The excellent *Nieuw Groninger Woordenboek* by K. TER LAAN (2nd edition, Groningen, 1952) gives more details. In the same class is H.J.E. ENDEPOL'S *Woordenboek of Diksjenaer van 't Mestreechs* (Maastricht, 1955). - L. GOEMANS composed *Leuvensch Taaleigen; Woordenboek, Deel I, A-F* (Brussels, 1936); the second part, G-Z, was finished by L. DE MAN (Tongres, 1954), after the author's death. The book conforms to the older types of South Netherlandic idiotica which were mentioned above in section A. - L. LIEVEVROUW-COOPMAN'S *Gents Woordenboek* (2 vols, Ghent, 1950-55) reminds one of the same type. - G.H. WANINK composed a *Twents-Achterhoeks Woordenboek* (Zutfen, 1948), of modest size, but not quite up to modern standards of scholarship. - S. KEYSER'S *Het Tessels* (Leyden, 1951) is for the greater part taken up by a dictionary; this is preceded by a short introduction and followed by some texts. - A small dictionary of the Katwijk dialect will be mentioned below. - Of the study *Dialekt van Kempenland* by A.P. DE BONT, which was planned on a large scale, the first instalment of Part II has appeared, *Vocabularium* (Assen, 1958); the second instalment will complete the work. - The *Woordenboek der*

Zeeuwse Dialecten (1st instalment The Hague, 1959), 'edited' by Miss Ha. C.M. GHIJSEN, as the title page rather modestly has it, will appear in three instalments.

The lexicographical work by J. GOOSSENAERTS, *De taal van en om het Landbouwbedrijf in het Noordwesten van de Kempen*, which has been appearing in instalments since 1956 at Ghent, will shortly be completed. This work is different from the other dialect dictionaries in that it is chiefly concerned with the speech of farmers, and also in that it gives many folkloristic, historical and 'local' details.

Some recent monographs are in general outline comparable with GOOSSENAERTS' work. In *Woord en wereld van de boer* (Utrecht-Antwerp, 1958), J. ELEMANS has placed the dialect material of the village of Huisseling against its sociological and historical background, also giving an accurate phonemic description of the dialect. In two books about the jargon of special trades, *De vlasserij in het Nederlands van de eerste helft der twintigste eeuw* (Nimeguen, 1957) by A.P.J. BROUWERS and *De vakttaal van de Nederlandse klompenmakers* (Assen, 1958) by J.J.A. VAN BAKEL, much attention is paid to the trades today and their historical development. These last two books can hardly be called 'dialectological' in the strict sense of the word. Miss A.H. VAN VESSEM's study of one aspect of farmer's speech, *Oogstgerei-benamingen* (Assen, 1956), is written in accordance with the principles of dialect geography.

Syntax takes a rather unimportant place in dialect research, and grammars usually do not give more than a few local peculiarities. A deliberately syntactical study like that by (V.) F. VANACKER, *Syntaxis van het Aalsters dialect* (Tongres, 1948) is unique of its kind. *De Volkstaal van Katwijk aan Zee* (Antwerp and Bois-le-Duc, 1940), by G.S. OVERDIEP (in collaboration with C. VARKEVISSER), pays due attention to syntax and the stylistic value of forms, but little to phonology. This very individual work was followed up by a small *Woordenboek van de volkstaal van Katwijk aan Zee* (Antwerp, 1949).

A. SASSEN, a pupil of OVERDIEP and G.A. VAN ES, applied in his doctoral thesis *Het Drents van Ruinen* (Assen, 1953), his teachers' views and methods, basing himself on wire recordings of texts spoken by inhabitants of the village of Ruinen. Nor does he neglect phonology and morphology, and he also, with great insight, attempts to situate the dialect geographically. Two lectures, one by SASSEN and one by VANACKER, on *De syntaxis in de dialectstudie*, were published together

as number XIX of the *Bijdragen en Mededelingen* of the 'Dialectencommissie' (Amsterdam, 1958).

The article by A.E. MEEUSSEN and VANACKER, on *De dubbele werkwoordgroep*, in *N.Tg.* XLIV, 36 ff, may be considered as a dialectological study in so far as it stresses regional differences. Certainly dialectological is MEEUSSEN's article *Vier isotagmen* in *Leuv. Bijdr.* XXXV, 47 ff, with maps of the Flemish-Belgian speech area. Miss A. PAUWELS instituted an extensive investigation into *De plaats van hulpwerkwoord, verleden deelwoord en infinitief in de Nederlandse bijzin* (2 vols, Louvain, 1953), illustrated with a large number of maps. An earlier discussion of this subject, seen from a more historical point of view, is B. VAN DEN BERG's article in *T. en Tongv.* I, 155 ff.

In his article *Congruerende Voegwoorden* for *Ts.* LVIII, 169 ff (reprinted *Neerlandica*, 246 ff), C.B. VAN HAERINGEN discussed those connecting words in subordinate clauses that, in many dialects, take 'flexion' in congruence with plural verbal forms in the same clause. J. VAN GINNEKEN, in *Onze Taaltuin* VIII, 1 ff and 33 ff, studied this phenomenon on a much larger scale, while F. VANACKER concentrated on the southern dialects for his essay *Over enkele meervoudsvormen van voegwoorden* in *Taal en Tongval* I, 32 ff and 77 ff, where he tries to fix geographical boundaries for these peculiar 'plurals'.

Since 1920 the volume of dialect research has been so great that no survey such as this can hope to be comprehensive. We have restricted ourselves to investigations of a scholarly nature. In our days, many people are showing an increasing interest in the dialect of their own area. This explains, among other things, the large sales of the more popular periodicals such as the *Driemaandelijks Bladen*, a publication devoted to 'taal en volksleven in het Oosten van Nederland', which was revived in 1948 under the editorship of H.L. BEZOEN and J. NAARDING. After BEZOEN's death in 1953, his place was taken by K. HEEROMA, who later made the periodical the organ of the 'Nedersaksisch Instituut' of Groningen University. Of older date is *V.E.L.D.E.K.E.*, edited by the society of that name, which cultivates local interest in regional speech in the Dutch province of Limburg. In Flemish Belgium in particular, such periodicals for dialect and folklore are flourishing; we may mention *Oostvlaamse Zanten*, *Eigen Schoon en De Brabander* (which also contains articles on placenames) and *Biecorf*. In marked contrast to this is the situation of *Taal en Tongval*, a periodical devoted to Netherlandic dialectology in general,

which was started in 1949 and is now forced to rely on government subsidies.

A *Bibliografie der dialecten van Nederland 1800-1950* (Amsterdam, 1958) was composed by P.J. MEERTENS and B. WANDER at the instigation of the 'Dialectencommissie'; the Southern Netherlandic dialects are not represented in it. K. SCHULTE-KEMMINGHAUSEN published a complete *Verzeichnis der Mundartkarten des niederländischen Sprachraumes* up to circa 1941, in *Deutsches Archiv für Landes- und Volksforschung* VI, 440 ff. Activities in the field of dialect geography until 1935 were reported on by W. PÉE in his article *La géographie linguistique néerlandaise*, for the *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* XIV, 105 ff.

A good survey of the aims and methods of dialectology, and of its relations with other branches of linguistic research, is the *Album L. Grootaers* (Louvain, 1950), presented to the Louvain dialectologist on his 65th birthday. In it, several scholars gave contributions, under the uniform title *Dialectologie en...*, on subjects like *cartografie* (G.G. KLOEKE), *lexicografie* (Jacoba H. VAN LESSEN), *fonologie* (A. WEIJNEN), *onomastiek* (K. ROELANDTS) and *taalgeschiedenis* (K. HEEROMA). Specially deserving of attention is the chapter *Dialectologie en syntaxis* by G.A. VAN ES, who, although he has not much to 'report', opens up interesting prospects for this particular field of study.

A very thorough piece of work, though not dealing with dialectology proper, is J.G.M. MOORMANN's *De Geheimtalen* (2 vols, Zutphen, 1932-34), in which appears a complete survey and an explanation of cant in the Netherlands, the examples for which were provided by the people who use such slang. - A similar work is C.G.N. DE VOOYS' *Oorsprong, eigenaardigheden en verbreiding van Nederlands 'slang'* (Amsterdam, 1940), in connection with which we ought to mention the review of it written by Jacoba H. VAN LESSEN in *Ts.* LX, 316 ff.

Jewish speech was the subject of J.L. VOORZANGER and J.E. POLAK's *Het Joodsch in Nederland* (Amsterdam, 1915). H. BEEM, in *Jerösche: Jiddische spreekwoorden en zegswijzen uit het Nederlandse taalgebied* (Assen, 1959), discusses several words of Jewish origin that have been generally adopted.

Several specimens of these and similar 'groeptalen' are to be found in J. VAN GINNEKEN's *Handboek der Nederlandsche taal* II (Nimeguen, 1914); cf. Ch. VIII, 2 of this book.

Chapter Eleven

Onomastics

In the series *Nomina Geographica Neerlandica (N.G.N.)* we find the results of the study of geographical names, which began, in the Northern Netherlands, in the last quarter of the 19th century. The volumes of this series have been appearing since 1884 at irregular intervals, with an alarmingly long pause between numbers V and VI. The first five volumes contain chiefly collections of historical material, from VI onward we also find, in addition to these lists of names, more in the way of detailed studies. An index to vols I-X was compiled by Miss Ida HABERMEHL (Leyden, 1938); XII contains an index to vols XI and XII, compiled by Miss Leyt H. VAN VESSEM (Leyden, 1948). In 1954 the XIVth and last volume appeared. The VIth, VIIIth and following volumes each contained reviews, by M. SCHÖNFELD, of recent publications, in the XIIIth this was done by A. WEIJNEN for the Northern and by A. VAN LOEY for the Southern geographical names.

In Flemish Belgium, place name research started later than in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, but it has been carried out more systematically and intensively. The monumental *Woordenboek der toponymie van Westelijk Vlaanderen* (18 volumes, Ghent-Bruges, 1914-1938) by K. DE FLOU has no counterpart in the North. An onomastic scholar of great merit, whose activities cover a long period, is Jan LINDEMANS. *Eigen Schoon*, the periodical he founded in 1911, later merged with *De Brabander* to *Eigen Schoon en de Brabander*, contains many articles from his hand. A survey of his achievements was given in the *Album Dr Jan Lindemans* (Brussels, 1951), which has essays, not confined to onomastics, by several scholars.

It was H.J. VAN DE WIJER who first established a toponymical centre in Louvain, and who in 1925 was also responsible for the founding of the 'Vlaamse Toponymische Vereniging'. Later on, as onomastic research broadened its scope, this Vereniging changed its name to 'Vereniging voor Naamkunde te Leuven'. Its *Mededelingen van de Vereniging voor Naamkunde te Leuven* appear regularly, and since the 26th volume (1950) have been published in association with the 'Commissie voor Naamkunde' in Amsterdam. In the Northern

Netherlands, onomastic studies had acquired a modest form of central organization with the establishment of a 'Commissie voor Naamkunde' in the Royal Academy of Sciences in Amsterdam, of which committee M. SCHÖNFELD was the first chairman. In Belgium, the Government had recognized and promoted toponymic research by the institution of the 'Koninklijke Commissie voor Toponymie en Dialectologie' mentioned in the preceding chapter.

One of the first results of the work done by the Northern committee for onomastics was M. SCHÖNFELD's *Veldnamen in Nederland* (Amsterdam, 1949; 2nd revised and enlarged edition 1950). It was followed by *Nederlandse waternamen* (mainly about names relating to water in the Netherlands; Amsterdam, 1955), in which the great variety of names in this country, so rich in water, is treated thoroughly and critically, with very readable results. The 'Commissie voor Naamkunde', like the 'Dialectencommissie', regularly organizes 'symposia', where two speakers review the same subject or related subjects; these lectures, with the resulting discussions, are published in the *Bijdragen en Mededelingen* of the committee.

Other publications in book form (to which we have restricted ourselves here) are W. DE VRIES' *Drentse plaatsnamen* (Assen, 1945) and *Groninger plaatsnamen* (Groningen, 1946), of which the latter is the better work. G. KARSTEN is the author of *Noordhollandse Plaatsnamen* (Amsterdam, 1951). Farm names are the subject of a rather popular but scholarly work by Vinc. VAN WIJK, *Boerderijnamen* (2nd edition, Leyden, 1948).

A first attempt at composing a general review of toponyms in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, *Wat zeggen onze aardrijkskundige namen?* (Assen, 1954) by G.J. UITMAN, was not very satisfactory. H.J. MOERMAN's *Nederlandse plaatsnamen: een overzicht* (Leyden, 1956) is better, but it, too, has serious shortcomings.

The list of onomastic books in Belgium is much longer. We might begin with J. MANSION's critical and useful work *De voornaamste bestanddelen der Vlaamsche plaatsnamen* (The Hague, 1935), and J. LINDEMAN's short handbook *Plaatsnamen, een inleidende studie* (2nd edition, Brussels, 1925). MANSION's *Oud-Gentsche Naamkunde*, of great value for the study of Old Netherlandic, was referred to in Chapter III. A. CARNOY studied the *Origines des noms de lieux des environs de Bruxelles* (Brussels, 1927), and later edited a general work on Belgian placenames, Walloon as well as Flemish, the *Diction-*

naire étymologique des noms des communes de Belgique (2 vols, Louvain, 1939-40). This book provoked a good deal of criticism, especially the part dealing with Walloon names. Virtually a revised and recast edition of the *Dictionnaire* is CARNOY's following comprehensive work, *Origines des noms de communes de Belgique, y compris les noms des rivières et principaux hameaux* (2 vols, Louvain, 1948-49), introduced by some noteworthy 'considérations générales'. CARNOY is steadily going on with his toponymic research, and does not restrict himself to Netherlandic or Germanic. He has written articles on tree-names for several periodicals.

As specimens of toponymic research in confined areas we ought to mention A. (C.H.) VAN LOEY's *Studie over de Nederlandsche plaatsnamen in de gemeenten Elsene en Ukkel* (Louvain, 1931). When a professor at Brussels University, VAN LOEY founded a 'Seminarie voor germaanse toponymie', which, though of more modest scope than the Louvain institute, may be looked upon as an important centre of toponymic studies. Of the immensely large number of J. LINDEMANS' publications we might mention his *Toponymie van Opwijk* (Louvain-Brussels, 1930) and *Toponymie van Asse* (Tongres, 1952). Another recent work in this style, exhaustively treating local toponymy, is the *Toponymie van Oudenburg* by M. GYSSELING (The Hague, 1950), who goes his own way as regards methods and criticism. Some years before, there appeared, in the same series (*Nomina Geographica Flandrica, Monographieën*), the monograph by J. HELSEN, *Toponymie van Noorderwijk* (Brussels, 1944), in which was included a sketch of the vowel system of the village. Such a sketch also appeared in Richard BILLIET's *Toponymie van Herne* (Ghent, 1955).

It is impossible to give more than a very general survey of onomastic publications in Flemish Belgium, even if we were to restrict ourselves to full-scale books and monographs. To select from the very large number of shorter articles would be quite impracticable. It is fundamental to toponymical research that it is concerned with details and, in order to be fair, we should mention either all the results or none at all. To draw attention to particular articles would be to imply that those not mentioned were inferior. This book no more aims at providing a complete bibliography of onomastics than it does for other linguistic branches.

An excellent survey of toponymic activities in Flemish Belgium from the beginning of the 20th century up to 1927 was given by

H.J. VAN DE WIJER in his *Bibliographie van de Vlaamsche plaatsnaamkunde* (Brussels, 1928). Since 1930 VAN DE WIJER regularly reviewed publications of the preceding year in the *Handelingen van de Koninklijke Commissie voor Toponymie en Dialectologie*, of recent years he has had the collaboration of H. DRAYE and K. ROELANDTS. These reviews are also published separately as *Bijlagen* to the *Mededelingen*. DRAYE himself, in his essay *Twintig jaar toponymisch onderzoek in Vlaanderen*, a contribution to the *Feestbundel H.J. van de Wijer* (Louvain, 1944) I, 61 ff, continued the line of VAN DE WIJER's bibliography up to 1943. The bibliographical notices in *N.G.N.* have already been mentioned. The *Mededelingen van de Vereniging voor Naamkunde te Leuven* also review recent onomastic publications, including those outside Belgium and the Netherlands.

In contrast with the great activity shown in the field of geographical names, the systematic research of family and christian names for quite a long time was carried out on a very modest scale, in spite of the steadily growing interest, not only among the higher social classes, in genealogical investigations. It is true, anthroponyms were treated occasionally, for example in several articles by J. LINDEMANS, and the number of special studies on this subject has been increasing in the last two decades; but we have to go back as far as the eighties of the 19th century for a comprehensive book on family names. J. WINKLER's *De Nederlandsche geslachtsnamen in oorsprong, geschiedenis en beteekenis* (Haarlem, 1885), though to some extent out of date, is still the standard work on Netherlandic family names. More recent books, such as G.J. UITMAN, *Hoe komen wij aan onze namen?* (Amsterdam, 1941), which also discusses christian names, A.E.H. SWAEN, *Nederlandsche Geslachtsnamen* (Zutphen, 1942), and P.J. MEERTENS, *De betekenis van de Nederlandse familienamen* (2nd edition, Naarden, 1944), the most original of the three, are based on WINKLER's principles, and take most of their examples from him. Honoris causa, we must mention another book by WINKLER, *Studiën in Nederlandsche namenkunde* (Haarlem, 1900), a collection of miscellaneous studies. MEERTENS also wrote a little book on *Zeeuwse familienamen* (Naarden, 1947).

J.J. GRAAF's *Nederlandsche doopnamen naar oorsprong en gebruik* (Bussum, 1915) was chiefly written as a guide for Roman Catholics in naming their children. Similar in aim was *Onze voornamen* by J.A. MEYERS and J.C. LUITINGH (3rd ed., Amsterdam, 1959), a list of

christian names current in Holland and accepted there by the registrars. It has an introduction containing some particulars about names and name-giving in general. The two books by A. HUIZINGA, *Encyclopedie van Namen*, about family names, and *Encyclopedie van Voornamen* (both Amsterdam, n.d.) have little or no scholarly value. A first attempt at a really historical treatment of anthroponyms in Holland is that by J. VAN DER SCHAAR, *Uit de wordingsgeschiedenis der Hollandse doop- en familienamen* (Assen, 1953), of which two parts appeared in one volume. Part three is to contain an index of names with commentary.

In Flemish Belgium a growing interest in anthroponyms is manifesting itself in the recent publications of the Louvain onomastic centre. Since 1941, K. ROELANDTS has written bibliographical reviews of research on personal names in the *Bijlagen* to the above-mentioned *Mededelingen* (also published in *Handelingen van de Koninklijke Commissie voor Toponymie en Dialectologie*). In 1947 the same centre started a separate series, *Anthroponymica*, made up of special studies in anthroponymics.

After the second World War, the well equipped and excellently organized Louvain institute developed into an International Centre for Onomastics. Since 1950, the International Centre has been publishing a bibliographical information bulletin called *Onoma*.

Chapter Twelve

Word Studies

It would be beyond the scope of this book to give a complete bibliography of all the articles dealing with problems of etymology and text interpretation that have appeared in periodicals or annotated editions and that sometimes deal with one word only. The conclusions reached in these articles, as far as they are more or less directly related to word history or word geography, are incorporated in the *Supplement* to FRANCK-VAN WIJK's *Etymologisch Woordenboek* mentioned in Chapter II, A. In 1933 an index was published to vols XXXVI-L of the *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde*, and in it, many publications of this kind are to be found. A supplement to this index is being prepared. Less numerous are the word studies in *De Nieuwe Taalgids*; the index to vols I-L of this periodical (see Chapter II, C) gives full references. The articles in *W.N.T.* dealing with stems, have introductions treating the etymological aspect, which vary in length and standard, according to editors and their interests.

Special mention deserve the thorough etymological articles by Jacoba H. VAN LESSEN, most of which appeared in *Ts.*, and which sometimes deal with the same subjects as those written by the same author for the *W.N.T.* during the years 1931-1949. Good specimens of these word studies are those on the words *stuiver* (*Ts.* LX, 49 ff) and *puik* (*Ts.* LXIV, 174 ff), and the fairly detailed study *Klanknabootsing als taalvormend element* (*Ts.* LV, 241 ff, LVII, 1 ff, LXII, 106 ff and LXVI, 119 ff). Number 3 of this series is *Over eenige werkwoorden die 'kijken' beteekenen*, *Ts.* LXI, 213 ff. Her discussion of onomatopoeics with K. HEEROMA resulted in the latter's important article *Gevoelswoorden* for *Ts.* LXIII, 1 ff, in which he points out the peculiar formal and semantic incalculability that can be observed in these 'emotional' words. C.G.N. DE VOOYS expressed his views on onomatopoeics in an Academy paper *Klanknabootsing, Klanksymboliek, Klankexpressie* (Amsterdam, 1942). In this connection mention should also be made of *Het Nederlandse voorvoegsel ka-* by A.C. BOUMAN (*Ts.* LXVIII, 97 ff). F. DE TOLLENAERE wrote a lengthy essay on the word *varken* for *Ts.* LXVII, 103 ff, which

provoked K. HEEROMA into disagreeing, in an article in *Ts.* LXVIII, 180 ff, where he put forward far-reaching historico-geographical theories.

The word-maps published by the Southern Netherlandic Dialect Centre of Louvain (see Ch. X) are usually accompanied by an etymological discussion of the word or words dealt with.

A special part of vocabulary, swearwords and mild oaths, was dealt with by C. DE BAERE, *Krachtpatzers in de Nederlandsche volkstaal* (Antwerp, 1940). In his article *Schimpighe woorden in de oudere toneelliteratuur* for *V.M.V.A.* 1951, 207 ff, the same author discussed these words belonging to the periphery of civilized speech, as they occurred in an older period (14th to 16th century).

If we take 'lexicography' in a somewhat wider sense, we might include here proverbs and sayings. In the *W.N.T.* these are given under the key-words occurring in such terms. A collection of proverbial sayings, with explanations of them, was made by F.A. STOETT, *Nederlandsche spreekwoorden, spreekwijzen, uitdrukkingen en gezegden, naar hun oorsprong en beteekenis verklaard* (2 vols, 4th edition, Zutphen, 1923-25), usually referred to as the *Spreekwoordenboek*. STOETT also made a shorter edition, *Nederlandse spreekwoorden en gezegden*, of which the 7th edition was completely revised by C. KRUYSKAMP (Zutphen, 1950; 8th edition, 1953). This book will in time replace STOETT's larger work. A useful compilation, intended for a wider public, is that by K. TER LAAN, *Nederlandse spreekwoorden, spreuken en zegswijzen* (2nd edition, The Hague-Djakarta, 1951). KRUYSKAMP also compiled a remarkable collection of what he calls *Apologische Spreekwoorden* (2nd edition, The Hague, 1948), sayings constructed with the phrase 'said...and...'. A good few of these 'said-sayings' can also be found in J. CAUBERGHE's *Nederlandse Taalschat* (2nd edition, Brussels-Amsterdam, 1957), 309 ff.

The extensive collections made by A. DE COCK, *Spreekwoorden en spreekwijzen afkomstig van oude volkszedes* (Ghent, 1906), *Spreekwoorden en zegswijzen over de vrouwen, de liefde en het huwelijk* (Ghent, 1911), and *Spreekwoorden, zegswijzen en uitdrukkingen op volksgeloof berustend* (2 vols, Antwerp-Ghent-Deventer, 1920-22), are chiefly of folkloristic interest.

The book by H. BEEM on Yiddish proverbs and sayings was mentioned at the end of Chapter X. The studies on the jargon used by clog-makers and flax-dressers have also been mentioned, see on p. 90.

Chapter Thirteen

Special Subjects

In the preceding chapters, a survey has been given of the activities in the field of Netherlandic linguistics, grouped according to periods and general subjects. It is perhaps not out of place in this final chapter, to review some special subjects that were much discussed since 1920. For the most part these subjects deal with 'history', and some of the studies have been mentioned elsewhere in this book.

Diphthongization of Old West Germanic *î* and *û*; 'Expansion'

O.W.G. *î* has developed, in modern Standard Netherlandic, into a diphthong which was levelled to the older diphthong *eî*, but which is distinguished in writing as *ij*. We find this diphthong in the dialects in a broad belt from south-east to north-west, and it is in the areas that lie outside this belt that the old monophthong has been preserved.

O.W.G. *û* is also represented in Standard Netherlandic by a diphthong, written *ui* [öy], the dialects having this diphthong are roughly those that have the diphthong resulting from O.W.G. *î*. In the nondiphthongizing area the situation is more complicated, the diphthongization having been preceded by a change from *û* to [y.], rendered in Modern Netherlandic orthography by *u* in open and *uu* in closed syllables. The older phase [u.], orthographically represented as *oe*, still survives in some regions, especially in the east. Thus the word for 'mouse' in the diphthongizing area is pronounced *muïs* (apart from phonetic variants), but in the non-diphthongizing areas either *moes* or *muus*.

Now, G.G. KLOEKE, in his *Hollandsche Expansie* (The Hague, 1927), mentioned in Ch. X, defended the theory that *ui* (and also *ij*) had been introduced into Holland and thus into Northern standard language by the many southern immigrants who, in the second half of the 16th century, settled in Amsterdam and other northern towns, and that the Hollanders imitated the southern speech, which they thought to be more cultivated than their own. Incidentally, this view had already been expressed by J. TE WINKEL. A later idea of KLOEKE's was that *uu* was developed in lower social circles, especially maritime ones, and spread eastward, so that *moes* had to retreat before *muus*.

In addition, KLOEKE maintained that many words in Hollandic with *oe* < O.W.G. *û* were not, as was generally thought, borrowed from eastern dialects, but were autochthonous 'relics' of a period when *oe* was general in Holland. C.B. VAN HAERINGEN was of the opinion that the semantic 'colour' of these words pointed rather to borrowings (*Relict of ontlening?*, *N.Tg.* XXI, 132 ff, reprinted *Neerlandica*, 158 ff), but M. SCHÖNFELD strongly supported the relic-theory by considering, in his *Oe-relikten in Holland en Zeeland* (Amsterdam, 1932), some toponyms with *oe* as relics.

W. DE VRIES vehemently opposed both the expansion and the relic theories in a number of articles (most of them replied to by KLOEKE), of which we have only room to mention *Is de uu voor oe Holland in- en uitgevoerd?* and his article against SCHÖNFELD, *Oe-relikten in Holland en Zeeland?* (*Ts.* XLVIII, 18 ff).

A good survey of this discussion is to be found in *De opbouw van de algemeen beschaafde uitspraak van het Nederlands* (Amsterdam, 1937) by W. GS. HELLINGA, who contests southern influence in the diphthongization. HELLINGA's book is also important for its stressing of the conscious 'building' of cultivated language, a process which the author considers to be greatly influenced by spelling. Another protest against KLOEKE's theory was raised by W.A.F. JANSSEN in *De verbreiding van de uu-uitspraak voor westgermaansch û in Zuid-Oost-Nederland* (Maastricht, 1941), which was based on regional dialect data, and the publication of which led to a debate with KLOEKE.

Some of the details in KLOEKE's theory may, it is true, have to be rectified, but that the expansion theory, not only in the case of *uu*, but also in that of other isoglosses, is now generally accepted, is due to his investigations. The *oe/uu* question is clearer and simpler than that of the diphthongization, the problem as to whether it was genuinely Hollandic or Brabant import having perhaps been formulated too simplistically. The truth is probably on both sides, autochthonous tendencies were no doubt promoted and stimulated by the example of the immigrants, whose civilization was superior to that in which they found themselves.

The idea of 'expansion' also came out in a discussion opened by KLOEKE in the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Mundarten* XVIII, 217 ff, on the origin of the diminutive ending, which in modern Standard Netherlandic is *-tje*, but is capable of remarkable variations that depend on the word to which it is added, as against *-ke(n)* which is predom-

inant in southern dialects. KLOEKE explained *-tje* as a palatalization of *-kîn*, and situated the starting point of this palatalization in North-Holland, from which province he considered it to have 'expanded'. W. DE VRIES attacked this view, pointing in particular to facts in the province of Groningen which required a different explanation and in general to internal factors influencing local development there and elsewhere. A long-drawn debate between the two scholars ensued, in which their views came somewhat nearer to each other. Conclusive to a certain extent was the extensive geographical publication by W. PÉE, *Dialectgeographie der Nederlandsche Diminutiva* (2 vols, nr. IV of the series 'Uit het Seminarie voor Vlaamse Dialectologie van de Universiteit te Gent', 1936-38), in which the publications on the subject were reviewed. PÉE takes *-kîn* as the general starting point from which all actual forms developed in accordance with phonetic tendencies existing in each dialect.

'Ingwaeonic'

As we have seen, the idea of an expansion in later centuries, defended by KLOEKE, has met with serious opposition. The idea that historical movements can be deduced from the present picture of isoglosses is, however, a much more dangerous one. To a certain extent there is a *communis opinio* as to an 'Ingwaeonic' substratum under Netherlandic, which later on was covered by a Franconian superstratum that probably moved northward from the south. This would mean that modern Netherlandic is to be looked upon as Franconian with an Ingwaeonic substratum showing itself in some 'Ingwaeonisms' formerly explained as 'Frisisms'.

'Ingwaeonic' itself, however, is a rather vague notion, and scholars are not all of them agreed as to what it stands for. And as the term 'Franconian', though less vague than 'Ingwaeonic', is not clearly defined either, speculations on this subject are bound to remain rather hazardous, the more so as they are concerned, for the greater part, with early historical periods.

G.G. KLOEKE, in his essay *Zum Ingwäonismen-problem* for the *Festschrift-Borchling* (Neumünster in Holstein, 1932), 338 ff, confesses that at first he had considered using the term 'Wasserkantenerscheinung' as being safer and free of an ethnological background. Later, in his *Herkomst en groei van het Afrikaans* (cf. Ch. IX), 145 ff, he felt inclined to drop the term 'Ingwaeonic', exactly because he did

not agree with the implications it had been given by some scholars.

K. HEEROMA in his publications has been very outspoken on the subject of Ingwaeonic. As early as in his *Hollandse Dialektstudies* (Groningen-Batavia, 1935) he took a radical standpoint as regards 'frisisms', and repudiated even quite convincing examples in place-names. Later, in several articles, always brilliant and charming, he expounded his - steadily changing - views on the problem of Ingwaeonic. They cannot all be cited here, just a few milestones in the development of his ideas will be mentioned in passing. In his essay *Ingwaeoons* (*Ts.* LVIII, 198 ff) he defined the term 'Ingwaeonic', making a distinction between East and West Ingwaeonic, and considering Frisian as originally Saxon. Four years later, in *Iets over de vroegste Nederlandse taalgeschiedenis* (*N.Tg.* XXXVII, 1 ff), he discussed developments and levellings in the earliest periods of Netherlandic. Five years after that, in *Ts.* LXV, 266 ff, he opened up new perspectives by introducing the term *Chaukisch*, identifying Chaucic with West Ingwaeonic.

Protests against HEEROMA's daring theories came from more than one side. His radical rejection of 'frisisms' in North-Holland was contested by G. GOSSES and G. KARSTEN in a 'symposion' held by the Dialect Committee of Amsterdam, in which HEEROMA himself took part (a report of these discussions is to be found in *Een Friesch substraat in Noord-Holland?* Amsterdam, 1942; in the *Bijdragen en Mededelingen van de Dialectencommissie*). GOSSES also attacked what he called *Ingvaeonomany* in an article in Frisian for the *Album-Baader* (Nimeguen, 1938), 65 ff, where he held on to the old view, based on old documents, of true Frisians outside the present area of Friesland. A more moderate standpoint was adopted by M. SCHÖNFELD in *Ingvaeoons* for the *N.Tg.* XXXIX, 55 ff, an article that owes much to the book by Th. FRINGS, *Die Stellung der Niederlande im Aufbau des Germanischen* (Halle a.d. Saale, 1944). Another cautious and sober study is that by P. JÖRGENSEN, *Das Problem der Ingwäonen*, published in *Philologia Frisica Anno 1956* (Groningen-Djakarta, 1957), 7 ff.

HEEROMA continued to go his own way in *Oostnederlandse taal-problemen* (Amsterdam, 1951), where he distinguishes five successive language strata in Groningen, each marked off by its own relics. HEEROMA visualizes the language situation of about 1000 as being clearly subdivided, as we can see from his article *Ontspoorde frankisering*

(Ts. LXI, 81 ff), in which he explains differences of sound in some Hollandic words as the result of wrong transpositions from Ingwaeonic into Franconian.

Pronominal problems

Another matter that, since 1920, has been the subject of many an interesting discussion, is that of the personal pronouns of the second person, the forms of address. In Flemish Belgium and the southern provinces of the Netherlands the usual pronoun corresponding to English *you* is *gij*, its non-emphatic form *ge*. Originally, this *gij*, Middle Netherlandic *ghi*, was the pronoun for the 2nd person plural, the singular being *du*. But already in the earliest Netherlandic texts we find it used in the singular as a polite form, *du* being the familiar form. For a long time, this *gij*, with its accessory object form *u*, was almost exclusively the form used in writing, also in the Northern Netherlands, though in spoken Northern Netherlandic it was not used at all. This is a good example of the dissimilarity between the spoken and the written language, and at the same time an illustration of the southern influence on written Standard Netherlandic (cf. Ch. I). In the Northern Netherlands, the familiar personal pronoun of the 2nd person is *jij*, *je*, beside which *U* is used as the polite form. Nowadays, the older *du* is known in eastern dialects only; its being herded into the eastern districts has been explained as a result of 'hollandse expansie' by G.G. KLOEKE in *N.Tg.* XX, 1 ff, a view which he expressed again in his *Hollandsche Expansie*, mentioned before.

After the appearance of the monograph by J.A. VOR DER HAKE, *De aanspreekvormen in het Nederlands*, of which only the first part, *Middeleeuwen* (Utrecht, 1908) came out, it was generally accepted that the forms with *j-*, an older stage of those with *g-*, had continued to exist in the 'Ingwaeonic', or in VOR DER HAKE's terminology 'Frisian' area. The fact, however, that in the written tradition these *j*-forms cannot be traced, led A.A. VERDENIUS to formulate a new theory, set forth in *Ts.* XLIII, 81 ff (reprinted in the author's *Studies over Zeventiende Eeuws - Amsterdam*, 1946-165 ff), namely that *je* and *jij* must have arisen, in the later medieval period, from a special process of palatalization in enclitic positions like *hebdi* = *hebt ghi*, where *-di*, via *dži* > *ži*, developed into *ji*. VERDENIUS' theory had the advantage that it accounted, in an acceptable way, for the peculiar fact that when the pronouns *je* or *jij* are preceded by the verb, the latter

has no personal ending, thus *neem je, ga je* as opposed to *je neemt, je gaat*. The theory, however, was contested by J.W. MULLER in *Ts.* XLV, 81 ff. On the whole, MULLER upholds the older views, explaining the absence of *j*-forms in the written tradition by considering *gi* as a possible spelling for phonetic *ji*. VERDENIUS in his article *Over mogelijke spelvormen onzer j-pronomina in Middelnederlandse en 17de-eeuwse taal* for *Ts.* XLIX, 97 ff (reprinted in *Studies over Zeventiende Eeuws*, 192 ff), defended himself against MULLER's arguments, but was forced to abandon his original position at several points, and MULLER's view of the matter may be regarded as being more or less generally accepted. Through this renewed discussion on pronouns, MULLER was led to write a summary, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis onzer Nieuwnederlandse aanspreekvormen*, for *N.Tg.* XX, 81 ff, 133 ff, 161 ff, which in a way is a continuation of VOR DER HAKE's book.

In this last article MULLER also deals with *U*, which had earlier been explained as having developed from the written abbreviation *UEd.* or *UE.* for *Uwe Edelheid*. VOR DER HAKE, in *N.Tg.* V, 16 ff, did not share this opinion, and considered *U* as the object form *u* of the pronoun *gij*. J.H. KERN, *ibid.*, 121 ff, pleaded for *UE.*, but admitted influence of the object form *u*. Such seems to be the general opinion for the time being, although the process is not yet clear in all its details. Seventeenth century evidence as to the use of *U*, *Uwe*, as KLOEKE pointed out in his article *Uit de voorgeschiedenis van het beleefde pronomem U* in *Verzamelde Opstellen voor Prof. J.H. Scholte* (Amsterdam, 1947), 15 ff, complicates rather than simplifies the situation. This explains the perhaps over-ingenious attempt by P.C. PAARDEKOOPER, in *N.Tg.* XLI, 199 ff, who wanted to account for the rise of *U* by treating it as a mixture, in 16th century Hollandic, of Brabantic and Hollandic pronominal usage.

The familiar plural form *jullie* was explained by KLOEKE, in his inaugural address *Deftige en gemeenzame taal* (Groningen, 1934) and in *N.Tg.* XXXV, 161 ff, as a development of *joului*. K. HEEROMA, in *Ts.* LVII, 80 ff, modified KLOEKE's picture of the phonetic process, but A.A. VERDENIUS, in *N.Tg.* XXXVI, 240 ff, started from *jjilui*, and did not exclude the possibility that *joului* has had its influence, especially in the object form. This last article has been reprinted in VERDENIUS' *Studies over Zeventiende Eeuws*, 299 ff. An important contribution by VERDENIUS is also his earlier essay *Over onze vertrou-*

weljkheidspronomina en de daarbij behorende werkwoordsvormen for *N.Tg.* XXXII, 205 ff, reprinted *Studies*, 204 ff.

We spoke of the complications in connection with the personal and possessive pronouns of the 3rd person, especially in written Northern Netherlandic, in Ch. VIII, 3. c. The form of the pronoun 'hij', always written *hij*, but pronounced *ie* or *die* in enclitic position, was discussed by K. KOOIMAN in *N.Tg.* XLIII, 324 ff and by M.C. VAN DEN TOORN in *N.Tg.* LII, 85 ff; the latter mentions earlier publications on the subject.

A. VAN LOEY has studied *Het bezittelijk voornaamwoord 'hun'* (Amsterdam, 1958), the original dative of the personal pronoun of the 3rd person plural.

Conclusion

In the foregoing pages we have tried to give a sketch of Netherlandic linguistic activity in the last four decades. It may be of some use to summarize in broad outlines those matters that have lost their cohesion as a result of being distributed over separate chapters.

The good old tradition of historical language research has been continued not without honour. In the domain of lexicology a work of high standard, the monumental *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek*, has been completed, and will serve as a lasting reminder to younger generations of the name of its eminent maker, J. VERDAM. Making steady progress is the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*, which may be classified under historical linguistics in so far as it presents the development of the vocabulary since the second half of the 16th century, although it also provides a detailed and accurate lexicological description of contemporary Netherlandic, both standard and dialectal.

In the 19th century the sources for the history of the language, especially those of medieval times, were edited essentially for philological and literary purposes. In the period this book deals with, editors have aimed more at making their texts suited for purely linguistic research, and have scrupulously respected the manuscript tradition. Much remains to be done in this field, and we may expect that new editions, presenting the old linguistic material in a new form, will lead Middle Netherlandic grammar to be arranged in an, in many respects completely new, way. The dialectal nuances of Middle Netherlandic in particular will be brought out more clearly than before. A. VAN LOEY's *Middelnederlandse Spraakkunst*, based for the most part on non-literary texts that can be dated and localized, is one pointer in the way things will develop.

The 16th century, an important period of transition in the history of Netherlandic, has been treated only superficially from a lexicological point of view, and the grammatical aspects, too, have been insufficiently investigated as yet. One of the many merits of C.G.N. DE VOOYS lies in his having stimulated several pupils to bridge the gap between Middle and Modern Netherlandic by producing reliable editions of 16th century texts.

The more prominent 17th century authors were and are being inter-

preted through many carefully annotated editions of separate texts. Here, the name of F.A. STOETT should be gratefully mentioned. Our period has seen a standard edition of V o n d e l's works, and a similar edition of H o o f t's prose and poetry is in preparation.

Meanwhile, a great deal of work has still to be done on the purely grammatical description of the 17th century Netherlandic. A comprehensive study of the language of H o o f t, C a t s and H u y g e n s, to mention only those authors who have so far received no more than incidental attention, would be a promising and rewarding task. Popular speech, too, as it appears in the numerous 17th century farces, sorely needs systematical investigation along the lines of the conscientious detail-work done on this subject by A.A. VERDENIUS.

In view of these gaps in the description of the older stages of the language, it is rather remarkable that the last few decades should have witnessed a lively activity in what is generally called 'historical grammar', especially in the history of sounds and forms, the results of which are accurately reported in the successive editions of SCHÖNFELD's historical grammar, both in the text itself and in the references. Paradoxical as it may seem, these historical studies have been strongly stimulated by the investigation of modern dialects. Research into dialect geography, initiated in the Northern Netherlands by J. VAN GINNEKEN, J. SCHRIJNEN and the energetic G.G. KLOEKE, and in the Southern Netherlands by L. GROOTAERS and E. BLANCQUAERT, brought about a rejuvenation in linguistic activities. When it comes to foreign influences and relations we think of TH. FRINGS in the case of KLOEKE, of J. GILLIÉRON in that of BLANCQUAERT. The two Netherlandic scholars, however, went their own way to such a degree that it would be gravely unjust to represent them as imitators.

Of the younger generation of dialectologists we should mention, for the North K. HEEROMA, several of whose rather sweeping but always absorbing publications have been mentioned; further A. WEIJNEN, more restrained than his great teacher, VAN GINNEKEN, and who, after L.C. MICHELS, was VAN GINNEKEN's successor at Nimeguen University. In Belgium, J.L. PAUWELS, pupil and successor of GROOTAERS, is showing great activity, while W. PÉE may be considered to have continued the work of his teacher BLANCQUAERT.

With GROOTAERS, BLANCQUAERT and A. VAN LOEY, to whom may be added the much regretted R. VERDEYEN, we are in the presence of men who blazed new trails. It is due to their enterprise that the

period since 1920 has witnessed the rise of Netherlandics in Flemish Belgium to a level that, in some respects, surpasses that of Holland. The co-operation that has existed between North and South in this period has been of enormous benefit, and demonstrates that the political frontier is no barrier to scholarly interchange.

Flemish scholars were pioneers and leaders in onomastics as well. Holland can boast of a first rate investigator in this field in the person of M. SCHÖNFELD, but in the Southern Netherlands, where JAN LINDEMANS dedicated his life's work to these studies, onomastic activity has been spurred on by the founding of a centre under the direction of H.J. VAN DE WIJER, which is fast gaining in international reputation. This branch of linguistics, in which much progress has been made, and which promises still more, has, by compensating to a certain extent for the paucity of direct Old Netherlandic sources, deepened and enlarged the study of Netherlandic as a whole. The tradition instituted by VAN DE WIJER has been worthily kept up by H. DRAYE and K. ROELANDTS.

From about 1930 onwards a new trend has shown itself, one that has been christened 'structural linguistics', and one that consciously opposes historical linguistics. It is phonemics in the first place that has given the most visible and lasting results. The names of phonemists like J. VAN GINNEKEN, N. VAN WIJK and A.W. DE GROOT are well-known by all cultivators of general linguistics, and deserve mentioning in this book because these scholars often took Netherlandic as their starting point or considered the phonemic treatment of Netherlandic their main aim.

So much ground has been gained by structural linguistics that the time seems favourable for a renewal of modern grammar, since structuralism is chiefly concerned with the synchronistical treatment of the language. Some preparatory work is already being done in this field by, among others, A.W. DE GROOT, B. VAN DEN BERG and P.C. PAARDEKOOPER, but the views held differ so widely as to fundamentals that we can hardly expect a satisfactory grammatical synthesis to result in the near future.

C.G.N. DE VOOYS' useful grammar of Modern Netherlandic stands apart from this new linguistic trend in that its treatment of modern grammatical facts is, consciously, not strictly synchronic but rather historical.

A remarkable and very individual attempt at writing a modern

Netherlandic grammar is that by G.S. OVERDIEP. This scholar also dissociated himself from the structural and theoretical school and, while concurring to a certain extent in 19th century grammatical opinions, preferred on the whole to follow his own 'stylistic' method, in which the elements of the language, including sounds, are treated principally according to their function in the context of the sentence. Our opinion may differ as to the advisability of mixing stylistics and grammar in this way, and prefer to follow W. GS. HELLINGA in firmly separating grammar from stylistics in his 'linguistische stilistiek'. Nevertheless, we must admit that OVERDIEP and his school have made important contributions to the description both of Modern Netherlandic and the Netherlandic of earlier periods. It is to the lasting credit of OVERDIEP and his pupils, among whom G.A. VAN ES - OVERDIEP's successor in the University of Groningen - is the most prominent, that they claimed for syntax its rightful place beside phonology and morphology.

Index

- Aalst: dialect 80, 90.
 Academie voor Taal- en Letterk., Kon. Vla. 15.
 Achterhoek: dialect 89.
 Afrikaans 76, 77.
 Aken, Hein van: 25.
 ALBERING, L.I.H.: study of Middle Netherlandic 30.
 ALLARD, E.: *Hadewijch* 29.
 ALPHEN, J. VAN: syntax 65.
 Ampzing, S. 47.
 ANGREMOND, TH.H. D': *Achilles en Polyxena* 41.
 ANNEMA, H.: syntax 65.
 Antwerp: dialect 80.
ἀπο χοινοῦ 31
 ASSELBERGS, W.J.M.A.: *Zwolse Drukken, Klassieken* 24, 25; *Nyeuwervaert* 24;
Leeuwendalers 42.
 AUSEMS, TH.W.A.: dialect research 87.
 AXTERS, S.: *Scholastiek Lexicon* 32.
- BAADER, TH.: dialect research 87.
 BAERE, C. DE: swearwords 99.
 BAKEL, J.J.A. VAN: dialect research 90.
Beatrijs 20, 21, 23.
Becanus 38.
 BECH, G.: syntax 65, 66.
 BECKER, B.: *Coornhert* 34.
 BECKERING VINCKERS, J. 78.
 BEEKMAN, A.A.: *Mnl. Wb.* 11.
 BEEM, H.: *Jerösche* 92, 99.
 BEER, T.H. DE: 14; dialect research 78, 79.
 BEETS, A.: *W.N.T.* 10.
 Belgium: linguistic situation 5 ff, 54.
 BELLAARD, D.H.G.: *Teuthonista* 37.
 BELLEMANS, A.F.W.: *Torec* 24.
 BENSE, J.F.: *Dictionary* 73.
 BERG, B. VAN DEN: *Geert Grote* 30; *Boers en Beschaafd*, Hooft 44;
Spraakkunst 57; *Foniek* 58, 60; stress 61; syntax 65; dialect research 88, 91;
 synchronistical treatment of the language 109.
 BERGH, J.C. VAN DEN: 86.
 Berghe, J. van den: 34.
 BEUKEN, W.H.: *Van den Levene ons Heren* 28.
 BEZOEN, H.L.: dialect research 86, 91.
Bibliotheca Neerlandica Manuscripta 21, 22.
Biecorf 91.
Bijdragen, Leuvense 15.
 BIJL, A.S.: stress 61.
 Bilderdijk 50.
 BILLIET, R.: onomastics 95.
Bladen, Driemaandelijkse 91.
 BLANCQUAERT, E.: phonetics 58; Afrikaans 77; dialect research 82, 83, 84, 108.

Bo, L.-L. DE: dialect research 79.
BOEKENOOGEN, G.J.: *W.N.T.* 10; dialect research 79, 86.
BOELENS, K.: Frisian 83.
Bommelerwaard: dialect 80.
BONT, A.P. DE: dialect research 89.
BOONZAJER, C.: *Teuthonista* 37.
Borchgravinne van Vergi, Die 20, 24.
BORGELD, A.: *De Oudoostnederfrankische Psalmen* 17.
BORGER, J.J.: *Haags* 48.
Borsselen, Ph. van: 44.
BOSCH, J.: *Bilderdijk* 50.
BOSCH, J.H. VAN DEN: *Taal en Letteren* 14; *Granida* 41.
BOSHOFF, S.P.E.: Afrikaans 76.
BOSSCHERIJ, J.B.: dialect research 80.
BOSMAN, D.B.: Afrikaans 76.
BOUMAN, A.C.: study of Middle Netherlandic 22, 27, 30, 32; syntax 65; prefix *ka-* 98.
Brabant 2, 8.
Brabantic 8, 29, 30, 32, 33, 53, 85.
BRAND, H. VAN DEN: dialect research 79.
BRANDEN, L. VAN DEN: Netherlandic in the 16th century 39.
BRANDS, G.A. 33.
Bredero -40 ff.
Bree: dialect 80.
BRINK, J. TEN: Bredero 40.
BROEKHUYSEN, J.: dialect research 87.
BROUWERS, A.P.J.: dialect research 90.
Bruges 30.

- BRUIN, C.C. DE: anthologies 22; *Imitatio* 23; bible translations 32, 46; *Bilderdijk* 50.
 Brussels: dialect 86.
 BRUYEL, M.: dialect research 80.
 BUCK, H. DE: study of Middle Netherlandic 51.
 BUITENRUST HETTEMA, F.: *Taal en Letteren* 14.
- CARÈME, M.: dialect research 82.
 CARNOY, A.: onomastics 94, 95.
 CARON, W.J.H.: doctoral thesis 39; Chr. van Heule, P. Leupenius, P. Montanus 46, 47.
 Catalan 73.
 Cats 41, 44, 108.
 CAUBERGHE, J.: *Ned. Taalschat* 99.
 Chandelier, Six van: 42.
 CLAES, D.: dialect research 79.
 CLIGNETT, J.A.: *Teuthonista* 37.
 COCK, A. DE: proverbs 99.
 COETSEM, F. VAN: bibliography 83.
 COHEN, A.: phonemics 60; diminutives 63.
 COLINET, PH.: dialect research 80.
 Commissie voor Top. en Dial., Kon. 83, 94.
 CORNELISSEN, J.: dialect research 79.
 COSIJN, P.J. 78.
 COWAN, H.K.J.: psalter fragments 17.
 CRAEYNEST, J.: *Loquela* 79.
 CRENA DE LONGH, A.C.: G.C. van Santen 44.
 Culemborg: dialect 87.
- DAAN, J.C.: dialect research 84, 88.
 Dale, J. van den: 34.
 DAM, C.F.A. VAN: Spanish influence 72.
 DAMAN, J.A.: *Het Alg. Beschaafd in Vlaanderen* 54.
 DAMBRE, O.: J. de Harduyn 42.
 DANIËLS, L.M. FR.: D. van Delf 28.
 Danish 72.
 DANTZIG, B. VAN: phonetics 59.
 Dasypodius, P. 37.
 DEBAENE, L.: *Mariken* 20, 21.
 DEGROOTE, G.: J. van den Dale 34; *Spiegel* 44.
 Delf, Dirc van: 28.
 Deventer: dialect 86.
 Deyssel, L. van: 64.
 Dialectencommissie 84.
 Diets, vid. Duits.
 diphthongization 38, 53, 100, 101.
 DIS, L.M. VAN: *Beatrijs, Reinaert* 23; *Reform. reder.spelen, Spelen van Sinne* 34; *Bloemhof* 42.
 Doesborch, J. van: 34.
 DOLS, W.: dialect research 86.
 DOORNE, A. VAN: 74.

DRAAK, M.: *Lancelot* 24.
 DRAYE, H.: onomastics 96, 109.
 Drechterland: dialect 86, 89.
 Drente: dialect 88.
 DREWES, J.B.: *Wilhelmus* 35.
Drukken en Herdrukken, Zwolse 24, 41, 42.
 DUINKERKEN, A. VAN: vid. W.J.M.A. ASSELBERGS.
 Duits, Diets: the term 9.
 DUPONT, J.: dialect research 80.
 Dutch: the term 3, 5.
 DUYFHUIZEN, G.M.J.: *Potgieter* 51.

EBBINGE WUBBEN, C.H.: *Mnl. Handwb.* 11.
 EBELING, C.L.: phonemics 60.
 EEGHEM, W. VAN: 16th century texts 34.
 Effen, J. van: 50, 70.
 EIJKMAN, L.P.H.: old grammars 39; phonetics 47, 58, 59.
Elckerlijc 23.
 ELEMANS, J.: dialect research 90.
 ELLERBROEK-FORTUIN, E. 34.
 Elten-Bergh: dialect 80.
 ELZINGA, J.J.B.: J. van Effen 50, 70; index 69.
 EMONDS, E.: *Sinte Kunera* 28.
 ENDEPOLS, (H.) J. (E.): *Tondalus' Visioen en St. Patricius' Vagevuur* 20; *Elckerlijc* 23; dialect research 89.
 ENGELS, G.: *Maerlant*- 30.
 English 72, 73.
 Enschede: dialect 86.
 Erasmus: *Pronunciatio* 38, 39.
 ERINGA, P.: phonemics 60.
 ERNÉ, B.H.: 16th century texts 34; stress 61.
 ES, G.A. VAN: *Servaes* 20; *Walewein* 24; OVERDIEP's *Vormleer van het Mnl.* 26, 27; *De attr. gen. in het Mnl.*

30; syntactical studies 31; *Six van Chandelier* 42; modern grammar 56, 57; dialectology and syntax 92; OVERDIEP's school 110.

Esmoreit 20, 21, 23.

Everaert, C. 33.

expansion 85, 101, 102.

Eybers, E. 66.

EYMAEL, H.J.: *Huygens* 41.

Ferguut 22, 31.

FIJN VAN DRAAT, P.: dialect research 86.

Flanders 7, 8, 93.

Flemish 2, 7, 8, 28, 29, 30, 54, 74, 78, 79, 87.

FLOU, K. DE: onomastics 93.

FOERSTE, W.: dialect research 85.

FOKKEMA, K.: *Kiliaan* 36; phonemics 60; Frisian 83.

FRANCK, J.: *Etym. Wdb. der Ned. Taal* 12; *Mnl. Grammatik* 25, 26, 27.

Franconic 2.

French: in Flemish Belgium 5, 6, 54, 74; mutual influence 69, 70, 73, 74, 75.

FRINGS, TH.: 2; *Servaes* 21; dialect studies 81; *Die Stellung der Niederlande* 103; 108.

Frisian 2, 4, 5, 82, 83.

GAARENSTROOM, J.H.: word stress 60.

GALAMA, E.G.A. 34.

GALLÉE, J.H.: dialect research 78.

gallicisms 32, 54.

gender 61, 62.

German 70, 71, 73.

German, Low 9.

GESCHIERE, L.: Walloon and Flemish 74.

GESSLER, J.: Walloon and Flemish 74.

GESTEL, P. VAN: *ABN-gids* 54.

GEZELLE, G.: *Loquela* 79.

Ghent: Old Ghent language 17; dialect 80, 89.

GHIJSEN, Ha. C.M.: dialect research 90.

GILLIÉRON, J. 108.

GINNEKEN, J. VAN: *Onze Taaltuin* 16; *Imitatio* 23; *Limb. Leven van Jezus* 29; *Handboek der Ned. Taal* 56, 92; phonemics 60, 109; word formation 63; children's language 67; dialect research 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 91, 108.

GODTHELP, H. 57.

GOEMANS, L.: *Kiliaan* 36, 37; *A. Sexagius* 38; dialect research 80, 89.

GONNET, C.J. 48.

GOOSSENAERTS, J.: dialect research 90.

GOSSES, G.: Ingwaeonic 103.

GOVAERT, M.: *Marnix* 36.

GRAAF, J.J.: christian names 96.

GRAULS, J.: Walloon and Flemish 74; dialect research 80.

Grave: dialect 87.

GRONDIJS, H.F. 33.

Groningen: dialect 87, 89.

GROOT, A.W. DE: *Structurele Syntaxis* 57; 109; phonemics 60, 109; intonation 61; prosody 67.

GROOT, K.W. DE: S. Stevin 47.

GROOTAERS, L.: history of Netherlandic 12; *Leuvense Bijdragen* 15; Walloon and Flemish 74; dialect research 78, 80, 82, 83, 84, 108.

Grote, Geert 28, 30.

Guelders: language of - 30.

GUITTART, L.J.: intonation 61.

GUNNINK, J.: dialect research 80.

GYSSSELING, M.: *Diplomata belgica* 17, 18; onomastics 95.

HABERMEHL, I.: index *N.G.N.* 93.

Hadewijch 23, 29.

HAEGHEN, F. VAN DER: J. Lambrecht 38.

HAENE, P. D': dialect research 82.

HAERINGEN, C.B. VAN: *Etym. Wdb. der Ned. Taal* 12; *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 15; phonetics 59; studies in Modern Netherlandic 53, 54, 62, 63, 65; French influence 70; *Nederlands tussen Duits en Engels* 72; dialect research 91; relics with *oe* 101.

Hague, The 48, 50.

HAKE, J.A. VOR DER: pronominal problems 104, 105.

HALL, R.A.: Negro-English 75.

HALTEREN, B. VAN: 16th century Netherlandic 36.

HAMMERICH, L.L.: influence of Netherlandic on Danish 72.
Handwoordenboek, Middelnederlandsch 11.

Harduyn, J. de: 42.

Hasselt: dialect 80.

- HASSELT, G. VAN: Kiliaan 36.
 HAUST, J.: Walloon and Flemish 74.
 HAVERBEKE, P. VAN: study of Middle Netherlandic 30.
 HEEMSTRA, J.: study of syntax 31, 64, 65.
 HEEREN, J.: P. de Heuiter 38.
 HEEROMA, K.: *Tweede Rose* 25; *Holl. dialectstudies* 30; diphthongization 38; *Goois* 50; stress 61; numerals 62; English influence 72; Netherlandic in Indonesia 75; dialect research 83, 84, 85, 88, 91, 92, 108; word studies 98, 99; Ingwaeonic 103, 104; pronominal problems 105.
 HEGMAN, W.E.: *Vierde Martijn* 25.
 HEINSIUS, J.: *W.N.T.* 10; Huygens 41; *Statenbijbel* 46.
 HELLINGA, W.GS.: *Reinaert* 20; *Zwolve Drukken, Klassieken* 24, 25; *Antwerpsch Liedboek* 35; diphthongization 38; 'linguistic-stylistic' method 66, 67, 110; Surinam 75; *De opbouw* 101.
 HELSEN, J.: onomastics 95.
 HELTEN, W.L. VAN: psalter fragments 17; *Mnl. Spraakkunst* 26, 27; pupils 35, 36; *Vondel's taal* 43.
 HEREMANS, J.F.J.: J. Lambrecht 38; *Onze Volkstaal* 78.
 HERMODSSON, L.: *Boec van den Houde* 25; *Reflexive und intransitive Verba etc.* 31, 32.
 HERTOOG, C.H. DEN: modern grammar 55, 56.
 HERTOOG, H.J. DEN: 55.
 HESSELING, D.C.: word formation 63; Negro-Dutch 75; Afrikaans 76.
 Heuiter, P. de: 38.
 Heule, Chr. van: 39, 46.
 HIJSZELER, C.C.W.J.: dialect research 88.
 Hildegarsberch, Willem van: 24, 30.
 HOEVEN, A. VAN DER: L. ten Kate 51.
 HOF, J.J.: dialect research 82.
 HOFKER, S.: *Melis Stoke* 30.
 HOL, A.R.: dialect research 82, 83.
 HOLK, A.G.F. VAN: phonemics 60.
 Holland 3, 5, 8.
 Hollandic 3, 5 ff, 30, 33, 48, 53.
 HOLMBERG, J.: *Bestiaire d'Amour* 28.
 HOMBERG-BOT, M. VAN DEN: dialect research 88.
 Hooft 40 ff, 108.
 HOOG, W. DE: English influence 72.
 HOOGEWERFF, G.J.: *Stalp van der Wielen* 42.
 Hoogstraten, D. van: 51, 52.
 HOUBEN, J.J.H.: dialect research 80.
 Hubert, A. de: 46.
 Huisseling: dialect 90.
 HUIZINGA, A.: onomastics 97.
 Huydecoper, B. 51.
 Huygens 40 ff, 108.
 HUYSMANS, A.P.: *Nyeuwervaert* 24.
- Imitatio* 23.
 Ingwaeonic 2, 102 ff.
 Italian 72.

JACOB, W.G.J.A.: dialect research 87.
 JACOBS, J.: study of Flemish 28, 29, 87; study of Middle Netherlandic 30.
 JAGER, A. DE: *Bilderdijk* 50.
 JANSONIUS, F.: stylistic studies 64.
 JANSSEN, W.A.F.: debate with KLOEKE 101.
 JAQUET, J. 74.
 Jewish 92.
 JONG, A.C. DE: *Hertspiegel* 44.
 JONG, M. DE: 34.
 JONGEJAN, S.: A. van Leeuwenhoek 48.
 JOOS, A.: dialect research 79.
 JÖRGENSEN, P.: Ingwaeonic 103.
 JOSSELIN DE JONG, J.P.B. DE: Negro-Dutch 75.
 Junius, H.: 37.

KAISER, L.: phonetics 59.
 KALFF, G.: *Bredero* 40.
 KALLEN, M. VAN DER: *Hadewijch* 29.
 Kampen: dialect 80.
 KAPER, W.: children's language 67, 68.
 KARSTEN, G.: M. DE VRIES and his pupils 10; dialect research 86, 89; onomastics 94; frisisms 103.
 Kate, L. ten: 51.
 KATS, J.C.P.: dialect research 86.
 Kempen(land): dialect 89, 90.
 KERCKHOVE, R. VAN DE: dialect research 82.
 KERN, J.H.: *Limburgsche Sermoenen* 28; 17th century Netherlandic 48; dia-

- lect research 78, 79, 84; pronominal problems 105.
- KESSEN, A.: *Cancellierboek* 29.
- KEYSER, S.: dialect research 89.
- KEYSER, P. DE: *Borchgravinne van Vergi* 24; J. Lambrecht 38.
- KIEFT, A.P.: *Homonymie* 89.
- Kiliaan 33, 36, 37.
- KLOEKE, G.G.: *Karel ende Elegast* 20; diphthongization 38, 100, 101; *Haagse volkstaal* 50; *Gezag en norm* 53, 54; *Provincialismen* 54; German influence 71; Afrikaans 76, 77; dialect research 78, 81, 82, 84, 89, 92, 108; *De Hollandsche Expansie* 81, 82, 100, 101; diminutives 101, 102; Ingwaeonic 102, 103; pronominal problems 104, 105.
- Kluit, A. 52.
- KLUYVER, A.: *W.N.T.* 10; Kiliaan 36, 37; *Bilderdijk* 50.
- KNOOP, M. 58.
- KNUTTEL, J.A.N.: *W.N.T.* 10; *Bredero* 40, 41.
- KOCH, A.C.F.: *Diplomata belgica* 18.
- KOELMANS, L.: index *N.Tg.* 15, 98; M. de Ruyter 45.
- KOLLEWIJN, R.A.: *Taal en Letteren* 14; *Bredero* 40; *Huydecoper* 51; *Van Hoogstraten* 52.
- KOLTHOFF, I.B.: 16th century Netherlandic 35, 36.
- KOOIMAN, K.: *Twe-spraack* 38; pronominal problems 106.
- KOOISTRA, J.: syntax 65.
- KOOPMANS, J.: *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 14, 15.
- KOON, T. VAN DER: Frisian 82.
- KOSSMANN, E.F.: *Die Haager Liederhandschrift* 21.
- KOSSMANN, F.: *Granida* 43.
- KRAMER, W.: stylistics 66.
- KRUISINGA, E.: *Taal en Leven* 16; modern Netherlandic 53, 57, 60; word formation 63; Afrikaans 76.
- KRUYSKAMP, C.H.A.: *W.N.T.* 10; *v. Dale* 11; *De Mnl. boerden* 23; J. van Doesborch, J.v.d. Berghe 34; proverbs 99.
- KUIPER, E.T.: *Geuzenliedboek* 35.
- KUIPER, G.: *Zwolse Drukken, Klassieken* 24, 25; *Twe-spraack* 38.
- LAAN, K. TER: dialect research 87, 89; proverbs 99.
- LAAN, N. VAN DER: 16th century texts 34, 35, 44.
- LABROISSE, G. 71.
- Lambrecht, J. 37, 38.
- LANDHEER, H.C.: dialect research 87, 89.
- LANGEVELD, M.: *Taal en Denken* 55.
- language boundary 5, 75.
- LECOUTERE, C. 12.
- LEENDERTZ, P.: *Geuzenliedboek* 35.
- LEENEN, J.: dialect research 74, 83.
- LEEST, J.: German influence 71.
- Leeuwenhoek, A. van: 48.
- LEGROS, E. 74.
- Lelyveld, F. van: 51.
- LENZ, R.: *Papiamento* 76.
- LEOPOLD, J.A. and L.: dialect reader 78.
- LESSEN, J.H. VAN: *W.N.T.* 10; *Samengestelde naamwoorden* 62; dialectology and lexicography, slang 92; word studies 98.

Leupenius, P. 47.
LEVITICUS, F.: *Servaes* 28.
LIEFTINCK, G.I.: *Mnl. Wb.* 11; *Servaes* 20; *Bibl. Neerl. Manuscr.* 21, 22; codices 22.
Liege 74.
LIEVEVROUW-COOPMAN, L.: dialect research 89.
Limburg 8.
Limburgic 8, 21, 28, 29, 81, 86.
LINDEBOOM, J.: *A. Moonen* 52.
LINDEMANS, J.: onomastics 93, 94, 95, 96, 109.
LINDES, E.: stylistics 66.
LOEY, A. (C.H.) VAN: SCHÖNFELD's *Hist. Grammatica* 13; *De oudste Mnl. oorkonden* 20; *Borchgravinne van Vergi* 20; *Mnl. Leerboek* 22; *Mnl. Spraakkunst* 27, 107, 108; *Zuid-West-Brabantsch* 29; *Netherlandic in Belgium* 54; onomastics 93, 95; the pronoun *hun* 106.
Long, I. le: 51.
Looy, J. van: 64.
Louvain: charters 32; dialect 80, 89; onomastics 97.
LOUW, S.A.: *Afrikaans* 77.
LUBACH, A.E.: 16th century *Netherlandic* 35, 36.

- LUBBE, H.F.A. VAN DER: *Woordvolgorde* 58.
 LUITINGH, J.C.: christian names 96, 97.
 LULOFS, F.: stylistics 66.
 LYNA, F.: J. van Stijevoort 34.
- Maastricht: dialect 80, 89.
 Maatschappij der Ned. Letterkunde 14.
 Maerlant, J. van: 24, 30.
 MAEYER, A. DE: *Mariken* 20, 21.
 MAK, J.J.: *De Roovere* 23; *Soliloquium* 28; eastern Middle Netherlandic 30; farces, *Rhetoricaal Glossarium* 35.
 Malay 75.
 MAN, L. DE: study of lexicology 32; dialect research 89.
 MANSION, J.: *Oud-Gentsche Naamkunde* 17, 18, 94; onomastics 94.
 Marais, E. 66.
Mariken van Nieumeghen 20, 21, 23.
 Marnix 36.
 MAXIMILIANUS, P.: *Sinte Franciscus Leven* 24.
 MAZEREEL, G.: dialect research 86.
 MEER, M.J. VAN DER: historical grammar 12, 13, 75.
 MEER, S.G.W. VAN DER: *Venloer Stadt-Texte* 29.
 MEERT, H.: Ruusbroec 28.
 MEERTENS, P.J.: dialect research 83, 84, 92; onomastics 96.
 MEERWALDT, J.D.: Vondel 40.
 MEEUSSEN, A.E.: dialect research 91.
 MEIJLING, H. 34.
 MENDELS, J.: A. van Leeuwenhoek 48.
 MESSING, E.E.J.: word formation 63.
 MEULEN, P. VAN DER: Coornhert 34.
 MEULEN, R. VAN DER: influence of Netherlandic on Russian 73.
 MEYERS, J.A.: christian names 96, 97.
 MICHELS, L.C.: *Tijdschr. voor Taal en Letteren* 15; *Filol. Opstellen* 32, 36, 41, 42; Kiliaan 37; Valcooch 39; Vondel 40, 42, 43; Six van Chand., Stalp. van der Wielen 42; word formation 63.
 MIERLO, J. VAN: Old Netherlandic 18; *Theophilus* 19, 23; *Mariken* 20, 21; Hadewijch, *Roelandslied*, Ruusbroec 23.
 MINDERAA, P.: *Zwolse Drukken, Klassieken* 24, 25.
 MINIS, C.: the 'ἀπό χοινοῦ'-construction 31.
 MIRANDE, A.F.: *Servaes* 20.
 MITZKA, W.: Netherlandic in Germany 73.
 MOERMAN, H.J.: onomastics 94.
 MOET, P.J.: dialect research 82.
 MOLKENBOER, B.H.: Vondel 40.
 MOLLER, H.W.E.: Vondel 40.
 MOLTZER, H.E.: Bredero 40.
 Montanus, P. 47.
 Moonen, A. 52.
 MOORMANN, J.G.M.: *De Geheimtalen* 92.
 MOORS, J.: *De oorkondentaal etc.* 21, 29.
 MOORTGAT, A.: germanisms 71.
 MULDER, G.J.A. 85.

MULLER, J.W.: *W.N.T.* 10; *Reinaert* 20, 24; gallicisms 32, 69, 70; Everaert 33; J. Lambrecht 38; *Spreektaal en schrijftaal* 53; Netherlandic in Germany 73; pronominal problems 105.
MULLER, P.E.: Ph. van Borsselen 44.

NAARDING, J.: dialect research 88, 91.

NAUTA, G.A.: Bredero 43.

Nederduits: the term 9.

NEEF, E. DE: 28.

Negro-Dutch 75.

Negro-English 75.

Netherlandic: the term 3, 5.

Netherlandic, Middle 19 ff.

Netherlandic, Old 1, 2, 17, 18.

Netherlandic, Standard 3.

NIENABER, C.J.M.: stylistics 66.

Nomina Geographica Neerlandica 93, 96.

Noord en Zuid, periodical 14.

Noord-Beveland: dialect 80.

Noordhorn: dialect 80.

Noot, J. van der: 35.

Nu Nog, periodical 55.

OBREEN, H.: *De oudste Middelned. oorkonden* 20.

OEHMANN, E.: French influence 70; Italian influence 72.

OPPREL, A.: Cats 44; dialect research 80.

- ORNÉE, W.A.: Marnix 36.
 Oud-Beierland: dialect 80.
 OUDEMANS, A.C.: dictionaries 42.
 OVERDIEP, G.S.: *Onze Taaltuin* 16; *Ferguut* 22, 28; study of Middle Netherlandic 26, 27, 28; his school 30, 31, 36; study of 17th century Netherlandic 44, 45, 48; Potgieter 51; modern grammar 56, 110; word formation 63; syntactical studies 63, 64; dialect research 90.
 Overflakkee: dialect 87, 89.
- PAARDEKOOPEP, P.C.: modern grammar 57, 58, 109; phonemics 60; pronominal problems 105.
 Papiamento 76.
Patricius' Vagevuur, St. 20.
 PAUL, H.: *Prinzipien* 56.
 PAUW-DE VEEN, L. DE: painters' jargon 43.
 PAUWELS, A.: dialect research 91.
 PAUWELS, J.L.: *Leuwense Bijdragen* 15; *Het Alg. Beschaafd in Vlaanderen* 54; syntax 65; Afrikaans 77; dialect research 82, 83, 86, 87, 108.
 PÉE, E.: intonation 61.
 PÉE, W.: intonation 61; Surinam 75; dialect research 83, 92, 102.
 PEETERS, C.H.: *Nederl. Taalgids* 54.
 PEETERS, F.J.P.: dialect research 86.
 Perk, J. 64.
 PLANQUE, P.A. DE: Valcooch 39.
 Plantijn 37.
 Poirters, A. 44.
 POLAK, J.E.: Jewish 92.
 Portuguese 73.
 Potgieter, E.J. 50, 51.
 Potter, Dirc 24.
 POUKENS, J.B.: Ruusbroec 23.
 PREUSLER, W.: Afrikaans 76.
 PRICK VAN WELY, F.: Malay and Netherlandic 75.
 PULLES, J.A.M.: study of syntax 31.
- RAMISCH, J.: dialect research 81.
 Reael, L.: 46.
 REICHLING, A.: phonemics 60.
Reinaert 20, 23, 24.
Renout 30.
 RENS, L.L.E.: Surinam 76.
 Revis, J. 44.
 REYPENS, L.: Ruusbroec 23.
 RIBBERT, P.TH.: dialect research 87.
 Riebeeck, J. van: 45.
 RIJNBACH, A.A. VAN: *De kluchten van G.A. Bredero* 41.
 RIJNBERK, G. VAN: 48.
Roelandslied 23.
 ROELANDTS, K.: onomastics 92, 96, 97, 109.
 ROEMANS, R.: *Mariken* 20, 21.
 Roermond: dialect 86.

ROMBOUITS, S.: children's language 67.
 ROMPELMAN, T.A.: ten Kate 51.
 ROORDA, P.: phonetics 58.
 ROTH, E.: psalters 17.
 Roovere, A. de: 23.
 ROUKENS, W.: dialect research 86.
 ROUX, J.J. LE: *Mnl. Grammatika* 26.
 ROUX, T.H. LE: *Mnl. Grammatika* 26.
 ROYEN, G.: *Tijdschrift voor Taal en Letteren* 15; intonation 61; sex and gender, flexions, derailments in written language 62: word formation 63; syntax 65; *Ongaaf Nederlands* 71.
 Ruinen: dialect 90.
 Russian 73.
 RUTTEN, A.: dialect research 79.
 RUTTEN, M.: *Dichtkunde en phonologie* 67.
 Ruusbroec, J. van: 23.
 Ruyter, M. de: 45.

SALVERDA DE GRAVE, J.J.: French influence on Netherlandic 69, 70, 74; influence of Netherlandic on French 74.
 SAMYN, J.: dialect research 79.
 Santen, G.C. van: 44.
 SASSEN, A.: dialect research 90, 91.
 Saxonian dialects 2, 84, 85.
 SCHAAR, J. VAN DER: onomastics 97.
 SCHARPÉ, L.: Everaert 33.
 SCHIEB, G.: *Servaes* 21.
 SCHMIDT, G.: study of syntax 31.
 SCHNEIDERS, A.J.: *Taal en Leven* 16.
 SCHOLTZ, H.V.D. MERWE: stylistics 66.
 SCHOLTZ, J. DU P.: Afrikaans 77.
 SCHÖNFELD, M.: *Hist. Grammatica* 13, 25, 108; Old Netherlandic 18; *Ned. Spraakkunst* 57; onomastics 93, 94, 109; relics with *oe* 101; Ingwaeonic 103.

- Schoon en De Brabander, Eigen* 91, 93.
 Schorus, A. 37.
 SCHOTHORST, W. VAN: *De Ned. Taal* 56; dialect research 80.
 Schouwen-Duiveland: dialect 87.
 SCHRIJNEN, J.: stress 60, 61; dialect research 81, 108.
 SCHUCHARDT, H.: Negro-Dutch 75.
 Schuere, J. van der: 47.
 Schueren, G. van der: 37.
 SCHUERMANS, L.W.: dialect research 79.
 SCHULTE-KEMMINGHAUSEN, K. 92.
 SCHURINGA, F.G.: dialect research 86.
 SCHURMANS, M.: Ruusbroec 23.
Servaes 20, 21.
 Séwel, A. 52.
 Sexagius, A. 38.
 SHETTER, W.Z.: diminutives 63.
 SIJMONS, B. 78.
 Sittard: dialect 86.
 SMET, G. DE: Kiliaan 37.
 SMIT, J.: *Bloemhof* 42; *Potgieter* 50.
 SMIT, W.A.P.: *De Nieuwe Taalgids* 15; *Zwolse Drukken, Klassieken* 24, 25; J. vander Noot 35; *Revius* 44.
 SMOUT, H.: Antwerp dialect 43, 80.
 Spanish 72, 73.
Spel van den H.S. vander Nyeuwervaert 24.
 spelling-reform 13, 14, 16, 49.
 Spiegel, H.L. 44.
 Stalpart van der Wielen, J.: 42.
 STAPELKAMP, CHR.: *Revius* 44.
Statenbijbel 45, 46.
 STAVERMAN, W.H.: word formation 63.
 STEENBERGEN, G.J.: *De bekeeringe Pauli* 34.
 STELLINGA, G.: *De abele spelen* 30, 31.
 Stevin, S. 47.
 Stijevoort, J. van: 34.
 STOETT, F.A.: *Mnl. Wb.* 11; history of Netherlandic 13; *Bloeml. Mnl. dichters* 22; *Mnl. Syntaxis* 26; *Drie kluchten* 34; *Moortje, Teeuwis de Boer* 41; 17th century dialect 48; proverbs 99; 17th century Netherlandic 108.
 Stoke, Melis 30.
 STOKVIS, Z.: stress 61.
 STRACKE, D.A.: Ruusbroec 23.
 STUTTERHEIM, C.F.P.: syntax 65; *Stijlleer* 67.
 Surinam 75, 76.
 SWAEN, A.E.H.: onomastics 96.
- Taal en Letteren* 14.
Taal en Leven 16.
Taal en Tongval 91, 92.
Taalatlas van N.- en Z.-Ned. 84.
Taalatlas van Oost-Nederland 84.
Taalgids, De Nieuwe 14, 15, 98.

Taaltuin, Onze 15, 16, 84.
Talen, Levende 15.
 TEIRLINCK, I.: dialect research 79.
 Tessel: dialect 89.
 TEUCHERT, H.: Netherlandic in Germany 73.
Theophilus 19, 23.
 TIEMEYER, W.F.: W. van Hildegarsberch 30.
Tijdschrift voor Taal en Letteren 15.
Tijdschrift voor Ned. Taal- en Letterkunde 13, 14, 98.
Tijdschrift voor Levende Talen 15.
 TILLE, E.: charters of Guelders 30.
 Tilligte: dialect 87.
 TINBERGEN, D.C.: *Beatrijs, Reinaert* 23; numerals 62; children's language 67.
 TOLLENAERE, F. DE: *W.N.T.* 10; *v. Dale* 11; word studies 98.
Tondalus' Visioen 20.
 Tongeren: dialect 80.
 TOORN, M.C. VAN DEN: 75, 106.
Torec 24.
Trivium 47.
 TUERLINCKX, J.F.: dialect research 79.
 Twente: dialect 86, 89.
Twe-spraack 38.

UIJLINGS, B.J.: syntax 64.
 UITMAN, G.J.: onomastics 94, 96.
 UNGER, J.H.W.: *Bredero* 40.

Valcooch 39.
 VALKHOFF, M.: Netherlandic and foreign languages 73, 74, 75.
 VANACKER, FR.: dialect research 83, 90, 91.
 VANDENHEUVEL, J.: dialect research 81.
 VANDERHEYDEN, J.F.: *A. Verwer* 52.
 VANGASSEN, H.: *Bouwstoffen etc.* 29, 30; dialect research 83.

- VARKEVISSER, C.: dialect research 90.
- VEEN, J.O.S. VAN DER: Bredero 43.
- VEENENBOS, K. 71.
- VEENSTRA, F.: *Baeto* 41, 42.
- Veldeke, Henric van: 21.
- V.E.L.D.E.K.E. 91.
- Veluwe: dialect 80.
- Venlo: dialect 86.
- VERCOULLIE, J.: etymological dictionary 12; historical grammar 13: dialect research 78, 79.
- VERDAM, J.: *Mnl. Wdb.* 10, 11, 107; *Mnl. Handwb.* 11; history of Netherlandic 13; *Theophilus* 19; *Ferguut* 22; *Teuthonista* 37.
- VERDENIUS, A.A.: lexicological studies 32; *Valcooch* 39; *Vondel* 40; *Granida* 41; *Studies over Zeventiende Eeuws* 42; pronominal problems 104, 105, 106; 17th century Netherlandic 108.
- VERDEYEN, R.: *Tondalus' Visioen en St. Patricius' Vagevuur* 20; *Esmoreit* 23; *Marnix* 36; *Naembouck* 37; Walloon and Flemish 74; 108.
- VERECKEN, C.: dialect research 83.
- VERHAGE, J.A.: *Dagregister* 45.
- VERHOFSTEDE, A.L.: *Beatrijs, Mariken* 20, 21.
- VERMEEREN, P.J.H.: doctoral thesis 22.
- VERSCHUEREN, J.: *Modern Woordenboek* 11, 12.
- VERSCHUUR, A.: *P. Montanus* 47; dialect research 80.
- Verlagen en Meded. van de Kon. Vla. Ac. voor Taal- en Letterk.* 15.
- VERSTEGEN, V.: dialect research 82.
- VERVLIET, J.B.: dialect research 79.
- Verwer, A. 52.
- VERWIJS, E.: *Mnl. Wb.* 10, 11; *Bloeml. Mnl. dichters* 22.
- VESSEM, A.H. VAN: dialect research 90; index *N.G.N.* 93.
- VIDOS, B.E. 73.
- VIEU-KUIK, H.J.: French words in *Wolff-Deken* 50, 70.
- VIN, A. DE: dialect research 87.
- VINDEVOGEL, TH.: sentence analysis 65.
- Visscher, R. 44.
- VLOTEN, J. VAN: *Cats* 41.
- Vondel* 40, 42, 43, 45, 108.
- VOORHOEVE, J.: *Surinam* 76.
- VOORZANGER, J.L.: *Jewish* 92.
- VOOYS, C.G.N. DE: *Gesch. van de Ned. Taal* 13; *De N. Taalgids* 14, 15; *Marialegenden* 20; lexicology 32; *Kiliaan* 37; old grammars 38, 46, 47; *Vondel* 40; *Spaenschen Brabander* 43; 17th century Netherlandic 48; 18th century Netherlandic 50; 18th century grammarians 51, 52; Standard Netherlandic 53, 54; modern grammar 57, 109; children's language 67; Netherlandic and foreign languages 70, 71, 72; 'homonymophobia' 89; slang 92; onomatopoeics 98; pupils 107.
- VOSKUIL, J.J.: *Surinam* 76.
- VREESE, W. DE: *Paradox* 21; *Bibl. Neerl. Manuscr.* 21, 22; gallicisms 54, 71.
- VRIENDT-DE MAN, M.J. DE: *zullen* 36.
- VRIES, J. DE: *Etym. Woordenboek* 12.
- VRIES, M. DE: *W.N.T.* 10.

VRIES, W. DE: word formation 62, 63; syntactical studies 64, 65; *Het oneigene* 71; dialect research 80; onomastics 94; debates with KLOEKE 101, 102.

WALCH, J.L.: *Von del* 43.

Walloon: mutual influence of Flemish and Walloon dialects 73, 74.

WANDER, B.: bibliography 92.

WANINK, G.H.: dialect research

WATER, A. VAN DE: dialect research 80.

Waterlands 88.

WEEL, M.A. VAN: dialect research 80.

WEEVERS, TH.: *Coornhert* 34, 35.

WEIJNEN, A.: *Zeventiende-eeuwse Taal* 43; *Poorters* 44; dialect research 85, 88, 92, 108; onomastics 93.

WELLANDER, E.: syntax 65.

WELTER, W.: dialect research 82.

WENKER, G. 81.

Werve, J. van der: 38.

West-Voorne: dialect 80.

WIEDER, F.C. 12.

Wieringen: dialect 88.

WIJER, H.J. VAN DE: onomastics 93, 96, 109.

WIJK, H.L.A. VAN: *Papiamento* 76.

WIJK, N. VAN: *Etym. Wdb. der Ned. Taal* 12; *Getijdenboek van G. Grote* 30; *De Ned. Taal* 56; phonemics 60, 109; history of sounds 81; dialect research 88.

- WIJK, V. VAN: onomastics 94.
Wilhelmus 35.
- WILLE, J.: series *Trivium* 47.
- WILLEUMIER-SCHALIJ, J.M.: *Boec der Minnen* 28.
- WINKEL, J. TE: history of Netherlandic 12; Bredero 40; Huygens 43, 44; Bilderdijk 50; dialect research 79, 80: diphthongization 100.
- WINKEL, L.A. TE: *W.N.T.* 10.
- WINKLER, J.: *Dialecticon* 78; onomastics 96.
- Winschooten, W. à: *Seeman* 48.
- Wit, Aug. de: 64.
- Wolff-Deken 50, 70.
- Woordenboek, Etymologisch* 12, 98.
- Woordenboek, Middelnederlandsch* 10, 11, 24, 33, 107.
- Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* 10, 11, 33, 42, 63, 99, 107.
- Woordenboek der Ned. Taal, van Dale's Nieuw Groot* 11.
- WORGT, G.: English influence 72.
- WORP, J.A.: Huygens 41.
- WOUDE, G. VAN DER: Frisian 83.
- Yiddish 92, 99.
- ZAALBERG, C.A.: *Granida* 41.
- Zanten, Oostvlaamse* 91.
- Zeeland: dialect 89, 90.
- Zelhem: dialect 87.
- ZIJDERVELD, A.: *Granida* 41.
- ZWAAN, F.L.: doctoral thesis 46, 47; J. van der Schuere 47.
- ZWAARDEMAKER, H.: phonetics 58.