



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Lambert ten Kate and eighteenth-century Dutch Linguistics

Wal, M.J. van der

Citation

Wal, M. J. van der. (2002). Lambert ten Kate and eighteenth-century Dutch Linguistics. *Beiträge Zur Geschichte Der Sprachwissenschaft*, 12, 49-63. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/18138>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/18138>

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

Marijke J. van der Wal

Lambert ten Kate and Eighteenth-Century Dutch Linguistics*

1. Introduction

The final decades of the twentieth century showed a considerable historiographical interest in eighteenth-century Dutch linguistics, a much neglected research area until then. As a result, our view of this period has modified the clear-cut picture of a flat linguistic landscape in which the major grammars by Arnold Moonen (1706) and Willem Séwel (1708) rise above the surface of various minor grammars, linguistic treatises, orthographical publications, schoolbooks and grammars for foreign language teaching and — more importantly — in which the excellent scholar Lambert ten Kate (1674–1731) towers high above all the linguistic activities mentioned. Our increased knowledge of the period results from detailed studies of the eighteenth-century normative practice in grammars and commentaries on the one hand, and from breaking new grounds on the other. A major example of the latter is the newly discovered importance of the 'Schola Hemsterhusiana', which consisted of scholars of classical and oriental languages. Although these new insights considerably changed our view of eighteenth-century linguistics, they left at least one element intact: even against the background of the Schola Hemsterhusiana, ten Kate still ranks high as an outstanding linguist.

Lambert ten Kate, who devoted himself to the study of Dutch and the other Germanic languages, published his *Gemeéenschap tussen de Gotische spraeke en de Nederduytsche* ('The Affinities and Similarities be-

* This article is an elaborate version of my paper given at the 'International Conference on the History of Language Sciences (ICHoLS)' VIII, 14 till 19 September 1999 in Paris. I thank various participants for their discussion and Rolf Bremmer (Leiden) for his useful comments on an earlier draft of this article.

tween the Gothic and Dutch Languages') anonymously in 1710. His major opus, the two-volume *Aenleiding tot de kennis van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche sprake* ('Introduction to the knowledge of the most important part of the Dutch language') followed thirteen years later. In 1780, almost fifty years after Lambert ten Kate's death, the anonymous author of a treatise on the origin of the Dutch language characterised the many-sided scholar ten Kate as "a man even praised by foreigners" ("een man zelfs bij Uitlanderen gepreezen") and this statement was correct (*Aanmerkingen* 1780: vi). Ten Kate was praised by foreigners such as, for instance, the Scot James Boswell (1740–1795). During his stay in Holland, Boswell became familiar with ten Kate's work. In his opinion ten Kate's *Aenleiding* was a real treasure.¹ It was this very book that was also greatly appreciated by the Italian cardinal and polyglot Giuseppe Gaspare Mezzofanti (1774–1849) (cf. Rizza 1987: 78). Moreover, ten Kate's first linguistic publication, *Geméenschap*, was held in high esteem by August Wilhelm von Schlegel (1767–1845) who advised Jacob Grimm to consult it in order to establish a solid foundation of linguistics (Jongeneelen 1996: 121).² Even in the keen eyes of twentieth-century historiographers, Lambert ten Kate is considered to be a precursor of nineteenth-century comparative historical linguistics.³ Historiographers have focussed mainly on the relationship between ten Kate and nineteenth-century linguistics. Only rarely has ten Kate's influence on his contemporaries been taken into account. Balthazar Huydecoper's well-known indebtedness to ten Kate was high-lighted and fully explored a few years ago,⁴ but otherwise, to my knowledge, no further detailed research of ten Kate's reception in the eighteenth century has been carried out. In order to fill this gap, I intend to examine the reception and influence of ten Kate's work, his *Aenleiding* in particular, in eighteenth-century Dutch grammars and treatises.

¹ When James Boswell, a student at the university of Utrecht from August 1763 till June 1764, discussed his plans for a Scottish dictionary, Gysbert Bonnet, professor of theology, drew his attention to Lambert ten Kate's *Aenleiding* – cf. Van der Wal (1998: 183–184); Barfoot/Bostoen (1994: 14–19).

² Grimm's correspondence with Hendrik Willem Tydeman shows that in 1812 Grimm was already familiar with ten Kate's name and that he obtained a copy of the *Aenleiding* in 1818 (Reifferscheid 1883: 31, 67).

³ Cf. Arens (1974: 104–105); Brink (1986); Jongeneelen (1992); Rompelman (1952).

⁴ Cf. Jongeneelen (1996); de Bonth (1998). – In the nineteenth century, Huydecoper and ten Kate were often considered to be the two major linguists of the previous century. Huydecoper's references to ten Kate mainly concern three fields: the irregular or strong verbs and morphology, etymology, and the cultivation of a standard language (Jongeneelen 1996: 124).

2. The Reception of ten Kate's Work: The Issues and the Corpus

The *Aenleiding*, considered a treasure by Boswell and many others, is indeed a rich source for both the Germanic languages in general and the Dutch language in particular. The book, which includes a soundly based etymological dictionary, presents ideas on language change and linguistic variation and offers an elaborate description of various Dutch language phenomena. Moreover, it establishes the nature of relation between various languages and it gives a view of phenomena which are similar in the Germanic languages. In this rich variety of subjects, ten Kate fully displays his methodological approach which can be briefly described as discovering the rules of language empirically within the language itself, or, in his own terminology: linguistic rules must be discovered not made. In ten Kate's view, exceptions were governed by rules not yet discovered and eventually very few exceptions would be left to account for. Such a strict adherence to empirical principles finds its origin in the Newtonian scientific approach, with which ten Kate was well familiar.⁵ In this respect, he perfectly fitted into the context of his time and can be regarded as a typical exponent of what has been called eighteenth-century Dutch mainstream Enlightenment which overthrew Cartesian deductive science by replacing it with experimental science (Noordegraaf 1996: 228). In eighteenth-century Dutch linguistics, however, which was dominated by discussions on spelling and language norms, such an empirical approach was entirely new.⁶ Equally new were ten Kate's thorough study of the Old Germanic languages, his systematic etymologies and his keen observations of Dutch language phenomena. In these respects, he differed markedly from the prevailing linguistic practice.

Noticing the vast discrepancy between ten Kate's achievements and the then current discussions in grammars and treatises, I intend not only to deal with his contemporaries' evaluation in reviews and their accidental remarks, but also to examine whether the eighteenth-century grammars

⁵ Cf. Jongeneelen (1992); Peeters (1990). – Ten Kate had studied the physics of Isaac Newton (1643–1727) and the phonetics of Johan Conrad Amman (1669–1724) in the Haarlem Collegium Physicum – cf. Jongeneelen (1994); Peeters (1990: 153).

⁶ Noordegraaf (1996: 231, note 25) emphasizes that ten Kate should not be regarded simply as an empiricist scholar but rather as an empiro-rationalist. Both he and the members of the Schola Hemsterhusiana "were adherents of eighteenth-century inductive, functional rationalism: reason is used for discovering and explaining the laws of language".

and treatises adopted any of his ideas or details of his linguistic description, and if so, to what degree these ideas were taken account of.

The publication of ten Kate's *Aenleiding* in 1723 did not pass unnoticed. The following year the learned periodical *Maendelyke uittreksels, of Boekzael der geleerde werelt* ('Monthly Abstracts or Library of the World of Letters'; 1724: 493–506) published a review which highly praised ten Kate and his book. Tribute was also paid to ten Kate in various publications from the second half of the eighteenth century, although there is a subtle hint of a less favourable reception some years before 1758. It is the mathematician Johan Lulofs (1711–1768) who in 1758 gratefully states that the *Aenleiding*, after having been rejected by ignorant people in previous years, is now gaining renewed appreciation.⁷ Such favourable evaluations and accidental remarks are no more than a starting point for my research which will be conducted by examining a corpus of texts on a number of issues chosen. Since methodological discussions and detailed etymologies are not likely to be found in eighteenth-century grammars, I want to concentrate on the following issues which all belong to the core of ten Kate's linguistic work and are therefore most appropriate for a closer examination of ten Kate's reception: firstly, his discovery of root stress and, even more importantly, of regularity in the so-called irregular verbs (the 'strong' verbs), which was the main result of ten Kate's comparative linguistic approach; secondly, ten Kate's two newly made distinctions: his tripartite division on the stylistic level and his distinction between two kinds of orthography.

To this end, I have examined a corpus of twenty texts, ranging from 1736 to 1799. Since the most important eighteenth-century grammars of Dutch (Moonen 1706; Séwel 1708) had both been published before ten Kate's *Aenleiding* (1723), I restricted myself to minor Dutch grammars.⁸

⁷ Cf. Lulofs' remark that the *Aenleiding* "voor eenige jaaren, als een onnut boek op eene onvergeeflyke wyze door onkundigen, die te zeer met vreemde taalen en zeden zyn ingenomen, agter de bank geworpen, tot blydschap van alle Taal kundigen in zyne rechte waarde begint gekend te worden by onze Landgenooten, die hunne oogen niet langer sluiten voor de kracht, rykdom en cierlykheid van onze Moeder-taal" – Lulofs' footnote f. in Hermannus Samuel Reimarus' *De voornaamste waarheden van den natuurlyken gods-dienst* (1758), first treatise, §14, page 56. This remark is also quoted by M[ynard] T[ydeman] in his 'Verhoog over eenige middelen ter vordering in taal-, oudheid- en dichtkunde', published in *Tweede Proeve van Oudheid-, Taal- en Dichtkunde door het genootschap Dulces ante Omnia Musae*, Utrecht: Paddenburg, 1782: 204–212; quotation on pp. 205–206. — I owe this reference to Jan Noordegraaf (Amsterdam).

⁸ *Korte verklaring* (1736), van Belle (1748, 1755), Elzevier (1761), de Haes (1764),

In addition to these books, I have analysed three bilingual grammars or Dutch grammars for foreigners⁹ and four treatises on language or linguistics.¹⁰ The details of my corpus are presented in the list below.

- 1736 / *Korte verklaring* | — *Korte verklaring over de zelfstandige naemvallen en het lydend werkwoordt gehoord worden*, s.p., s.t. [1736], pp. 1–38. In: *Alle de werken van 't kunstgenootschap Natura et arte*, volume V.
- 1748 / van Belle | — Jan van Belle, *Korte wegwijzer, ter spel- spraak- en dichtkonden*, Haarlem: Van der Vinne.
- 1755 / van Belle | — Jan van Belle, *Korte schets der Néderduitsche spraakkonst*, Haarlem: Bohn.
- 1755 / van Iperen | — Josua van Iperen, *Proeve van taalkunde als eene wetenschap behandeld*, Amsterdam: Rykman.
- 1755 / Kramer | — Matthias Kramer, *Neue hollaendische grammatica*, Amsterdam: Van Belkom.
- 1761 / Burman | — Frans Burman, *Eenige nieuwe aenmerkingen, de nederduitsche tael en verscheidene oudheden aengaende*, Utrecht: Kroon e.a.
- 1761 / Elzevier | — Korn. Elzevier, *Proef van een nieuwe Nederduitsche spraakkonst*. In: *Drie dichtproeven (...) benevens een proef van een nieuwe Nederduitsche spraakkonst*, Haarlem: Bosch, 49–140.
- 1764 / de Haes | — Frans de Haes, *De nagelaten gedichten en Nederduitsche Spraakkunst van wylen den heer Frans de Haes*, Amsterdam: Meijer.
- 1769 / van der Palm | — Kornelis van der Palm, *Nederduitsche spraakkunst, voor de jeugd*, Rotterdam: Arrenberg.
- 1770 / *Nederduitsche spraakkunst* | — *Nederduitsche spraakkunst, ten gebruike van het genootschap onder de spreuk: kunst wordt door arbeid verkreegen, binnen Leyden*, Leiden: [Van Hoogeveen].
- 1771 / Mestingh | — Derk Mestingh, *Verhandeling over den oorsprong en de natuur der taalen in het gemeen beschouwd*, Groningen: Span-daw.
- 1776 / Stijl | — Klaas Stijl, *Beknopte Aanleiding tot de kennis der Spelling, Spraakdeelen, en Zintekenen van de Nederduitsche taal (...) vermeerderd met bijgevoegde Aanmerkingen (...) door Lambertus van Bolhuis*, Groningen: Oomkens.

van der Palm (1769), *Nederduitsche spraakkunst* (1770), Stijl (1776), *De Nederduitsche taalkunde* (1783), *Inleyding tot de grondregels* (1785), Holtrop (1791), Zeydelaar (1791), *Rudimenta* (1799).

⁹ Kramer (1755), Evans (1778), Moerbeek (1791).

¹⁰ Van Iperen (1755), Burman (1761), Mestingh (1771), *Aanmerkingen* (1780).

- 1778 / Evans | — Edward Evans, *Nieuwe en volkomene Engelsche en Nederduitsche Spraakkonst* (2e dr), Rotterdam: De Leeuw.
- 1780 / *Aanmerkingen* | — *Aanmerkingen over den Oorsprong en verderen voortgang der Nederduitsche taale*, Franeker: Van der Sluis.
- 1783 / *De Nederduitsche taalkunde* | — *De Nederduitsche Taalkunde gemaklijk gemaakt*, Amsterdam: Van Selm.
- 1785 / *Inleyding tot de grondregels* | — *Inleyding tot de grondregels der Vlaemische Spraek- en Spelkonste*, Dendermonde: Ducaju.
- 1791 / Holtrop | — W. Holtrop, *Nieuwe en volledige nederduitsche spel- en spraakkunst*, Amsterdam: Holtrop.
- 1791 / Zeydelaar | — *Néderduitsche Spraakkonst ten dienste der Néderlandsche Taalbeminnaars*, Amsterdam: Van Vliet.
- 1791 / Moerbeek | — Adam Abrahamsz. van Moerbeek, *Neue, vollkommene Hollaendische Sprachlehre*, Leipzig: Junius.
- 1799 / *Rudimenta* | — *Rudimenta, of Gronden der Nederduitsche Spraake*, Leiden, etc.: Mortier.

3. Root Stress and the Regularity of the Verbs

As early as in his *Geméenschap*, Ten Kate discussed the Germanic characteristic of word stress: stress was on the root (“zakelijke deel”) of a word, not on prefixes or endings. The stress rule as such was an important discovery, although ten Kate erroneously assumed root stress to be an old pre-Germanic heritage rather than a Germanic innovation. Ten Kate’s stress rule is to be found in three of our corpus texts.¹¹ In his treatise *Eenige nieuwe aanmerkingen, de nederduitsche tael en verscheidene oudheden aengaande*, Frans Burman deals with various words which Dutch and French have in common and, in his discussion of stress, he briefly and critically refers to ten Kate (Burman 1761: 499–500). The author of the treatise *Aanmerkingen over den Oorsprong en verderen voortgang der Nederduitsche taal* mentions root stress as a characteristic of genuine Dutch words with reference to ten Kate; therefore, words with stressed endings are identified as loans (*Aenmerkingen* 1780: 20).¹² Klaas Stijl’s grammar of 1776, edited and annotated by Lambertus van Bolhuis, also includes ten Kate’s rule for root stress. Furthermore, Stijl (1776: 151, n.

¹¹ Balthazar Huydecoper also adopted ten Kate’s stress rule (cf. de Bonth 1998: 94).

¹² The unmentioned author may be Everwinus Wassenbergh (1742–1826), professor of Greek at the university of Franeker, who also taught Dutch language and literature (cf. Noordegraaf 1997: 27).

133) pays attention to the effect of stress on the meaning of certain words (words such as *voórkomen* ‘to come forward’ – *voorkómen* ‘to prevent’ M.v.d.W.), an observation he owed to ten Kate.

It is in the grammars, and not in the treatises, that we find ten Kate’s main discovery: the principle of vowel gradation or ablaut in the strong verb system. Ten Kate recognized the importance of this morphological pattern not only for Dutch, but for all the Germanic languages. He explicitly pointed out that the ‘irregular’ verbs (‘ongelyk vloeyende werkwoorden’), even though they constitute only a small portion of the inventory of Dutch verbs, have a much higher frequency of occurrence than the ‘regular’ verbs (‘gelykvloeyende werkwoorden’) (ten Kate 1723, I: 545). Observing that the former category belongs to the core vocabulary of the language, he called them *Primitiva*. Ten Kate discovered that the conjugation of verbs in the other Germanic languages showed similar patterns as in Dutch and concluded that their pattern of vowel change had to date back to the time before Germanic split up into its various languages (ten Kate 1723, I: 545). This discovery enabled him to arrange the ‘irregular’ verbs into several classes according to their vowel alternations. It should be noted as an aside that this organization of the strong verbs actually established the foundation of the nineteenth-century ablaut rules and that on account of this discovery ten Kate has been considered a forerunner of Jacob Grimm.¹³

Jan van Belle’s *Korte wegwizer, ter spel- spraak- en dichtkonden*, a grammar in verse for both adults and younger ones, is the first grammar to present ten Kate’s verbal system, although the verbs are presented in an order that differs from that of ten Kate (Van Belle 1748: 39–40, 49).¹⁴ The differences can be outlined as follows:

Van Belle (1748)			Ten Kate
1. panama	haat-haatte-gehaat	‘to hate’	I
2. panamalen	weef-weefde-geweven	‘to weave’	VI
3. panémé	koop-kogt-gekogt	‘to buy’	V
4. panémélen	sluit-sloot-gesloten	‘to close’	II
5. panémalen	treed-trad-getreden	‘to tread’	III
6. panémielen	steel-stal-gestolen	‘to steal’	IV

¹³ A comparison between ten Kate’s system of verb classes and the current twentieth-century system is to be found in Schultink (1989); a broader comparison between ten Kate’s morphological observations and descriptions and modern Dutch morphology is presented in Schultink (1994).

¹⁴ For further information on van Belle and his readers, see Van der Wal (1990).

On the left hand side is van Belle's mnemonic aid for his pupils, on the right ten Kate's division of verbal classes. Both van Belle's and ten Kate's class one are the regular weak verbs. Van Belle's class two is ten Kate's class six, characterised by weak preterites and strong past participles. Van Belle's class three corresponds to ten Kate's class five. Van Belle's classes four, five and six reflect ten Kate's classes two (including *blijven* 'to stay' and *vinden* 'to find'), three (including *geven* 'to give', *raden* 'to guess' and *dragen* 'to carry') and four (including *bidden* 'to pray' and *helpen* 'to help'). Ten Kate distinguished a remaining group for those irregular verbs that did not fit in any of his six classes, such as *doen* 'to do', *hebben* 'to have', *konnen* 'to be able' (ten Kate 1723,I: 543-574).

Van Belle applied ten Kate's verbal system without following him blindly. Whereas ten Kate assigned verbs such as *bakken* 'to bake' — *biek/bakte* — *gebakken* to two different classes, the one according to the obsolete strong preterite form *biek*, the other according to the current weak preterite *bakte*, van Belle stuck to a synchronic approach. He assigned such originally strong verbs which had become partly weak by the eighteenth century, to his second class (panamalen). Van Belle's synchronic approach also resulted in an irregular status for the verbs *gaan*, *staan*, *worden* 'to go, to stand, to become', which belong to class three in ten Kate's system.

Almost thirty years later, Stijl (1776: 129-132), when dealing with the verbs in his grammar, presented ten Kate's system of six classes (or ranks "rangen"), illustrated with examples. For further information on the irregular verbs and various other aspects of the Dutch verbs, Stijl refers to ten Kate himself.¹⁵ In the *Aenmerkingen*, ten Kate's system of classes is to be found too, although the author does not mention ten Kate's name explicitly (*Aenmerkingen* 1780: 29-31).

At this point, we can conclude that ten Kate's classification of the verbs was adopted, and sometimes adapted, in eighteenth-century grammars and treatises. In the next session, I want to assess whether his distinction of three stylistic or linguistic levels was similarly accepted.

4. Three Stylistic Levels

The three different styles or levels of language use that ten Kate distinguished are the *hoogdravende* or *verhevene stijl* (the sublime style), the

¹⁵ Cf. Stijl (1776: 133, n. 110; 108, n. 72; 110, n. 76; 114, n. 81; 115, n. 85; 116, n. 86).

deftige or *statige stijl* (the solemn style) and the *gemeenzame stijl* (the plain style). According to his own description, the sublime style has the characteristics of ancient usage; it is a style used by scholars. The solemn style approaches daily usage ("de daeglijkse gewoonte"), but it sticks to the full and regular order and solemnity of expression ("de volledige en regelmatige orde en deftigheid des gezegs"). This style implies that 'shortenings' ("inkortende wijzen", "inkortingen") such as the apocope of *-e*, *-en* or *-er* do not often occur. The plain style corresponds to daily usage ("de daeglijksche Taelvoering en Spreektrant") in which such 'shortenings' frequently occur, but it is clearly distinguished from the vulgar colloquial and street-language ("de platte Spreek- en Straettael") (cf. ten Kate 1723,I: 334).

The three levels show a different degree to which case endings are used, as illustrated with the genitive and dative (ten Kate 1723,I: 337):¹⁶

GENITIVE	sublime style:	<i>eener grooten of groeter vrouwe</i>
	solemn style:	<i>van eene groote vrouwe of vrouw'</i>
	plain style:	<i>van een' groote vrouw</i>
DATIVE	sublime style:	<i>eener groeter of aen eene groote vrouwe</i>
	solemn style:	<i>aen eene groote vrouwe of vrouw'</i>
	plain style:	<i>aen een' groote vrouw</i>

The lower the style, the fewer articles, adjectives and nouns are provided with case endings. Other linguistic phenomena such as full and phonetically reduced pronominal forms were accounted for in a similar way: the unstressed, reduced pronouns *me*, *we*, *je*, *ze* (versus *mij*, *wij*, *jij*, *zij*) are restricted to the plain style; the compounded pronouns *gijlieden*, *zijlieden* (versus *gij*, *zij*) are part of both the sublime and the solemn style (ten Kate 1723,I: 469-470).

In passing, I note that in rhetoric a similar stylistic tripartite division has been used for centuries: the so-called high, mediocre and low styles, the choice of which depended on the subject involved. Ten Kate is the only linguist known to have adopted this tripartition from rhetoric. I am not familiar with similar cases inside or outside the Dutch context.

Did ten Kate's new classification of style gain ground in my corpus material? Only in Stijl's grammar ten Kate's tripartition is explicitly mentioned (Stijl 1776: 81-82, n. 46). In addition to that, Stijl emphasizes

¹⁶ Polomé (1983: 3) has pointed out the importance of the various styles from a sociolinguistic point of view.

that the usage of *me, ge, we, ze* instead of *mij, gij, wij, zij* corresponds to the plain style (Stijl 1776: 101, n. 68). Dealing with the definite and indefinite articles, Stijl (1776: 80) also points to a relationship between their inflexions and the level of style, a relationship however, which he (or his editor van Bolhuis) questions in a footnote by arguing that differences in inflexion should be accounted for by euphony or obsolescence (Stijl 1776: 81–82, n. 46).

In Zeydelaar's *Néderduitsche Spraakkonst* (1791), we find terms which suggest a bipartition.¹⁷ Zeydelaar, who refers repeatedly to ten Kate in various parts of his grammar, uses the terms "gemeene stijl" (plain style) and "hoogdravende stijl" (sublime style). For instance, Zeydelaar states that the plain style has *met een 'magtig' Vorst* 'with a powerful sovereign', where the sublime style uses *met eenen magtigen vorste* (Zeydelaar 1791: 99). In dealing with the cases, however, Zeydelaar emphasizes the difference between the prepositional phrases and the inflected forms without using ten Kate's terminology. He states that both the dative and the preposition *aan* 'at' are required in examples such as *het hangt aan den hals, aan den spijker* 'it hangs at the neck, at the nail', even in the "verheven stijl", ten Kate's synonym of the "hoogdravende stijl" (Zeydelaar 1791: 165).¹⁸ The poetical language is said to require another style than daily language use does; hence its preference for *der, mijner, uwes, aller* over *van de, van mijne, van uwe, van alle* (Zeydelaar 1791: 164).

The *Rudimenta, of Gronden der Nederduitsche Spraake uitgegeeven door de Maatschappij tot nut van 't algemeen* (1799), according to the author's preface a publication written for children,¹⁹ yields a passage in which differences in inflexion such as *van een Kind, of eens Kinds, aan een Kind, of eens Kinds* [sic] are said to correspond to two manners of speaking ("twee wijzen van spreken"): a plain ("gemeenzame") manner to be learnt in daily usage and a solemn or sublime ("deftige of verhevene") manner to be learnt from well-written books (*Rudimenta* 1799: 12). The terminology is so similar to ten Kate's that adoption is highly probable. Apparently, two levels of style sufficed: the sublime and

solemn style, which differed only gradually, merged.²⁰ The bipartition is presented with a clear indication of how to acquire the two different styles or manners.

From this overview it appears that ten Kate's stylistic tripartition, whether in its original or in an adapted form, was adopted in a few grammars.

5. Two Kinds of Orthography

During ten Kate's lifetime grammarians paid so much attention to minor orthographic discussions that ten Kate once spoke of orthography (in Dutch "spelkonst") as "spil- of quelkonst" that is as timewasting and irritating (ten Kate 1723,I: 109). Ten Kate himself argued for two kinds of orthography: the "burgerlijke" (civil) or "gemeene" (common) orthography, based on custom, that is mainly on the usage of prestigious authors versus the "natuerkundige" (physical) or "critique" (critical) orthography, based on the principle of representing one sound by only one symbol (ten Kate 1723,I: 110–111; 114–115). It is not at all surprising that ten Kate strove at establishing the latter orthography which would deviate from both the orthographic practice of previous grammarians, such as Moonen and Séwel, and that of his contemporary Huydecoper (de Bonth 1998: 117).

Ten Kate's principle of one sound, one symbol played a considerable role in the on-going discussion on superfluous symbols. Grammarians sometimes quote ten Kate and use his authority to emphasize their own opinion in this matter. Van Belle (1748: 5), for instance, considers the X (=KS) and QU (=KW) as redundant symbols in the Dutch orthography. Following ten Kate, he also rejects GH in word final position (*wegh, dagh*), a symbol used by Moonen and other grammarians to distinguish homonyms (*wegh* 'way' – *weg* 'bread' and *dagh* 'day' – *dag* 'dagger') (van Belle 1748: 13). Uncommon orthographies such as ten Kate's (*v*)*row*, (*l*)*eeuw* found no favour in the eyes of van Belle who preferred the traditional spelling *vrouw, leeuw* (van Belle 1748: 19). Zeydelaar (1791: 130), when dealing with the distinction between S and Z, refers to ten Kate's principle that a difference in sound requires a difference in symbol.

¹⁷ I am grateful to Gerrit Jongeneelen (Amsterdam) who facilitated my research greatly by providing me with his xerox copy of Zeydelaar's grammar.

¹⁸ I note that Zeydelaar's remark appears to be a quotation from the *Aenleiding*, I: 340.

¹⁹ According to the "Bericht" in the book itself, the *Rudimenta* is an adapted collection of texts written by G. van Varik (*Rudimenta* 1799: iv). For the authorship, see also Noordegraaf (1975).

²⁰ In ten Kate's *Aenleiding* the sublime and solemn style sometimes show similar characteristics against the plain style. Cf. the nominative and accusative *eene groote vrouwe* (or: *vrouw*) in both sublime and solemn style against plain style *een' groote vrouw* (ten Kate 1723,I: 337).

In four further corpus texts ten Kate is referred to in orthographical matters: Van der Palm 1769 (*passim*), Stijl 1776 (14–15, n. 12), *De Nederduitsche taalkunde* (1783: 13) and Holtrop 1791 (*passim*). Discussing the spelling E/EE and O/OO, Holtrop gives a quotation from ten Kate in which the two kinds of orthography are mentioned. He also evaluates the contemporary spelling discussions to which ten Kate is superior:

Almost all Dutch authors north of the Rhine double all single vowel symbols mainly to indicate a long vowel. Those authors who live south of the Rhine, however, only double the E, I, and O; and write AE and UE instead of AA and UU. Nearly all our grammars are filled with polemics on which spelling is to be preferred here. Only ten Kate deems it of little value.²¹

Ten Kate's name figured in some of the disputes on spelling problems, but his orthographic principles, which could have laid the foundations for a better Dutch orthography, were never seriously taken into consideration.

6. Conclusion

My explorations enable me to draw a number of conclusions. First of all, the small category of bilingual grammars (or the Dutch grammars for foreigners) did not show any influence from ten Kate. Secondly, the authors of the essays on language referred to ten Kate, when dealing with root stress, cognateness and language families. Josua van Iperen, however, who in his *Proeve van taalkunde als eene wetenschap behandeld* (1755) attempted to deal with linguistics as a science, did not even mention ten Kate. Thirdly, two Dutch grammars (van Belle and Stijl) and one treatise presented ten Kate's verbal system; three grammars (Stijl, Zeydelaar and *Rudimenta*) mentioned a stylistic bi- or tripartition which is very similar to ten Kate's. In orthographic matters the grammarians repeatedly refer to ten Kate, mostly to bring out their own opinion. They sometimes mention his two kinds of orthography, but they do not discuss his orthographic principles.

It should not come as a surprise that the bilingual grammars or Dutch grammars for foreigners do not show any influence from ten Kate at

²¹ This is my translation of the following quotation: "Meest alle Nederlandsche schrijvers van benoorden den Rhijn koppelen alle klinkers, hoofdzakelijk om denzelfen eenen langen klank mede te deelen. Die van bezuiden den Rhijn koppelen slechts de E, I, en O; en schrijven voor AA en UU, de twee klanken AE en UE. *Bijkans alle onze spraakkunsten zijn met twistredenen opgevuld, welk schrijffgebruik hier het beste zij: ten Kate alleen acht het van geringe waarde*" (Holtrop 1791: 64–65; italics MvdW).

all, since they served only a practical purpose. Within the category of the Dutch grammars, the adoption of ten Kate's ideas also depends to a large extent on the kind of grammar. Van der Palm's grammar for the youth, for instance, reflects the author's view that linguistic discussions should not take place in a grammar which was designed mainly for teaching. Stijl's grammar is just the opposite of van der Palm's: in his grammar a vast amount of references, both to ten Kate and Huydecoper, and very many footnotes are to be found. He evidently saw his grammar as a contribution to the scholarly discourse.

My tentative conclusions have to be assessed by examination of further texts such as, for instance, treatises published by societies in the second half of the eighteenth century.²² A complete picture of ten Kate's reception, or rather of the reception of some of his major ideas in the eighteenth century, can not yet be given, but the picture that emerges is that even some minor linguistic publications show traces of ten Kate's influence.

Marijke J. van der Wal
Leiden University
Department of Dutch Language and Literature
P.N. van Eyckhof 1, P.O. Box 9515
NL-2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands
eMail: m.j.van.der.wal@let.leidenuniv.nl

References

- Aanmerkingen*
1780 *Aanmerkingen over den Oorsprong en verderen voortgang der Nederduitsche taale*, Franeker: Van der Sluis.
- Arens, Hans
1974 *Sprachwissenschaft. Der Gang ihrer Entwicklung von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*. 2 vols. Frankfurt: Athenäum Fischer.
- Barfoot, C. C. / Bostoën, K. J.
1994 "Een Beytie Hollansche". *James Boswell's Dutch Compositions*. Ed. by

²² Moreover, I suggest that the second edition of Adriaen Verwer's *Idea Linguae Belgicae grammatica, poetica et rhetorica* (Verwer 1783, edited by Everardus van Driel) should be subjected to further examination. In a first inspection, I came across frequent references to ten Kate in the footnotes of this edition.

- C. C. Barfoot, K. J. Bostoen. Leiden: Academic Press. [second revised edition 1995].
- de Bonth, Roland J. G.
1998 "De Aristarch van 't Y". *De 'grammatica' uit Balthazar Huydecopers "Proeve van Taal- en Dichtkunde" (1730)*. Maastricht: Shaker.
- Brink, Daniel
1986 "Lambert ten Kate as Indo-Europeanist". *Dutch Linguistics at Berkeley*. Ed. by Jeanne van Oosten, Johan P. Snapper. Berkeley: The Dutch Studies Program, 125-135.
- Jongeneelen, Gerrit H.
1992 "Lambert ten Kate and the Origin of 19th-Century Historical Linguistics". *The History of Linguistics in the Low Countries*. Ed. by Jan Noordegraaf, Kees Versteegh. Konrad Koerner. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins, 201-219. (Studies in the History of the Language Sciences. 64.)
1994 *Fonetiek en Verlichting. De Redenering over de talen van Jan Trioen (1692)*. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen. (Cahiers voor Taalkunde. 12.)
1996 "Huydecoper's Reception of Ten Kate's Linguistic Theory". *Linguistics in the Low Countries. The Eighteenth Century*. Ed. by Roland de Bonth, Jan Noordegraaf. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 121-132. (Uitgaven Stichting Neerlandistiek VU. 19),
- ten Kate, Lambert
1710 *Gemeenschap tussen de Gottische spraeke en de Nederduytsche*. Amsterdam: Rieuwertsz.
1723 *Aenleiding tot de kennisse van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche sprake*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Wetstein.
- Maendelyke uittreksels
1724 *Maendelyke uittreksels, of Boekzael der geleerde werelt*. Vol. 19 [October issue 1724]. Amsterdam: Onder de Linden, 493-506.
- Moonen, Arnold
1706 *Nederduitsche spraakkunst*. Amsterdam: Halma.
- Noordegraaf, Jan
1975 "De 'Maatschappij' en haar grammatici". *De Nieuwe Taalgids*. 68: 121-124.
1996 "Dutch Philologists and General Linguistic Theory". *Linguists and Their Diversions. A Festschrift for R. H. Robins on His 75th Birthday*. Ed. by Vivien Law, Werner Hüllen. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 211-243.
1997 "Het begin van de universitaire neerlandistiek: Franeker 1790?". *Voorlopig Verleden. Taalkundige plaatsbepalingen, 1797-1960*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 14-27.
- Peeters, Leopold
1990 "Lambert ten Kate (1674-1731) en achttiende-eeuwse taalwetenschap". *Traditie en progressie Handelingen van het 40ste Nederlands Filologencongres*. 's Gravenhage: SDU, 151-160.

- Polomé, Edgar C.
1983 "Lambert ten Kate's significance for the history of the Dutch language". *Tijdschrift voor Nederlands en Afrikaans* 1,2: 2-14.
- Reifferscheid, A.
1883 *Briefe von Jakob Grimm an Hendrik Willem Tydeman*. Ed. by A. Reifferscheid. Heilbronn: Henninger.
- Rizza, Riccardo
1987 *La Lingua e la Letteratura Nderlandese in Italia*. Bologna: Cappelli.
- Rompelman, T. A.
1952 "Lambert ten Kate als germanist". *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, deel 15*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1-30.
- Séwel, Willem
1708 *Nederduytsche spraakkunst*. Amsterdam: Blokland.
- Schultink, Henk
1989 "Regelmaat in onregelmatigheid Ten Kate, Van Haeringen en de ANS in historisch perspectief". *Palaeogermanica et onomastica. Festschrift für J. A. Huisman zum 70. Geburtstag*. Ed. by Arens Quak, Florus van der Rhee. Amsterdam, Atlanta/GA: Rodopi, 203-213. (Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik. 29.)
1994 "Lambert ten Kate en hedendaagse Nederlandse morfologie". *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde*. 110: 257-294.
- Verwer, Adriaen
1783 *Schets van de Nederlandse taal. Grammatica, poëtica en retorica. Naar de editie van E. van Driel vertaald door J. Knol. Met een fotomechanische herdruk van Anonymus Batavus' Idea Linguae Belgicae grammatica, poetica et rhetorica bezorgd door Everhardus van Driel, Leiden 1783*. Ed. by Theo A. J. M. Janssen, Jan Noordegraaf. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen [1996]. (Uitgaven Stichting Neerlandistiek VU. 21.)
- van der Wal, Marijke J.
1990 "Meer der geleerde weereld' hunne vernuftige gedachten als der jeugd' hunne lessen mede te deelen? - vragen over het gebruik van grammatica's". *Vragende wijs. Vragen over tekst, taal en taalgeschiedenis. Een bundel aangeboden aan Leopold Peeters bij zijn afscheid als Hoogleraar Historische Taalkunde aan de Universiteit van Amsterdam*. Ed. by J. den Besten, A. M. Duinhoven, J. P. Stroop. Amsterdam, Atlanta/GA: Rodopi, 223-230.
1998 "Tweede-taalverwerving van 18de-eeuws Nederlands: natuurlijke methode versus grammatica en woordenboek?". *Tydskrif vir Nederlands en Afrikaans*. 5: 181-195.