



Universiteit  
Leiden

The Netherlands

**Grammar to the people. The Dutch Language and the Public Sphere in the 18th Century. With Special Reference to Kornelis van der Palm**

Rutten, G.J.

**Citation**

Rutten, G. J. (2009). Grammar to the people. The Dutch Language and the Public Sphere in the 18th Century. With Special Reference to Kornelis van der Palm. *Beiträge Zur Geschichte Der Sprachwissenschaft*, 2009(19), 55-86.

Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/61673>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

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

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/61673>

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

---

Gijsbert Rutten

## Grammar to the People

### The Dutch Language and the Public Sphere in the 18th Century

With Special Reference to Kornelis van der Palm

#### 1. Introduction: language and the public sphere

The history of Dutch 18<sup>th</sup>-century linguistics appears somewhat paradoxical.<sup>1</sup> If one compares the important 1805 grammar by Pieter Weiland (1754–1841) with the equally important 1706 grammar by Arnold Moonen (1644–1711) of almost a century before, then one would be tempted to conclude that besides some changes mainly due to the influence of Johann Christoph Adelung (1732–1806) on Weiland (Noordegraaf 1985), the grammatical and normative analysis of the Dutch language hardly changed during the century: grammar is divided into two main parts; the first comprises orthography and the parts of speech, the second is syntax in the classical sense, that is, *concordia* or *convenientia*, and *rectio*.<sup>2</sup> But if one takes the social, cultural and institutional circumstances into consideration, it appears that Dutch linguistics underwent some crucial changes during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, as a result of which the more recent books, such as Weiland's, are in no way similar to the earlier ones, such as Moonen's. While the 'internal', grammatical description was continued and consolidated, 'externally' language and linguistics were attributed completely different functions. Therefore, a proper understanding of the history of gram-

---

1) Many thanks to Mike Olson (Madison/WI) for correcting my English.

2) Moonen's (1706) division of grammar into *woordgronding*, "word-founding" (i.e. orthography and the parts of speech), and *woord-voeging*, "word-joining" (i.e. syntax) was taken and translated from Justus-Georg Schottelius who in his *Ausführliche Arbeit von der Teutschen Haupt-Sprache* (1663) spoke of *Wortgründung* and *Wortfügung*; cf. Schaars (1988). This division dominates 18<sup>th</sup>-century Dutch grammar.

mar, language and linguistics should take into account the functions these are attributed by and within society.

With regard to the changing functions of language and linguistics during the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the relationship between these and the public sphere comes to the fore. The 18<sup>th</sup> century has been characterized as the age of the rise of the public sphere in a classic account by Habermas (1990) as well as by, among many others, Dutch historians such as Kloek/Mijnhardt (2001) who stress the importance of the concept (and the rise) of the *burgher* in Dutch history of the late 18<sup>th</sup> century. Linguistically, the 18<sup>th</sup> century has been associated with the birth of a “bourgeois linguistic sphere” (Crowley 1996: 73). Among the (socio)-linguistic implications of the opening up of the public domain to larger groups of the population are the call for and actual increase of new grammar books, and the desire to teach the vernacular in the schools (Crowley 1996: 73–81, Beal 2004: 93–105). The 18<sup>th</sup> century, then, first brought forth the conviction that this new language variety of a ‘cultivated’, ‘educated’, ‘standardized’ form should be the hall-mark of ever larger parts of society, secondly that these larger parts should learn it in school (Lenders 1988).

Taking these crucial changes in the social function of language and linguistics seriously, one can discern three periods in the history of Dutch linguistics in the so-called longer 18<sup>th</sup> century. The first period, from the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century until c.1740/50, is characterized by a certain *elitism* and could be termed the period of *elitist grammar*. The second period of *civil grammar* runs from 1740/50 to c.1780/90. Then the third period of *nationalism* or *national grammar* begins which is actually characteristic of the longer 19<sup>th</sup> century.

In this article, I would like to discuss the transition from elitism to nationalism by focussing on four grammarians and their grammars from around the middle of the century: Elzevier (1761), de Haes (1764), van Belle (1748, 1755), and van der Palm (1769). These four, from the second period of civil grammar, are usually considered the most important ones between 1740 and 1770.<sup>3</sup> While extensive research has been carried out on the first and third periods (e.g. Noordegraaf 1985, Schaars 1988, de Bonth 1998, ten Kate 2001, Verwer 2005, Rutten 2006, and the references there), the period of civil grammar is still somewhat *terra incognita*. Previous research, however, by van der Wal (1990, 2002), Dibbets (2003) and Rutten (2008) enables us to fill in this gap in the history of Dutch linguistics.

<sup>3</sup>) Knol (1977: 68–69); next, there were two important periodicals (*Tael- en dicht-kundige bydragen*, 1758–62, and *Nieuwe bydragen tot opbouw der vaderlandsche letterkunde*, 1763–67), and a southern, that is in modern terms Belgian grammar by Jan Des Roches (2007; *Nieuwe Nederduytsche spraek-konst*, 1761). See also Rutten (2008: 95–97).

In section 2, I will briefly introduce the three periods, mainly drawing on previous research. In section 3, the grammarians Elzevier and de Haes are discussed. In their works we witness the first steps away from true elitism. Section 4 is devoted to the third grammarian van Belle who took the function of grammar again a step further away from elitism. In section 5, a detailed analysis of the work of the fourth grammarian van der Palm is presented as it provides the most clear-cut representation of civil grammar. Such a detailed analysis of van der Palm’s important grammar has not been published before. Van der Palm came at the birth of the third period of national grammar discussed in section 6.

One last remark should be made in advance. When speaking of grammar and linguistics, we have to make a clear distinction between basic literacy and grammatical knowledge. ABC-books and reading manuals that aim at basic literacy and that teach the child or the adult to read, sometimes enhanced with writing instructions, existed throughout the 16<sup>th</sup>, 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. These constitute a separate tradition. Linguistic works aiming at grammatical knowledge beyond the domain of basic reading and writing are the object of this paper. It is, however, the merit of the 18<sup>th</sup> century that these two separate traditions are brought together (see section 5.4).

## 2. From elitism to nationalism: three periods

The first period, from the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and until c.1740/50, is characterized by a certain *elitism*.<sup>4</sup> Grammatical works are mainly written for the upper classes in the cities who enter the public domain as politicians, lawyers, preachers, and occasionally as a writer of poetry or prose. One particular and somewhat narrow interpretation by the poet, teacher and grammarian David van Hoogstraten (1658–1724) defines the intended readership even as especially the male juveniles who are to become the next great poets. Thus, grammar serves literature: it has a propaedeutical function in the education of the cultural elite. Grammar also functions as a mark of intellectualism, and of scholarship. Studying Dutch grammar is hardly possible without knowledge of Latin and/or Greek, and it would only be slightly exaggerated to call for example Moonen’s grammar (1706) a Latin grammar in which the object language has been substituted by Dutch. In this period, linguistic education of the happy few, and knowledge of grammar distinguished the upper class from the middle and lower classes. Linguistics is a scholarly occupation, carried out by and for the benefit of those who are well-off, and in the context of the international Republic of Letters. The so-called discourse community of the Dutch elite engaged in grammar is not constituted by other groups within Dutch society but

<sup>4</sup>) For this paragraph, see Rutten (2006, 2007a).

by similar elites across the language border such as the French *savants*. The few linguistic works that are not explicitly meant as foundation course for writers-to-be are either in Latin such as Adriaen Verwer's (c. 1655–1717) *Linguae Belgicae idea grammatica, poetica, rhetorica* (1707, cf. Verwer 2005) or very complicated, such as Lambert ten Kate's (1674–1731) celebrated *Aenleiding tot de kennis van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche sprake*, "Introduction to the knowledge of the sublime part of the Dutch language" (1723, see ten Kate 2001), and therefore certainly not less elitist. The period brought forth the two most important normative grammars of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the before-mentioned 1706 grammar by Moonen, and Willem Sewel's (1654–1720) grammar (1708, 21712). A third important linguistic publication is Balthazar Huydecoper's (1695–1778) *Proeve van taal- en dichtkunde* (1730), "Sketch of grammar and poetics", a collection of linguistic and poetical remarks to a work of one of the great poets of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Joost van den Vondel (1587–1679, see de Bonth 1998).

In the second period, roughly the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the intended readership of main stream grammars is enlarged by incorporating men as well as women, and the youth of the upper as well as the middle classes.<sup>5</sup> Grammar now serves as a mark of civilized *burghers*. The wider accessibility of the public domain from about 1750 onward, the so-called rise of the public sphere, is accompanied by a different goal of linguistic activities. Educating the citizens and creating what we might call *civil grammar* are the linguistic counterparts of the democratic revolutions of the later 18<sup>th</sup> century (Rutten 2008). Knowledge of Latin or Greek is no longer necessary: the grammars are rephrased in a less classical vocabulary, and educational strategies are employed in order to render grammatical knowledge more comprehensible. Still, knowledge of grammar distinguishes the middle and the upper classes from the lower classes.

The third period begins in the last decade of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and partly overlaps the second period, in time as well as conceptually.<sup>6</sup> It is characterized by an even further extension of the intended readership. Grammar is no longer an activity of certain groups within society; it is now a matter of national concern, of society as a whole. The intended readership consists of everyone, that is, the inhabitants of the (Kingdom of the) Netherlands. So, from education of the elite, via educating the *burghers*, we have arrived at the typical 19<sup>th</sup> century enterprise of the education of the nation. The grammar of Weiland (1805) is a *national grammar* in the sense that it was supposed to be used by the administration and by school teachers. Grammatical knowledge of the Dutch language should now no longer divide Dutch society, 'the Dutch nation', instead

<sup>5</sup>) On the second period: see sections 3, 4 and 5.

<sup>6</sup>) On the third period: see section 6, and Noordegraaf (1985); also Rutten (2007b).

it should separate the Dutch nation from other nations. Knowledge of grammar should no longer be a distinguishing force: it unites the Dutch people, as language or the 'mother-tongue' is the hallmark of a people. The most important grammar of the national period is probably Weiland's (1805).

### 3. Kornelis Elzevier (1761) and Frans de Haes (1764)

From the 1760's, two grammar books call for discussion. The *Proef van een nieuwe Nederduitsche spraakkunst*, "Outline of a new Dutch grammar", was published in 1761 by Kornelis Elzevier (1717–1761). It was added to a collection of poems. Elzevier relied heavily on Frans de Haes' (1708–1761) *Nederduitsche spraakkunst*, "Dutch grammar", which was posthumously published in 1764, three years later than Elzevier's *Proef*, but already conceived around 1740 (Dibbets 2003: 213). De Haes' grammar was also added to a collection of poems. Both authors were from Rotterdam, and they knew each other: they were members of the poetic society *Natura et arte*. The manuscript of de Haes' grammar circulated among the members of this society. At first sight, Elzevier and de Haes appear to link up with the linguistic practice of the first period. It is not just the case that poetry and grammar are being combined in their works, moreover their grammatical works were added to publications they were far more fond of and would gain much more respect with: poetry. As it appears, grammar still serves literature.

Though literature and linguistics are not separated with Elzevier in de Haes, it would be false to conclude that they were just continuing the approach of Moonen (1706) c.s. First, it is of great importance that they were members of a literary society and that they undertook their linguistic activities within that society. The rise of literary and scientific societies is typical of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, especially of the second half of the century, and it is usually associated with the rise of the *bourgeoisie*, and with the public domain being taken over by larger parts of society as a whole (Kloek/Mijnhardt 2001). Historians refer to these developments with the term *sociability* (Singeling 1996). Through these societies, the upper and the upper-middle classes are creating networks in order to share and concentrate power and knowledge. One essential characteristic of the societies is that they were participating in what is usually called in Dutch a 'civilization offensive', that is, the desire to disseminate knowledge and culture, science and the arts, over increasingly larger parts of society (de Vries 2001).

Secondly, although both Elzevier and de Haes add their grammar to literary pieces, and although both heavily rely on Moonen (1706), and Elzevier on his turn on de Haes (Dibbets 2003), we do witness with them a less complicated approach to grammatical issues — a decrease of complexity being neces-

sary for the spread of grammar to less educated people. The less complicated approach is not just clear from the size of their grammars. Moonen's (1706) and Sewel's (1712) cover several hundred pages, de Haes' 170, and Elzevier's only 90. More importantly, the simplifying approach de Haes and Elzevier display reveals the broader context in which their books function. I will give a few illustrative examples from the core subjects of early modern Dutch grammar: nominal and verbal inflection. Also, I will make more use of Elzevier than of de Haes since the latter has been thoroughly discussed by Dibbets (2003) who extensively showed de Haes' dependence on Moonen (1706), Sewel (1712) and Huydecoper (1730).

The first example concerns the names of the cases. Most early modern Dutch linguists were of the opinion that Dutch, as Latin and Greek, has several cases, and de Haes and Elzevier follow Moonen (1706) and Sewel (1712), and in fact almost every predecessor in claiming there are six. The names of the six cases, however, were somewhat problematic. The Latin names could of course be Dutchified by leaving out the suffix *-us* (*nominatief, genitief*, etc.). Also, the Latin terms could be replaced by numerical ones (the first case, the second case, etc.). But already in the first grammar of Dutch, the *Twe-spraak vande Nederduitsche letterkunst*, "Dialogue on the grammar of Dutch", which was anonymously published in 1584, translations had been offered which lasted well into the 18<sup>th</sup> century (cf. Rutten 2006: 240–241):

Latin name	Dutch translation...	and derivation	English equivalent
nominativus	noemer	< noemen, "to name/to call"	namer/caller
genitivus	barer	< baren, "to bear"	bearer
	teler	< telen, "to grow"	grower
dativus	gever	< geven, "to give"	giver
accusativus	aanklager	< aanklagen, "to accuse"	accuser
vocativus	roeper	< roepen, "to call"	caller
ablativus	(af)nemer	< (af)nemen, "to take (away)"	taker

For instance, the nominative was termed *noemer* which is derived from the verb *noemen*, "to name/to call", so the English equivalent of *noemer* would be "namer" or "caller". The 1584 invention for the genitive, *barer*, was commonly replaced by Moonen's alternative *teler* from 1706 onward.

By 1700, these terms were part of the standard grammatical terminology, while at the same time almost completely incomprehensible, all the more since they were interpreted as referring to agents. It was thought unclear that the noun phrase that functioned as subject would be assigned the *noemer*, "namer" — what is being named? Likewise, what does the noun in the genitive *baar*? Why would the dative express the giver as it prototypically expresses the re-

ceiver? Similarly, the vocative is assigned to someone who is spoken to, not someone who speaks (or calls) himself. Again, who is accused in the accusative? Etc.

Considerations such as these led de Haes to coining the terms "hollow sounds, which, to our opinion, must have been as incomprehensible to the Romans themselves, as they are inconceivable to all Dutch ears".<sup>7</sup> Therefore, de Haes (1764: 19) developed a new terminology more in line with on the one hand comprehensible Dutch and on the other hand the semantic function of the cases within the sentence.<sup>8</sup> The new names were slightly modified taken over by Elzevier (cf. Dibbets 2003) as well as Kornelis van der Palm (cf. section 5, and van der Palm 1769,II: 6).

Latin	Dutch translation	English equivalent
nom	de werkende persoon of zaek	the working person or thing
gen	de eigenaer of bezitter	the owner or possessor
dat	de ontvanger	the receiver
acc	de daedlyk bewerkt wordende persoon of zaek	the person or thing acted upon
voc	de aengesprokene persoon of zaek	the person or thing spoken to
abl	de onbepaalde naemval	the indefinite case

The improvement in comparison with the tradition is clear: the terms now express the prototypical function of the six cases — at least, the first five ones. The ablative is notoriously complicated in Dutch, particularly because constructions similar to the Latin ablative do not exist, or, put differently, the semantic functions expressed by Dutch ablative-like constructions are too diverse. De Haes' solution is as brave as it is questionable: it brings the issue of the Dutch ablative to the head; meanwhile its existence is maintained.

De Haes' terminological innovation with regard to the names of the cases was considered so important by Elzevier that he devotes the first ten pages of his grammar to a discussion of the cases in which the new and easier terms play a prominent role (Elzevier 1762: 49–58). Apart from the general importance of subjects such as case and gender in early modern Dutch grammar (Rutten 2006: 114–122) the immediate cause of this appears to be the simplifying approach Elzevier wishes to adopt as opposed to Moonen's more sophisticated grammar:

<sup>7</sup>) De Haes (1764: 19): "holle klanken, die, onzes bedunkens, zoo onverstaenbaer voor de Latynen zelfs moeten geweest zyn, als zy onvatbaer zyn voor alle Nederduitsche ooren"; cf. Dibbets (2003: 50).

<sup>8</sup>) As such, de Haes has been considered a precursor of the invention of parsing, a grammatical technique the development of which is usually located at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century; see Dibbets (2003).

Beforehand, we will assume that our student does not understand any foreign language, and therefore also does not know anything of the foundations of our language; for someone who masters Latin or another language shall understand more easily the properties and foundations of our language, and successfully thumb through the Grammar by Moonen; since that Gentleman appears to have written his Grammar rather for those who already understand their language than for Students who are eager to learn their own language.<sup>9</sup>

Then Elzevier introduces the six cases by their Latin names and he refers to the traditional Dutch translations also employed by Moonen (*noemer* etc), with which Moonen, as Elzevier's understatement runs, "has not opened a small door of confusion".<sup>10</sup> The following discussion of the case functions and the terminology involved entirely depends on Moonen (1706) on the one hand, and the manuscript grammar from *Natura et Arte*, that is, de Haes (1764) on the other hand.

A second example concerns the definition of the noun. Elzevier (1761: 76) states:

The *Nouns* [the subject] which follow[s] now, we will discuss in a simple way without concerning ourselves with the division Moonen makes, dividing them in *primitive, derived, proper*, etc. we will keep it short and say that a Noun is that which standing by itself completely signifies the nature of an independent thing which one names, such as *man, woman, child, fish, bird*, etc.<sup>11</sup>

Indeed, Moonen (1706: 47–49) discusses primitives and derivatives as well as proper and common nouns, adding numerous examples, after having given the definition of the noun which Elzevier almost literally copied.<sup>12</sup>

The third example concerns the discussion of the verb which in Moonen's grammar covers nearly one hundred of the 356 pages (1706: 138–234), whereas Elzevier only needs nine pages for a summary of Moonen's account (1761:

9) Elzevier (1762: 50): "Vooraf zullen wy onderstellen, dat onze leerling geen vreemde talen verstaet, en dus ook niets van onze taelgronden weet; want iemand die de Latynsche, of één ander tael magtig is, zal de eigenschappen en gronden onzer tael gemakkelijker begrypen, en met vrucht de Spraekkonst van Monen doorbladeren; want die Heer schynt eer zyne Spraekkonst te hebben geschreven voor hun, die de tael reeds verstaen, dan voor Leerlingen die begerig zyn om hun eigen tael te leeren."

10) Elzevier (1761: 50): "dus geen kleine deur van verwarring voor de leergierige jeugd' [heeft] opengezet".

11) Elzevier (1761: 76): "De *Zelfstandige Naemwoorden* die nu volgen, zullen wy eenvoudig verhandelen, zonder ons optehouden met de verdeeling die Monen daer van maekt, als dezelve onderscheidende in *oorsprongkeyken, afgeleiden, eigen*, enz. wy zullen kort gaen, en zeggen dat het een *Zelfstandig Naemwoord* is, dat alleen staende, het wezen eener zelfstandige zaek, die men noemt, volkomen betekent, als: *man, vrouw, kind, vis, vogel*, enz."

12) Moonen (1706: 47): "Een *Zelfstandigh Naemwoord* is, dat, alleen staende en zonder hulpwoord, het Weezen eener *Zelfstandige zaek*, die men noemt, volkoomelyk betekent; als *Man, Vrouw, Kint, Hemel, Aerde, Zee, Lucht*".

96–104). It should be noted that Elzevier in this context not just relies on Moonen but also mentions his grammar as a book of reference for students: Elzevier jumps over the conjugation of the auxiliaries for lack of space but also because one can find them in Moonen's grammar (Elzevier 1761: 104, with reference to Moonen 1706: 144–163). Another adjustment Elzevier makes has to do with the order of subjects. Moonen first defines the verb semantically and then proceeds with subsequently *verba personalia* and *impersonalia*, the different moods and tenses, the regular and irregular conjugation, and finally person and number (1706: 138–142). Elzevier repeats Moonen's definition of the verb and he also discusses the *(im)personalia*. He goes on, however, with the probably easier subjects of person and number and only then addresses the more difficult subjects *modus* and *tempus* (1761: 96–101). Moreover, whereas Moonen's explanation of the conjunctive mood is very brief and indeed only comprehensible if one knows Latin or another Romance language or German,<sup>13</sup> Elzevier in fact elaborates on Moonen's sketchy reference to certain conjunctions which would govern the conjunctive by devoting two full pages to a discussion of the conjunctions in question and to the semantic implications of using either the indicative or the conjunctive (Elzevier 1761: 100–101). As the Dutch conjunctive had become mainly limited to well-educated written language at that time, Elzevier apparently judged an expansion reasonable, even though his main goal was to summarize and simplify Moonen.

In sum, Elzevier and de Haes were on the one hand continuing the line of Moonen (1706) c.s. from the first period of elitism. Their grammars were mainly founded on Moonen's seminal study, and the link with literature, with poetry, could hardly be more explicit than with them since both incorporated their grammatical work into a first and foremost literary publication. On the other hand, they employed some educationally motivated means in order to render the art of grammar more accessible, for example with regard to the names of the cases, the definition of the noun and the verbal system. Occasionally, a better explanation was felt to be necessary as with Elzevier's account of the conjunctive mood. Finally, the fact that they undertook their linguistic activities within the context of a literary society, makes them representatives of the little by little 'democratizing' art of grammar: they wanted to open up the art of grammar to a larger part of the population.

13) Moonen (1706: 139): "De *Aenvoegende Wyze*, die ook de *Toelaetende* genoemd kan worden, wordt gebruikt in iet op zekere voorwaerden of tot zekere einden te stellen, en moet zich eenigszins naer de *By- en Voegwoorden Zoo, Als, Dat, Opdat* en diergelyke voegen en rechten; als in, *Zoo Ik Koome, Dat Zy Hoorden, Opdat Hy Gestraft Wierd*; en *Toelaetender Wyze*, met *Dat of Laet*; als in, *Dat Zy Roepen, Laet Hy Zoeken, Laeten Zy Schreeuwen*."

## 4. Jan van Belle (1748, 1755)

Jan van Belle (ca. 1690–1754), a school teacher in the city of Haarlem, was also taking important steps in the ‘democratization’ of grammar, and in the creation of a civil grammar following the previous period of elitism. He published two grammar books: *Korte wegwyzer, ter spel- spraak- en dichtkuden*, “Short introduction to orthography, grammar and poetry”, in 1748, and in 1755 *Korte schéts der Néderduitsche spraakkonst*, “Short sketch of Dutch grammar”.

Like Elzevier and de Haes, van Belle’s intended readership consisted of the *burghers*, the citizens of Haarlem, and not just the well-educated elite (van der Wal 1990, Rutten 2008). He wanted to teach the upper- as well as the middle-class adults, and he hoped that they would then transmit their freshly acquired linguistic knowledge to the younger generations. Contrary to Elzevier and de Haes, van Belle did not write his grammar books in the context of a literary society, though he did initially conceive his work as part of a literary enterprise: the 1748 grammar is followed by an introduction to poetry. In 1755, van Belle cut normative grammar loose from the literary context and released it from its propaedeutic function. He was not so much concerned that literature be written in grammatically flawless Dutch, instead, he was convinced that also the middle classes should obtain grammatical knowledge. While in the works of Elzevier and de Haes the context of a literary society implied a first step towards an enlargement of the public sphere, van Belle took grammar out of its literary context and defined it simply as a matter of mature citizenship, and in doing so van Belle made a second democratizing step.

With regard to the contents, van Belle, as Elzevier and de Haes, employed educationally motivated means in order to render Dutch grammar more comprehensible. In this respect, he again went a little further than Elzevier and de Haes. Whereas the 1748 grammar counts about a hundred pages, the 1755 grammar is no longer than 55 pages. It goes without saying that in such a short piece of work only the bare essentials of the Dutch grammar can be explained. Van Belle consciously aimed at limiting the contents to the absolute minimum: the titles of both his grammars begin with *Korte*, “Short”, and in the subtitle of the second book this is even emphasized by the claim that “the grounds of the Dutch language” are represented *op eene zeer kóрте en beknópte wyze*, “in a very short and concise way”.

More importantly, Van Belle shows himself to be a real educational experimenter, a very creative grammarian on the search for new ways of transmitting the art of grammar (Rutten 2008). First and foremost, his 1748 book is in rhyme because, as Van Belle claims, verses are easily memorized. It is a

remarkable experiment yet not very easy, especially when all the declensions and conjugations as well as the irregularities need to be discussed. Consider the paradigm of the present indicative of *zyn*, “to be”, to which I added a provisional translation into English. Six pronouns and six verb forms would suffice but van Belle needs six full verses.

Van Belle (1748: 50)	English translation
<i>Ik ben, is de eerste</i> in 't Tal van drie Persoonen.	<i>I am, is the first</i> of three Persons.
<i>Gy zyt, de tweede</i> , om 't Enkelvoud te toonen.	<i>You are, the second</i> , to show the singular.
<i>Hy is, de derde, aantoonende</i> alle drie.	<i>He is, the third, indicating</i> all three.
<i>Wy zyn, is de eerste</i> , in 't Meerdertal van die.	<i>We are, is the first</i> , in the plural of these.
<i>Gy-lieden zyt, de tweede</i> , en méde als vooren.	<i>You are, the second</i> , and also [plural] as before.
<i>Zy zyn, de derde</i> , als elk kan zien óf hooren.	<i>They are, the third</i> , as anyone can see or hear.

The method is as innovative as it is laborious. Note, however, how van Belle’s use of italics and commas helps to distinguish the language of instruction in normal script from the paradigm (in italics and before the first comma), as well as from the metalanguage (also in italics).

Another educational feature van Belle employs are memory aids, for example for the conjugation of the verbs, and especially of the so-called strong verbs which he categorized in accordance with the ground-breaking work of ten Kate ([1723] 2001, cf. van der Wal 2002). Van Belle (1748) devised a syllabic pattern which the pupil should use. The pattern *panama*, for instance, symbolically represented by + + +, refers to the regular conjugation of weak verbs in which there is no vowel shift in the preterite or the participle: therefore, three identical items are used. The strong verbs, then, are variations on the *panama* c.q. + + + theme of the weak verbs. Whenever the (sound of the) vowel changes, the corresponding syllable in *panama* changes as well as the standard symbol +. If the participle ends in *-en* the ending *-len* is attached to *panama* and a fourth symbol is added:<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup>) I substituted van Belle’s Dutch examples with English examples. The examples do not offer a full representation of the English principal parts, in fact, van Belle’s original examples not even of the Dutch principal parts; cf. van der Wal (2002).

		Present	Preterite	Participle
<i>panama</i>	+ + +	walk	walked	walked
<i>panamalen</i>	+ + + -	beat	beat	beaten
<i>panémé</i>	+ ≠ ≠	hear	heard	heard
<i>panémélen</i>	+ ≠ ≠ -	break	broke	broken
<i>panémalen</i>	+ ≠ + -	take	took	taken
<i>panémielen</i>	+ ≠ † -	write	wrote	written <sup>15</sup>

In his second grammar of 1755, it turns out that van Belle has done away with this new approach to verbal morphology. He comes up with another educational strategy in order to easily represent the conjugation of the strong verbs to the less-educated (1755: 46–55). Now he only uses single letters as markers for the changing vowels, for instance, the pattern of *breken*, “to break” which runs *breek-brak-gebroken* is marked by the letters a, b, d denoting the difference of all three main vowels, whereas *geven*, “to give” with the pattern *geef-gaf-gegeven* is assigned a, b, a because of the similarity of the vowels in the present and in the participle. Last but not least, a folded sheet with the size of three pages is added to the grammar book; it contains the conjugations of seventeen frequent verbs, marked with letters denoting the vowel pattern (a, b, d). It could function as a useful reference piece, be it a short one.

Van Belle’s educational ingenuity is remarkable. Whereas Elzevier’s and de Haes’s educational approach mainly consisted of simplifying the thorough work of Moonen (1706), van Belle introduces various kinds of educational novelties (cf. Rutten 2008). Unfortunately, van Belle died in his early sixties, and his 1755 grammar was only posthumously published. In the introduction, the publisher of van Belle (1755) mentions another grammar book by van Belle, still easier than this one, in which van Belle would have taken up the educational means with the longest possible tradition in western linguistics: he would have written a dialogue on grammar. It has never been published but only a few years later, in 1769, a true grammatical dialogue came out, written by Kornelis van der Palm.

## 5. Kornelis van der Palm (1769)

Kornelis van der Palm (1730–1789) exemplifies the second period of civil grammar while at the same time he is at the birth of the third period of national grammar. In the life and work of van der Palm we witness the changes in the

<sup>15</sup> The third symbol † is for clarity’s sake added by me; in van Belle (1748) the second symbol ≠ is repeated which has to be a mistake.

social and cultural settings of linguistics being put to the fore. Van der Palm lived in Rotterdam as a school teacher. It is told that he, as a non-academic, studied Latin at night because he dreamed of becoming a preacher. When, however, his wife — they married in 1755 — gave birth to eight children he had to give up his dream (Witsen Geysbeek 1824: 50–56). Van der Palm did have time for some other work at night, though: in 1769 he published *Nederduitsche spraakkunst, voor de jeugd*, “Dutch grammar, for the youth”.

The addition “for the youth” was chosen deliberately and is explained by van der Palm in the preface to his grammar. As stated above (section 4), van Belle removed grammatical knowledge from its literary context and considered it a matter of mature citizenship. Van der Palm now takes a pedagogical stand and concludes that if grammatical knowledge is a hall-mark of mature citizens, then these mature citizens should make sure their children are being taught grammar (van der Palm 1769, I: \*3<sup>r-v</sup>). Referring to the grammars of the first period and of the society *Natura et Arte* of which Elzevier and de Haes were members, van der Palm explains that these works appear to consist of ideas meant for discussion in the community of the learned rather than of lessons meant for the youth. Echoing Elzevier, van der Palm writes:

after all, anyone who has judiciously examined their works, will have noticed that the goal of these writers has rather been to communicate their clever thoughts to the learned world than to communicate their lessons to the youth; moreover, that one has to possess a certain knowledge — if not of other than at least of our language, if one wants to profit from their work. Our goal, on the contrary, is merely to serve the youth: for them we have written our Grammar; to our opinion, one has to start with the youth if one ever wants to have reason to have high hopes that our Dutch language will be appreciated by the Dutch.<sup>16</sup>

The reproach is of course very similar to the one Elzevier made with respect to Moonen (see section 3). The grammatical contents of the first grammars of the second period, by de Haes and Elzevier, are considered still too complicated by van der Palm. As a result, he aims at three redefinitions with respect to the art of grammar: 1) of the contents: lessons instead of ideas; 2) the approach: didactic instead of discursive (not “communicate clever thoughts to the learned”); 3) the public: the youth instead of (learned) adults.<sup>17</sup> These redefini-

<sup>16</sup> Van der Palm (1769, I: \*3<sup>r-v</sup>): “wie immer hunne werken oordeelkundig heeft ingezien, zal gemerkt hebben, dat het oogmerk dier schryveren meer geweest zy der geleerde weereld’ hunne vernuftige gedachten, als der jeugd’ hunne lessen, medetedeelen; ja dat men zelfs eenige kundigheid, zoo niet van andere, ten minste van onze tale bezitten moet, wil men de vrucht van hunnen arbeid plukken. Ons oogmerk, in tegendeel, is alleen der jeugd’ dienstig te zyn: voor haer is het dat wy deze Spraakkunst opgesteld hebben; moetende men, naer onze gedachten, met de jeugd’ beginnen, indien men immer gegronde hoop kan opvatten, dat onze Nederlandsche spraek, by de Nederlanders, op haren rechten prys gestelt zal worden.”

<sup>17</sup> A youth-oriented redefinition had also taken place within the first period, esp. in the works of

tions are implemented by a few clear-cut choices van der Palm makes. First of all, he explicitly states that he has not written a new grammar but instead has focused on simplifying existing knowledge (1769,I: \*3<sup>v</sup>–\*4<sup>v</sup>). The way in which he simplified the received knowledge of preceding grammars (Moonen 1706, Sewel 1712, de Haes 1764) is the main topic of this section (see below 5.1, 5.2, 5.3). Secondly, he has divided his grammar book into four relatively short booklets on the assumption that pupils remain more interested when they are regularly confronted with new learning materials (1769,I: \*4<sup>r-v</sup>). Working through one voluminous body of work was apparently considered more tiring, or even boring, than proceeding from one to another (see 5.4). Van der Palm's third choice concerned the revival of an ancient, well-known yet at the time within Dutch linguistics uncommon form: he wrote a dialogue on grammar, composed in such a way that the answers by themselves make up the grammar (1769,I: \*4<sup>v</sup>). One is not obliged to read the book as a dialogue.

With regard to the simplification of grammatical knowledge, van der Palm's procedure is straightforward: the contents of his book, his grammatical lessons, are for the greater part taken from the most important grammars of the first period (Moonen 1706 and Sewel 1712) or from their followers of the second period (Elzevier 1761, de Haes 1764), but then simplified, stripped of superfluous and potentially confusing details, and presented in more easy Dutch which means no long sentences, not too many subclauses, no participial phrases. In what follows, I will discuss van der Palm's adaptation of Moonen, Sewel c.s. in more detail, especially with regard to the introduction, orthography and morphology.

### 5.1 Introduction and orthography

On the first page of the book it immediately becomes clear in what way van der Palm wanted to render the insights of his predecessors accessible to the youth. The first chapter is devoted to the definition of grammar. Van der Palm's definition is taken from Sewel who wrote:

What Grammar is — or according to the Greek word *Grammatica*: the *Art of Letters* — has been said so many times that it appears needless to repeat that here; all the more since the Dutch name itself indicates its meaning, and anyone will understand that *Knowledge of Letters and Speech* is meant.<sup>18</sup>

David van Hoogstraten (1658–1724), but then the social embedding was different: grammatical knowledge was considered useful only for members of the higher circles (cf. Rutten 2006).

18) Sewel (1712: 1): "Wat de SPRAAKKONST, óf vólgens het Grieksch woord *Grammatica*, de *Letterkunst* zy, is zo menigmaal gezegd, dat ik het noodeloos achte zulks alhier te herhaalen; te meer dewyl de Nederduytsche benaaming uyt zichzelfe haare betekenis aanwyst, en een iegelyk wel begrypt dat men daardoor verstaat een *Kennis van de Letteren en de Spraake*".

This is the discursive mode of reasoning, oriented to educated adults, van der Palm regretted his fore-runners had employed. His rephrasing of the passage is telling:

Q. What is Grammar?  
 Answ. Grammar is knowledge of Letters and Speech.<sup>19</sup>

Apart from this kind of summarizing previous work, van der Palm also re-writes passages by predecessors in the question-answer-form. After the first brief definition of grammar further explanation is required for which van der Palm turns to Moonen. His dependence on Moonen is striking; compare:

It [grammar, GR] consists of two parts, which are called *Word-founding* and *Word-joining*. Word-founding, the first part of Grammar, investigates the *Origins, Qualities, Derivations* and *Doubling* of single Words. In this respect, she first requires an investigation of the *Letters* which the Words are made up of. And this part of Word-founding is called *Spelling*. After this, the Word-founding considers the *Syllables*, how these are to be pronounced correctly. And this part is called *Pronunciation*.<sup>20</sup>

Q. Of how many parts does Grammar consist?  
 Answ. It consists of two parts: the *Word-founding*, and *Word-joining*.

Q. What does *Word-founding* teach?  
 Answ. *Word-founding* teaches the Origin, Quality, Derivation and Doubling of single words.

Q. What is required in this respect?  
 Answ. Firstly, knowledge of the letters which the words are made up of is required, which is called *Spelling*, and secondly, an investigation of the syllables, that is, how these are correctly pronounced, which is called *Pronunciation*.<sup>21</sup>

Next to such literal rewriting, there is a more creative type of adaptation. The second chapter on the alphabet is again a true mixture of van der Palm's fore-

19) Van der Palm (1769,I: 1): "Vr. Wat is de Spraekunst? Answ. De Spraekkunst is eene kennis van Letteren en Sprake".

20) Moonen (1706: 1): "Zy bestaet uit twee deelen, die de *Woortgronding* en *Woortvoeging* genoemt worden. De *Woortgronding*, het eerste deel der *Spraekkunst*, onderzoekt de *Oirsprongen, Eigenschappen, Afleidingen* en *Verdubbelingen* van enkele Woorden. Hier toe eischt zy alereerst een onderzoek der *Letteren* of boekstaven, waer uit de Woorden samengezet worden, hoe naemelyk die, het zy enkel, het zy met andere gevoegt, recht naer de grondige eigenschap te schryven zyn. En dit stuk der *Woortgronding* wordt de *Spelling* geheeten. Hier na slaet de *Woortgronding* de *Lettergreepen* gade, hoe die recht uit te spreken zyn. En dit deel noemt men de *Uitspraek*."

21) Van der Palm (1769,I: 1): "Vr. Uit hoe vele deelen bestaet de *Spraekkunst*? Answ. Zy bestaet uit twee deelen, namelyk, de *Woortgronding* en *Woortvoeging*. Vr. Wat leert de *Woortgronding*? Answ. De *Woortgronding* leert den Oorsprong, de *Eigenschap, Afleiding* en *Verdubbeling* van enkele woorden. Vr. Wat wordt daer toe vereischt? Answ. Daer toe wordt vereischt; vooreerst, eene kennis der letteren, waar uit de woorden t'samengesteld worden, 't welk de *Spelling* genoemt wordt; en ten tweede, een onderzoek der *lettergreepen*, dat is, hoe die recht uittespreken zyn, 't welk men de *Uitspraek* noemt."

runners. The definition of *vowel* is copied from Moonen but rephrased in easier Dutch:

A vowel is a letter, which by itself sounds clear and distinct, and thus, without the help of another letter, can make up a whole syllable: as in *A-rendt*, *E-del*, *I-ber*, *O-lie*, *U-we*, *Y-ver*.<sup>22</sup>

The *Vowels* carry this name, because they, by themselves and by their own force clear and distinctly sounding, with or without the help of Consonants can make up a Syllable or Word.<sup>23</sup>

Van der Palm turns Moonen's reference to the origin of the term *klinker*, "vowel" into a reference to the name of the chapter: *a vowel is a letter which et cetera* instead of *vowels carry this name because et cetera*. He avoids the participial phrase (*klinkende*, "sounding"). He limits superfluous "with or without" to "without", and similarly "Syllable or Word" to "syllable". He does not use the as yet unexplained concept of the consonant. And contrary to Moonen he provides examples, which are taken from de Haes (1764: 4). Finally, van der Palm uses the term *zelfklinker*, "self-sounder", "vowel", in which the prefixed *zelf-* is in transparent opposition to the first syllable of *medeklinker*, "with-sounder", that is, consonant. This terminological innovation, not reported in Moonen (1706) or any of van der Palm's other predecessors, is a good example of his desire to maximize the simplicity of the grammatical system.

Summaries and literal copies of passages from Moonen (1706), Sewel (1712) and de Haes (1764) as well as dialogues moulded on these predecessors can be found throughout van der Palm's grammar. More interesting, perhaps, are the passages in which he not only abundantly exploits the 18<sup>th</sup>-century tradition but also strives at the most comprehensible way of transmitting its outcomes to the youth. In what follows, I will present some more illustrative examples of van der Palm's method of creative paedagogic adaptation.

Van der Palm's third chapter is on orthography (1769, I: 6–30). His definition of spelling (1769, I: 6) is taken from de Haes (1764: 4) who used Moonen (1706: 3) and mainly consists of the common idea that one should not use more nor less vowels and consonants than necessary. Unlike Moonen and Sewel (1712) who proceed with the letter A, de Haes (1764: 4–5) expands on this idea of the right amount of letters by giving five words as well as possible misspellings of these words. The importance of the right spelling, he contin-

<sup>22</sup> Van der Palm (1769, I: 3): "Een Zelfklinker is eene letter, die uit zich zelve klaer en duidelyk klinkt, en dus, zonder behulp van eene andere letter, eene geheele lettergreep kan uitmaken: als in *A-rendt*, *E-del*, *I-ber*, *O-lie*, *U-we*, *Y-ver*".

<sup>23</sup> Moonen (1706: 2): "De *Klinkers* draegen deezen naem, om dat zy, uit zich zelve en door hunne eige kracht klaer en duidelyk klinkende, met of zonder hulpe der *Medeklinkeren* eene Lettergreep of Woort kunnen uitmaeken".

ues, has not just to do with avoidance of superfluous letters but also of lexical confusion: misspellings might generate a different lexical item than intended. Interestingly, de Haes in this passage mainly focuses on extra consonants in the *Auslaut* which do not lead to confusion at all; of his examples, only two (*abel* instead of *abeel*, and *haart* instead of *hart*) are in fact different words, and in both cases the vowel causes the possible confusion:

noun	possible misspellings	possible lexical confusion
<i>abt</i> , "abbot"	<i>abtt</i>	—
<i>abeel</i> , "white poplar"	<i>abeell</i> <i>abel</i>	— <i>Abel</i> , "Abel"
<i>ark</i> , "ark"	<i>arck</i> <i>arckk</i>	— —
<i>hart</i> , "hart"	<i>haart</i> <i>hartt</i>	<i>haart</i> , "hearth" —
<i>half</i> , "half"	<i>halff</i>	—

Evidently, examples such as *abtt*, *abeell*, *arck* will not automatically convince the pupil of the importance of the right amount of letters but only if he beforehand agrees that superfluities should be avoided. Van der Palm, then, is convinced of the importance of the right amount of letters, that is, of a regulated spelling system, and he tries to convince the reader of this by adjusting de Haes's passage considerably. The adjustment consists of giving clear examples of nouns in which the representation of the vowel is essential because otherwise another noun is generated. His pairs are (van der Palm 1769, I: 6–7):

<i>haert</i> , "haerth"	vs.	<i>hart</i> , "hart"
<i>boom</i> , "tree"	vs.	<i>bom</i> , "bomb"
<i>boot</i> , "boat"	vs.	<i>bot</i> , "bone"
<i>abeel</i> , "white poplar"	vs.	<i>Abel</i> , "Abel"

Van der Palm also regulates the phonological pattern involved: in each case, the incorrect short representation of a long vowel generates a different noun than intended.

A similar strategy of ordering systematically relevant examples is displayed in van der Palm's treatment of homonyms and near-homonyms. Sewel (1712: 63) briefly discusses orthographical and phonological variation with respect to single lexical items of which he presents 19 examples (e.g. *heden/huyden*, "today"; *duur/dier*, "expensive"). De Haes (1764: 15–16) refers to Sewel's passage and repeats most of his examples but he also discusses problematic (near)homonymic pairs such as *aert*, "nature" and *aerd*, "earth", *na*, "after" and *naer*, "to". With van der Palm (1769, I: 46–52), Sewel's variational

pairs have disappeared and the discussion is limited to homonyms and near-homonyms. Van der Palm's educational approach, however, and his concern for the accessibility of the material prompt him to sharply distinguish between four different types which de Haes had randomly mixed together. First, there are homonyms with a different spelling (such as *aert* and *aerd*). Secondly, there are homonyms which are also homographs (e.g. *aes*, "food" and *aes*, "ace"). Thirdly, there are words which differ phonologically as well as orthographically that are however often confused (such as *na* and *naer*). Finally, there are homographs which sound different (e.g. *hóóp*, "heap" and *hoop*, "hope") — which are only homographs if one ignores the diacritics. Next to this helpful discrimination of four different types, van der Palm also gives, per type, a short alphabetical list of the most frequent words of that type.

In passages such as this one, we can hardly that say van der Palm simplifies the grammatical contents of his predecessors. Instead, by systematizing insights and problematic issues, by presenting these in a clear and educationally motivated way, he reshapes the received grammatical ideas and issues into a coherent, comprehensible, and to anyone accessible framework, in order to disseminate the art of grammar over ever larger parts of society.

## 5.2 Morphology

Moonen's discussion of the nominative runs as follows:

The *Nominative* is the first and Right [*rectus*, GR] Case, which, preceding the Verb, and answering the Interrogative Words, *Who*, *Which* or *What*, places the Noun in its first and foremost Meaning. It has as its Characteristics in Singular *Een*, *Eene*, *De*, *Het*; as in *Een Man*, *De Man*, *Eene Vrouw*, *De Vrouw*, *Een Paert*, *Het Paert*; and in plural *De*; as in *De Mans*, *De Vrouwen*, *De Paerden*.<sup>24</sup>

This discussion combines in two long sentences the term *nominative*, an alternative description of it, the syntactic position, the heuristics to determine the nominative, a semantic indication of its function, and the morphosyntactic characteristics which mainly relate to the form of the article. Sewel's description is similar but he adds the pronouns *ik*, *gy*, *hy* and *zy* ("I", "you", "he", "she") as markers of the nominative (1712: 180). An important innovation (cf. Dibbets 2003: 52–53) was made by de Haes (1764: 19–20) who improved not only the names of the cases (cf. section 3) but also the heuristics. Still, the passage in which de Haes explains it is fairly complex:

<sup>24</sup>) Moonen (1706: 84): "De *Noemer* is de eerste en Rechte Naemval, die, voor het Werkwoord henegeande, en het Vraagwoord, *Wie*, *Welke* of *Wat* beantwoordende, het Naemwoord in zyne eerste en weezentlyke Beduidenis stelt. Dees heeft tot zyne Merktekens in het Eenvouwige Getal *Een*, *Eene*, *De*, *Het*; als in *Een Man*, *De Man*, *Eene Vrouw*, *De Vrouw*, *Een Paert*, *Het Paert*; en in het Meervouwige *De*; als in *De Mans*, *De Vrouwen*, *De Paerden*".

To that end we posit here a sentence or a reason, for example: *the wisdom of the general does the enemies more harm than the courage of the soldiers*. To be able to ask: Who is the first case? first one has to search and know the verb; by a verb, then, the busyness or the act of a person is expressed; such as *to read*, *to write*, *to love*, *to do*, et cetera. This last verb, then, we find in the preceding sentence, namely *does*; thus, the question is naturally posed, who is the person or thing that *does* something here? the answer will also be natural, *the wisdom*, which is also principally the first case. (as the words of *the general* are only added, to be able to expand on this example) all that matters here is *the wisdom*, it is one and the same be it from a general, an ordinary soldier, or a state servant.<sup>25</sup>

The detailed procedure for finding the nominative is an improvement compared to Moonen's and Sewel's brief remarks but the explanation is rather elaborate. The syntactic position in front of the verb to which Moonen and Sewel referred is rightly omitted; it is not difficult to think of sentences that have a noun in the nominative after the verb. The semantic function, on the other hand, is only indirectly addressed via the heuristics proposed, and no reference is made to the adnominal and pronominal markers of the nominative (or: of the subject). What is most striking, is the absence of the new term de Haes had come up with in the previous paragraph: the nominative as *the working person or thing*. This use of this term would definitely have cleared up his procedure to find the nominative. Finally, the example sentence is deliberately chosen in a way that it also comprises a genitive, a dative and an accusative but the result is of course quite complex.

Van der Palm draws heavily on de Haes but he also diverts from his predecessor in that he discusses the semantic function of the nominative as well as its ad- and pronominal markers. Educationally motivated as he is, van der Palm (1769,II: 7) begins with the name of the case which he adopts from de Haes but shortens to the concise term *werker*, "worker" that Elzevier had also used a few years before (1761: 51). He explains this name by reference to the semantic function of denoting the person who or thing that works or does something, and subsequently he is able to naturally proceed to the role of the verb. Verbs express acts, and for each act an *actor* or *worker* is required. Van der Palm then goes on: "*Q*. Could you give an example please?", and the example he provides is the simple sentence "*Peter reads*; in which the act, that

<sup>25</sup>) De Haes (1764: 19–20): "Wy stellen ten dien einde een zin of rede dan hier eens neer, by voorbeeld: *de wysheit van eenen veldheer doet den vyanden meer afbreuk dan de dapperheit van de soldaten*. Om nu hier te kunnen vragen: Wie is de eerste naemval? moet men eerst het werkwoord opzoeken en kennen; door een werkwoord nu word het bedryf of eene daed van eenen persoon uitgedrukt; als *lezen*, *schryven*, *beminnen*, *doen*, enz. Dit laetste werkwoord nu vinden wy in den bovenstaende zin, *doet*, namelyk: natuurlyk valt derhalven hier de vraag, wie is de persoon of zaak die hier iets *doet*? het antwoord zal ook natuurlyk zyn, *de wysheit*, die ook wezendlyk de eerste naemval is. (want de woorden *van den veldheer* zyn hier maar bygevoegt, om onze toets of proef wat ruimer te kunnen nemen) 't komt hier op *de wysheit* alleen aen, 't is een en 't zelve of die van een veldheer, of gemeen soldaet, of staetbedienaer zy".

happens, is *reading*; but the person that acts is Peter: and he therefore is the *Worker* [nominative, GR].<sup>26</sup> After this first example, the central issue is at stake — although it is implied by everything up to here. Thus, van der Palm (1769,II: 7) asks “How do we find this *Worker*?”, and the answer is that one has to ask who or what does the deed, “by which this case is immediately discovered”.<sup>27</sup> Again, examples are asked for, and van der Palm (1769,II: 8) now gives two examples, one with the transitive verb *beminnen*, “to love”, and one with ditransitive *maken*, “to make”. Step by step things are getting more difficult — and of crucial importance is the fact that van der Palm does it step by step. The next question is how the nominative sometimes is also used, and the answer refers to subject clauses, again a more difficult example. Finally, van der Palm (1769,II: 8–9) discusses the articles and pronouns associated with the nominative and again provides numerous examples of these. Summing up, van der Palm is brilliantly clear in disentangling all the elements and presenting them in a proper way with increasingly difficult examples.

Likewise, van der Palm’s discussion of the verb (1769,II: 52–59) reads as a more systematic part-by-part, or step-by-step reformulation of the received ideas of Moonen, Sewel, de Haes and Elzevier. His predecessors either define the verb semantically and mix references to *tempus* (Moonen 1706: 138) or to *genus* (active-passive) (Sewel 1712: 241; Elzevier 1761: 96) in the definition, or simply discuss *genus* and *qualitas* (personal-impersonal) without defining the verb (de Haes 1764: 53–54). Van der Palm first defines the verb semantically and then discusses the easiest *accidens*: *qualitas*, and gives numerous examples (1769,II: 52–54). He then proceeds with the other *accidentia*. With regard to *tempus* and *modus*, van der Palm (1769,II: 56, 57) is again innovative in that he explains their meaning whereas none of his predecessors does that. Sewel (1712: 248) even explicitly states that an explanation is unnecessary as their meaning will become clear from the examples.

Van der Palm’s (1769,II: 28–35) chapter on the declension of the nouns calls for discussion as it is the only example of an unsuccessful attempt at simplifying and reshaping received ideas. In the history of Dutch grammar, *declinatio* had always been connected to *genus*: grammarians discern three genders, and subsequently declare there are three declinations, the masculine, the femi-

26) Van der Palm (1769,II: 7): “Vr. Geef hier een voorbeeld van? Antw. Men kan dit door het volgende voorbeeld bevestigen, als, *Pieter leest*; waer in de daedt, die geschiedt, *lezen* is; maer de persoon die dezelve verricht is *Pieter*: deze laetste is derhalve de *Werker*”. Elzevier (1761: 51), from whom van der Palm seems to have taken the term *werker* also has an example with “*Pieter*” but uses the perhaps morally less neutral examples *bemint*, *slaet*, *stoot*, that is, “loves”, “hits”, “bumps”. Moreover, these are transitives which van der Palm only uses later on.

27) Van der Palm (1769,II: 7): “Vr. Op welk eene wyze vindt men nu deze *Werker*? Antw. Deze *Werker* vindt men door te vragen: wie of wat de daedt verricht? waer door deze Naemval zich aenstonds ontdekt”.

nine, and the neuter one (Dibbets 1995). This position is also maintained by Moonen (1706: 86–109), Sewel (1712: 178–226), and de Haes (1764: 22–31). This apparently clear system is complicated by the fact that there is considerable variation within each gender category, and hence within each declination. This variation is due to various reasons. Historically, a strong and a weak nominal inflection existed, the first one with a consonant ending, the second one with final schwa. In particular in the genitive singular of masculine and neuter nouns the difference between strong and weak nouns is important as it is formed with *-s* and *-n* respectively; compare Table 1:

		Strong	Weak
M	Nom	coninc [“king”]	mensche [“man”]
	Gen	conincs	menschen
N	Nom	paert [“horse”]	herte [“heart”]
	Gen	paerts	herten

Table 1: Middle Dutch strong and weak *masculina*

Variation also exists in the Dutch plural. Whereas most commonly the plural is marked by a schwa-suffix, usually spelled *-en*, there are also *-s*-endings. Still more complicating is the fact that some nouns can have both *-(e)n* and *-s* with one of these possibilities as the preferred one; compare Table 2:

Sg	stoel [“chair”]	tafel [“table”]	man [“man”]	vader [“father”]
Pl	stoelen	tafels	mannen, mans	vaders, vaderen

Table 2: Dutch plurals

Next, feminine nouns were usually declined with *-e* in genitive, dative and ablative singular but there are exceptions: those in *-heid* such as *waarheid*, “truth” are preferably not altered. Further, nouns in *-s* are also not declined in the singular, be it masculine, feminine or neuter nouns. And so on.

As a result of this undeniable variation within gender categories, and hence within declinations, all previous grammarians of Dutch presented the three gender-based declinations, usually followed by paradigms, and then described or enumerated the most common exceptions, for example the strong declension of masculine nouns was considered the common one, and grammarians would add that there are also *masculina* without genitival *-s* but with *-(e)n* instead. Efforts at regularization were also undertaken. Variation in the plural was dis-

tributed over the different cases, for example with the nouns in *-er*, *-aar* and *-el* which are the most common instances of this variation; compare the following examples taken from de Haes (1764: 26–31) who has a chapter on nouns “that cannot be declined in accordance with the common rule”:

Pl	M	F	N
Nom	leeraers [“teachers”]	vrysters [“spinsters”]	vensters [“windows”]
Gen	leeraren	vrysteren	vensteren
Dat	leeraren	vrysteren	vensteren
Acc	leeraers	vrysters	vensters
Voc	leeraers	vrysters	vensters
Abl	leeraren	vrysteren	vensteren

Table 3: Examples from de Haes (1764)

The suffix variation is regularly distributed: *-s* is reserved for the nominative, accusative and vocative, and *-en* marks the genitive, dative and ablative. A further effort at regularization was undertaken by ten Kate (1723, I: 383–386) who introduced three style levels, and claimed that *-s* was commonly in use in all cases in the lowest style, but that the two higher style levels also allowed for *-en*-endings such as *vaderen* instead of *vaders* “fathers”.

Nominal inflection, then, was characterized by a gender-based distribution of nouns over three declinations with numerous exceptions to every category. This inconvenience Elzevier (1761: 78–86) tries to solve by adopting a different definition of *declinatio*, and van der Palm (1769, II: 28–35) followed Elzevier’s proposal. They focused on formal changes within singular and plural paradigms instead of on the grammatical gender. Depending on the absence or the presence of change, four possibilities exist on the basis of which three declinations are adopted; the fourth possibility is not discussed by either grammarian.

Declination	Change in Sg	Change in Pl	Elzevier’s example	Van der Palm’s example
1	yes	yes	man [“man”]	man
2	yes	no	hemel [“heaven”]	boom [“tree”]
3	no	no	feniks [“phoenix”]	feniks
4	no	yes	–	–

Table 4: System of nominal flexion according to Elzevier and van der Palm

For reasons of brevity, Elzevier only gives masculine examples claiming that the ab-/presence of change in the paradigms will enable students to decide to which declination feminine and neuter nouns belong. Van der Palm, however, does provide examples of the other genders and these are very informative with regard to the usefulness of this new division into three declinations.

Declination		M	F	N
1 Sg	Nom	man [“man”]	parel [“pearl”]	kindt [“child”]
	Gen	mans	paerle	kinds
	Dat	manne	paerle	kinde
	Acc	man	parel	kindt
	Voc	man	parel	kindt
	Abl	manne	paerle	kinde
1 Pl	Nom	mans	parels	kinders
	Gen	mannen	paerlen	kinderen
	Dat	mannen	paerlen	kinderen
	Acc	mans	parels	kinders
	Voc	mans	parels	kinders
	Abl	mannen	paerlen	kinderen
2 Sg	Nom	boom [“tree”]	vrouw [“woman”]	paerdt [“horse”]
	Gen	booms	vrouwe	paerds
	Dat	boome	vrouwe	paerde
	Acc	boom	vrouw	paerdt
	Voc	boom	vrouw	paerdt
	Abl	boome	vrouwe	paerdt
2 Pl	Nom	boomen	vrouwen	paerden
	Gen etc	boomen	vrouwen	paerden
3 Sg	Nom	feniks	wysheit [“wisdom”]	glas [“glass”]
	Gen etc	feniks	wysheit	glas
3 Pl	Nom	feniksen	wysheden	glazen
	Gen etc	feniksen	wysheden	glazen

Table 5: Van der Palm’s examples of the three declinations

As is shown in Tables 4 and 5, only the first declination varies in the plural. Elzevier's example is *man*, "man", usually considered an exception to the rule that the plural is either formed with *-s* or with *-en*. Van der Palm follows Elzevier. Next, his feminine example is *parel*, "pearl" from the category of nouns in *-er*, *-aar* and *-el* (see Table 3), and his neuter example *kindt*, "child" is equally disputable as the variation in the plural is due to a complex morphological history which resulted in both *kinderen* and *kinders*, "children" with double plural suffixation, apart from the older plurals *kinden* and *kinder* with the *-en* and the historic *-er* plural respectively. In other words, the first declination is only useful for capturing a limited set of words ending in *-er*, *-el* et cetera as well as well-known exceptions such as *man* and *kind*. Likewise, the third declination is mainly made up for masculine and neuter nouns ending in a sonorant as a result of which the typical genitive marker *-s* is obscured, and for *feminina* ending in *-heit*. Finally, the fact that almost all nouns are completely regular in the plural paradigm, with either *-s* or *-en* throughout the six cases, is obscured by this definition of declinations in which variation or change in the paradigm is crucial. Still, Elzevier and van der Palm were probably right in separating gender from nominal inflection: their 18<sup>th</sup>-century Dutch only showed the remnants of the Middle Dutch system of grammatical gender so they sought for a new and easier approach of dealing with nominal inflection in which formal changes within paradigms are crucial. Since they also adopted the regular distribution of *-s* and *-en* plurals over the six cases with nouns such as *man*, *parel* and *kind* as their predecessors had done with respect to nouns such as *vader* and *leeraer* (cf. Table 3), it should be doubted to what extent their innovation was an improvement, let alone a simplification in comparison to the traditional approach exemplified by Moonen, Sewel and de Haes, or to ten Kate's stylistic variable. In any case, Elzevier's and van der Palm's proposal was not taken over by later grammarians. Especially van der Palm's elaborated discussion provides a good example though of their efforts at simplifying Dutch grammar since they were right in being unsatisfied with the traditional approach in which grammatical gender was so important.

### 5.3 Syntax

The syntax part of van der Palm's grammar, that is, the third booklet, is again a simplified version of mainly Moonen's and de Haes' syntax, and de Haes, of course, relied heavily on Moonen. Consider the definition of syntax these three authors provide:

De *Woortvoeging* is het tweede deel der Spraakkunst, dat de Woorden leert geschiktelijk samenstellen, om eene rede te maeken (Moonen 1706: 256)

De *Woordvoeging* dient eigenlyk om woorden geschiktlyk samen te stellen en by elkanderen te voegen, om eene rede uit te maken (de Haes 1764: 126)

Vr. Wat is de *Woordvoeging*?

Antw. De *Woordvoeging* is eene schikking der woorden, om door dezelve een goede rede uittemaken. (van der Palm 1769, III: 3)

De Haes' definition is an elaboration of Moonen's; the elaborated parts are in bold. Van der Palm simplifies the long phrase before the comma so that only the concise phrase *eene schikking der woorden*, "the ordering of words" remains. In the part after the comma, van der Palm adds the adjective *goede*, "good".

Van der Palm's discussion of syntax is very similar to his treatment of orthography and morphology in that he simplifies and summarizes the insights of Moonen and de Haes. I will not go into this in much detail as the procedure will be clear from sections 5.1 and 5.2. It will suffice to show van der Palm's dependence on his predecessors in the following table. In Table 6, I have put on the left the main sources of van der Palm's syntactic chapters 1-7, that is Moonen (1706: 256-283) and de Haes (1764: 126-139). Van der Palm has consulted Moonen via de Haes as he and de Haes have a similar division into chapters, be it that van der Palm once further refines de Haes' refinement of Moonen's division, whereas at another point he is less specific than de Haes and puts two of his chapters together; perhaps I should add that de Haes' chapter 4 counts only 1 sentence of 9 lines on p. 132. Note that Moonen does not use chapter titles; the subjects discussed correspond to the titles of de Haes' and van der Palm's chapters.

Moonen's insights from chapters 36-39 are systematically dispersed over 7 chapters in the works of de Haes and van der Palm, who also add chapter titles. With respect to both terminology and definitions as well as examples, the format of Moonen is maintained by his followers.

Moonen (1706)	de Haes (1764)	van der Palm (1769)
Ch. 36, pp. 256-259 Ch. 37, p. 260	Ch. 1, pp. 126-129: <i>Van de Woordvoeging in het algemeen</i> , "On syntax in general"	Ch. 1, pp 3-4: <i>Van de Woordvoeging</i> , "On syntax"  Ch. 2, pp. 4-9: <i>Aenmerkingen over de Geslachtwoorden</i> , "Remarks on the articles"
Ch. 37, pp. 260-263	Ch. 2, pp. 129-131: <i>Van de samenvoeging der zelfstandige en byvoeglyke naemwoorden</i> , "On the conjunction of nouns and adjectives"	Ch. 3, pp. 9-12: <i>Van de t'samenvoeging der Zelfstandige en Toevoegelyke Naemwoorden</i> , "On the conjunction of nouns and adjectives"
Ch. 37, pp. 263-264	Ch. 3, pp. 131-132: <i>Van het plaetsen der zelfstandige Voornamwoorden</i> , "On the position of pronouns"  Ch. 4, pp. 132: <i>Van het plaetsen der andere Voornaemwoorden</i> , "On the position of other pronouns"	Ch. 4, pp. 12-14: <i>Van het plaetsen der Voornaemwoorden</i> , "On the position of pronouns"
Ch. 37, pp. 264-265 Ch. 38, pp. 265-271	Ch. 5, pp. 133-143: <i>Van het schicken der Naemen Werkwoorden</i> , "On the ordering of nouns and verbs"	Ch. 5, pp. 15-18: <i>Van de schikking der Naemen Werkwoorden</i> , "On the ordering of nouns and verbs"
Ch. 39, pp. 271-273	Ch. 6, pp. 135-136: <i>Van het plaetsen der Bywoorden</i> , "On the position of adverbs"	Ch. 6, pp. 19-21: <i>Van het plaetsen der Bywoorden</i> , "On the position of adverbs"
Ch. 39, pp. 273-283	Ch. 7, pp. 136-139: <i>Van het plaetsen der Voegwoorden</i> , "On the position of conjunctions"	Ch. 7, pp. 21-27: <i>Van het plaetsen der Voegwoorden</i> , "On the position of conjunctions"

Table 6: The first part of Moonen's, de Haes' and van der Palm's syntax

#### 5.4 The fourth booklet

As stated above, van der Palm divided his grammar into four booklets on the assumption that pupils will remain more interested when they are regularly confronted with new learning materials (1769,I: \*4<sup>r-v</sup>). The first three booklets correspond to the traditional parts of grammar and quantitatively express to the usual prominence of morphology (*etymologia*):

book 1: orthography and prosody (52 pp.)

book 2: parts of speech (104 pp.)

book 3: syntax (68 pp.)

The fourth booklet, however, counts no less than 110 pages. What does it contain? As the first book, it is devoted to orthography and prosody, with some morphological items. It mainly consists of lists of monosyllabic, disyllabic, trisyllabic, quadrosyllabic and pentasyllabic words. These kinds of word lists with cumulative syllable structures are typical of the reading and writing instructions aiming at basic literacy. These are included, for instance, in basic reading and writing manuals such as Hakvoord (1746) and Bincken (1757). So here, in the work of van der Palm, we see two quite separate traditions converge: the 'lower' ABC-books with the basic literacy goal, and the 'higher' linguistic works aiming at grammatical knowledge, are brought together in van der Palm's "Dutch grammar, for the youth". The 'democratization' of grammar is being fulfilled. With the convergence of these two separate traditions, van der Palm, who wrote the master piece of the second period of civil grammar, also marks the beginning of the third period of national grammar.

#### 6. Van der Palm sr. and van der Palm jr.

In the second period of civil grammar, the third period of national grammar is already conceptualized, and van der Palm stood at the birth of national grammar. Enlightened *burghers* of the second half of the eighteenth century such as van der Palm who considered knowledge of grammar along with knowledge of for example poetry, history and experimental science necessary for middle- and upper-class members of society soon developed an inclusive idea of citizenship. Inclusive citizenship refers to the non-exclusion of any social group and led to laws that stated every child should attend school and there learn the basis principles of the Dutch grammar. Inclusive citizenship is characteristic of the national period, and of national grammar. A clear example is provided by the Dutch educational laws of 1801, 1803 and 1806 which regulated primary education and put it under national control. These laws are typically interpreted as an outcome of middle-class *burghers* taking over the public debate on

education as well as public institutions such as the schools. At the same time they were instrumental in the forging of a nation through education.<sup>28</sup>

The society mainly connected with the beginnings of this educational revolution is the *Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen*, "Society for the Benefit of the Common". The *Maatschappij*, founded in 1784, published numerous prize essays on educational reform and founded departments all over the country. By 1800, 52 departments existed with almost 3700 members (Lenders 1988: 34). It is safe to speak not just of a bourgeois linguistic sphere with regard to the later eighteenth century (see section 1) but also of a *bourgeois educational sphere*. The typically late-eighteenth-century inclusive ideas of this society are nicely summed up in its definition of the target group: de "minvermogende burger", that is, the less wealthy *burghers/citizens* (Lenders 1988: 33). The *Maatschappij* wanted to disseminate knowledge and virtue in order to make these citizens participate in the common wealth, and in this dissemination the improvement of the public schools was of utmost importance (Lenders 1988: 33).

Other *burgher* societies also published prize essays (Los 2005). In 1780, the *Zeeuwsch Genootschap der Wetenschappen*, "Zealand Society for Sciences" awarded Kornelis van der Palm's essay *Over de verbetering der Scholen*, "On the improvement of Schools" in which van der Palm, be it somewhat halfheartedly, employed an inclusive idea of society (Los 2005). It was, however, his son: the preacher, Leiden professor, and secretary of education Johan Hendrik van der Palm (1763–1840) who was responsible for the laws on education of 1801, 1803 and 1806 which laid the foundation for a general, national system of primary education. The younger van der Palm also took the lead in the nationalization of language. The official Dutch spelling of 1804 designed by another Leiden professor, Matthijs Siegenbeek (1774–1854), and Weiland's grammar of 1805 were only nationally prescribed in the administration and in education because van der Palm had declared they were. Thus, whereas the father Kornelis van der Palm represents the period of civil grammar, his son Johan Hendrik provides an outstanding example of the period of national grammar.

Finally, the democratizing waves of the later eighteenth century, in the sense of the opening up of the public sphere to larger parts of society, are beautifully illustrated by the personal careers of both van der Palm's. Whereas the non-academic but talented father, the school teacher, only dreamt of becoming a preacher, his son went to the university, became a preacher, then a professor in Leiden, and eventually the secretary of education, in which capacity he made a great effort for the nationalization of education.

<sup>28</sup> For this paragraph, see Boekholt/De Booy (1989), Dekker (2006), Lenders (1988), Los (2005).

## 7. Final remarks

In the course of a century, from the early eighteenth to the early nineteenth century, the contents of the most important Dutch grammars had remained the same in many respects. The Dutch eighteenth century, therefore, is often characterized as a period of stagnation, or, somewhat less negatively, consolidation. The seventeenth century, the Golden Age, produced cultural highlights that were only repeated over and over again during the eighteenth century. In fact, however, the function of grammar and of linguistics has been turned upside down during the eighteenth century. While many linguistic ideas and opinions remained the same, grammar as a cultural phenomenon changed from a rather elitist leisure activity, through a short period of civil responsibility, into a compulsory element of the national school curriculum. In this article, I have shown how eighteenth-century grammar books internally changed in accordance with the external, functional changes taking place. The contents of linguistic publications were simplified, (further) systematized, refined and sometimes reshaped in order to make the art of grammar accessible to ever larger parts of society.

Gijsbert Rutten  
Vrije Universiteit Brussel  
Centrum voor Linguïstiek  
Pleinlaan 2  
B-1050 Brussel  
eMail: g.j.rutten@hum.leidenuniv.nl

## References

- Beal, Joan  
2004 *English in Modern Times 1700–1945*. London: Arnold.
- Belle, Jan van  
1748 *Korte wegwyzer, ter spel- spraak- en dichtkonden*. Haarlem: Izaak van der Vinne.
- Belle, Jan van  
1755 *Korte schéts der Néderduitsche spraakkunst*. Haarlem: Christoph Henrich Bohn.
- Bincken, P.  
1757 *Fondamenten ofte grond-regels der Neder-duytsche spel-kunst*. Antwerpen: Hubertus Bincken.
- Boekholt, P. Th. F. M. / de Booy, E. P.  
1989 *Geschiedenis van de school in Nederland vanaf de middeleeuwen tot aan de huidige tijd*. Assen, Maastricht: Van Gorcum.
- Bonth, Roland de  
1998 "De Aristarch van 't Y". *De "grammatica" uit Balthazar Huydecopers Proeve van Taal- en Dichtkunde (1730)*. Maastricht: Shaker.
- Crowley, Tony  
1996 *Language in History. Theories and Texts*. Londo, New York: Routledge.
- Dekker, Jeroen J. H.  
2006 *Het verlangen naar opvoeden. Over de groei van de pedagogische ruimte in Nederland sinds de Gouden Eeuw tot omstreeks 1900*. Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- Des Roches, Jan  
2007 *Nieuwe Nederduytsche Spraek-kunst*. Heruitgave van de tekst door J.M. van der Horst met een inleiding door J. Smeyers. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen. (Geschiedenis van het talenonderwijs in de Lage Landen. 2.). [1761].
- Dibbets, Geert R. W.  
1995 *De woordsoorten in de Nederlandse triviumgrammatica*. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen.  
2003 "De Nederduitsche spraakkunst (1764) van Frans de Haes" [1999]. G. R. W. Dibbets, *Taal kundig geregeld*. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen: 193–221.
- Elzevier, Kornelis  
1761 *Drie dichtproeven [...] benevens een proef van een nieuwe Nederduitsche spraek-kunst*. Haarlem: J. Bosch.
- Habermas, Jürgen  
1990 *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft* [1962]. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

- Haes, Frans de  
1764 *De nagelaten gedichten, en Nederduitsche spraekkunst*. Amsterdam: Pieter Meijer.
- Hakvoord, Barend  
1746 *De Nieuwe Nederduitse spel-, lees- en schryf-kunst*. Deventer: Abraham van Wezel.
- Huydecoper, Balthazar  
1730 *Proeve van taal- en dichtkunde*. Amsterdam: Evert Visscher & Isaak Tirion.
- Kate, Lambert ten  
2001 *Aenleiding tot de kennis van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche sprake* [1723]. Ed. by Jan Noordegraaf, Marijke van der Wal. Alphen aan de Rijn: Canaletto.
- Kloek, Joost / Mijnhardt, Wijnand  
2001 *1800. Blaudrukken voor een samenleving*. Den Haag: Sdu.
- Knol, Jan  
1977 "De grammatica in de achttiende eeuw". *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taalkunde*. Ed. by D. M. Bakker, G. R. W. Dibbets. Den Bosch: Malmberg, 65–112.
- Lenders, Jan  
1988 *De burger en de volksschool. Culturele en mentale achtergronden van een onderwijshervorming, Nederland 1780–1850*. Nijmegen: SUN.
- Los, Willeke  
2005 *Opvoeding tot mens en burger. Pedagogiek als Cultuurkritiek in Nederland in de 18<sup>e</sup> eeuw*. Hilversum: Verloren.
- Moonen, Arnold  
1706 *Nederduitsche spraekkunst*. Amsterdam: François Halma.
- Noordegraaf, Jan  
1985 *Norm, geest en geschiedenis*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Palm, Kornelis van der  
1769 *Nederduitsche spraekkunst, voor de jeugd*. 4 vols. Rotterdam: Reinier Arrenberg.
- Rutten, Gijsbert  
2006 *De Archimedische punten van de taalbeschouwing. David van Hoogstraten (1658–1724) en de vroegmoderne taalcultuur*. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen.  
2007a "Remark and Remember. Cultivating Dutch in Early Modern Europe". *The Henry Sweet Society Bulletin* 49: 39–52.  
2007b "The Nationalist Turn. Dutch Linguistics and German Philosophy in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries". *History of Linguistics 2005. Selected papers from the Tenth International Conference on the History of the Language*

- Sciences (ICHOLS X)*, 1–5 September 2005, Urbana-Champaign, Illinois. Ed. by D.A. Kibbee. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 288–307.
- 2008 “Jan van Belle: didacticus, popularisator”. *Ontheven aan de tijd. Linguïstisch-historische studies voor Jan Noordegraaf*. Ed. by L. van Driel, Th. Janssen. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 95–104.
- Schaars, Frans  
1988 *De Nederduytsche spraakkonst (1706) van Arnold Moonen (1644–1711)*. Wijhe: Quarto.
- Sewel, Willem  
1712 *Nederduytsche spraakkonst*. Amsterdam: R. Blokland.
- Singeling, Kees  
1996 “Sociable men of letters. Literary sociability in the Netherlands in the second half of the eighteenth century”. *Europäische Sozietätsbewegung und demokratische Tradition. Die europäischen Akademien der Frühen Neuzeit zwischen Frührenaissance und Spätaufklärung*. Hrsg. v. K. Garber, H. Wismann, W. Siebers. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 881–894.
- Verwer, Adriaen  
2005 *Taalkundige geschriften (1707–1711)*. Ed. by Igor van de Bilt. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen.
- Vries, Marleen de  
2001 *Beschaven! Letterkundige genootschappen in Nederland 1750–1800*. Nijmegen: Vantilt.
- Wal, Marijke J. van der  
1990 “Meer der geleerde weereld’ hunne vernuiftige gedachten als der jeugd’ hunne lessen mede te deelen? Vragen over het gebruik van grammatika’s”. *Vragende wijs. Vragen over tekst, taal en taalgeschiedenis*. Ed. by J. B. den Besten et al. Amsterdam, Atlanta/GA: Rodopi, 223–230.
- 2002 “Lambert ten Kate and eighteenth-century Dutch linguistics”. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*. 12: 49–63.
- Weiland, Pieter  
1805 *Nederduitsche spraakkunst*. Amsterdam: Johannes Allart.
- Witsen Geysbeek, P.G.  
1824 *Biographisch, anthologisch en critisch woordenboek der Nederduitsche dichters. Deel 5 OGI-VER*. Amsterdam: C.L. Schleyer.
-