# 1. Introduction. Fascinating Multilingualism

## 1.1. Introduction

The year 1546 constitutes a pivotal moment in the history of the Dutch language. It was in this year that Ghent schoolmaster and printer Joos Lambrecht published his *Naembouck*. Not only was this the first alphabetically ordered dictionary with a variant of Dutch as its source language, it is also considered to be the first purist dictionary of this vernacular. As such, the *Naembouck* is part of a sixteenth-century trend in the Low Countries, that focused on the rejection of foreign—usually French or Latin—loanwords. Needless to say, no historical overview of the Dutch tongue fails to mention this work. However, rather than a monolingual feat focused solely on the promotion of Dutch, the *Naembouck* is a Dutch-French dictionary designed for the instruction of the latter tongue. Moreover, Lambrecht used a new way of spelling both Dutch and French words that was strongly inspired by French orthographical treatises.

The *Naembouck* is not a product of simple veneration of Dutch, but of an inquisitive mind interested in the languages he encountered in his everyday life. The sixteenth-century Low Countries were, indeed, fundamentally multilingual. While Latin continued to be an important player in the interregional, scholarly, and religious fields, the vernacular realm saw Dutch and French dialects in constant contact. Although French was the native tongue in a smaller geographic region, it played an important role as an aristocratic, administrative, judicial, and interregional language in the Dutch-speaking areas. Lambrecht, as both a teacher of French and a printer in the city of Ghent, was confronted with this situation on a daily basis. It was in this context that he, along with many others, started thinking about the local languages of his region. From the 1540s onwards, this culminated in intense reflections on the status of Dutch and French and on the form in which they should be forged in order to reach a golden mean that was understandable to everyone.

*Illustration, Purification, Construction, Standardization*

The sixteenth century was marked by the production of a large number of dictionaries, orthographical treatises, and grammars of many of the languages of Europe. Everywhere, people were fascinated with language. While many observations on classical and exotic languages, such as Persian, were written down, a great deal of work was done on the local vernaculars as well.[1] Scholars interested in this early modern language fascination have largely approached the topic from the point of view of one particular language. Such an initial monolingual approach was stimulated in part by the fragmentation of language departments at universities that has existed since the nineteenth century. Moreover, well-defined studies were needed to lay a solid foundation before further comparative and cross-over research could be undertaken. However, to this day, only one monograph, written in the 1950s, deals with the early-modern discussions about the vernacular which took place in the Low Countries: Lode Van den Branden's *Het streven naar verheerlijking, zuivering en opbouw van het Nederlands in de 16e eeuw*.[2]

While he deserves praise for identifying large quantities of sources dealing with the Dutch language, Van den Branden's interpretations were, congruent with the contemporary research paradigm, guided by a teleological focus, trying to reveal how the Dutch language of his own time had come into being. He summarized the versatile discussions on language in the sixteenth-century Low Countries through the triptych of 'illustration, purification, and construction of Dutch' also mentioned in his title. The manifold reflections have thus been reduced to three strands which were, indeed, strongly present. The first term, 'illustration' ('verheerlijking'), receives no explanation by Van den Branden, but seems to target the same sense as Joachim Du Bellay's 1549 manifesto on the French vernacular, *La deffence, et illvstration de la Langue Francoyse*.[3] 'Illustration' in this context signifies rendering something—in this case, language—illustrious. 'Purification' ('zuivering') is the call for an exclusion of loanwords from other languages.[4] 'Construction' ('opbouw'), lastly, targets the

---

[1] The Persian language was discussed by humanists, such as Franciscus Raphelengius and Justus Lipsius. T. Van Hal, 'The Earliest Stages of Persian-German Language Comparison'. In G. Hassler (Ed.), *History of Linguistics 2008: Selected Papers from the 11th International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2011). See: Chapter 3.3.

[2] *The Pursuit of Illustration, Purification, and Construction of Dutch in the 16th Century*. L. Van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking, zuivering en opbouw van het Nederlands in de 16e eeuw* (Arnhem: Gijsbers & Van Loon, 1967). An earlier edition of this book appeared in 1956.

[3] J. Du Bellay, *La deffence, et illvstration de la Langue Francoyse* (Paris: Arnoul l'Angelier, 1549). I am grateful to Peter Burke for this suggestion.

[4] Van den Branden's definition of purification is a narrow one, focusing on loanwords alone and not on the exclusion of unwanted elements in general. For the different possible definitions of the term 'purism', see: N. Langer & W. Davies, 'An Introduction to Linguistic Purism'. In N. Langer & W. Davies (Eds.), *Linguistic Purism*

creation of a standard, regularized, and uniform language that is suitable for any speech domain, be it literary or scholarly.[5]

Van den Branden's tripartite view, which is often repeated in more recent studies, indeed represents a considerable part of the opinions that were put forward by sixteenth-century language debaters.[6] Many individuals praised Dutch, called for a rejection of words that had been borrowed from French and Latin, and proposed certain rules. Contemporaries also proposed, nevertheless, a range of nuanced viewpoints and contradicting statements that do not fit Van den Branden's three main topics. The Dutch language was not moving in such a clear direction as it might have seemed. Furthermore, the general fascination with language and wish to develop the vernacular which was prevalent at that time expressed itself in many more ways—for instance, as enquiries into the differences between languages, their particular characteristics, their histories, and so on. Moreover, there was a broad interest in languages other than Dutch: some inhabitants of the Low Countries, including native speakers of Dutch, also praised French and designed rules for its use.

Van den Branden had a particular focus on calls for purification, highlighting the earliest authors who spoke out against loanwords but leaving out those who defended them, since they represented the norm.[7] This led to the common misconception among scholars after Van den Branden that the anti-loanword movement was widely supported and knew little resistance. Marco Prandoni, for instance, assumed that the sixteenth-century Low Countries knew an 'obsession of purity' or even 'an anti-French crusade in language'.[8] These are overstatements: most language debaters had a nuanced opinion on loanwords, accepting them under certain conditions. Furthermore, many of those who supported borrowing explained their position with argumentations that reveal a conscious reflection on the nature of their mother tongue and a wish to develop Dutch. Because he did not count defences of borrowing as attempts to support

---

*in the Germanic Languages* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005), 3-4; N. Langer & A. Nesse, 'Linguistic Purism'. In J. M. Hernández-Campoy & J. C. Conde-Silvestre (Eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 608.

[5] Van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking*.

[6] See, for instance: M. J. van der Wal & C. van Bree, *Geschiedenis van het Nederlands*, fifth edition, (Houten: Spectrum, 2008), 186, 191, 195; J. Jansen, '"Sincere Simplicity": Gerbrand Bredero's Apprenticeship with Coornhert and Spiegel'. *Dutch Crossing*, *41*, 1 (2017), 6.

[7] Various monographs have been devoted to the issue of loanwords in European languages. See, for instance: J. J. Salverda de Grave, *De Franse woorden in het Nederlands* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1920); N. van der Sijs, *Leenwoordenboek: De invloed van andere talen op het Nederlands* (The Hague: Sdu Uitgevers, 1996); P. Durkin. *Borrowed Words: A History of Loanwords in English* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).

[8] M. Prandoni, 'Vive la France, à bas la France ! Contradictory Attitude Toward the Appropriation of French Cultural Elements in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century: The Forewords of "Modern" Poetry Collections'. In B. Noak (Ed.), *Wissenstransfer und Auctoritas in der frühneuzeitlichen niederländischsprachigen Literatur* (Göttingen: V&R Unipress, 2014), 188, 191.

Dutch, Van den Branden equated only purification with construction. This presents a problematic contradiction in his work.

Wishing to contextualize his findings, Van den Branden pointed out three major supposed causes of the debates: Renaissance, humanism, and patriotism.[9] There is a grain of truth in this presentation of events, but it requires some complementary remarks.[10] As Van den Branden's own examples amply show, these reflections on language were not confined to individuals with academic training, and many humanist scholars interacted with people from outside academic circles.[11] The fact that we know few examples of Latin texts commenting on vernacular treatises is, perhaps, caused in part by the fact that scholarly interest in mutual Latin-vernacular exchange is a relatively recent development.[12]

When reading early modern reflections on language, the notion of 'fatherland' is indeed recurrent, as are expressions of competition with other regions and languages.[13] Van den

---

[9] On the link between patriotism and language debates in the early modern period, see also: F. Chiappelli (Ed.), *The Fairest Flower: The Emergence of Linguistic National Consciousness in Renaissance Europe* (Florence: Accademia della Crusca, 1985); J. Noordegraaf, 'Nationalistische tendensen in de Nederlandse taalkunde'. In J. H. Hulstijn & S. R. Slings (Eds.), *Eigen en vreemd: Identiteit en ontlening in taal, literatuur en beeldende kunst* (Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij, 1987); M. J. van der Wal, 'De Opstand en de taal: Nationaal bewustzijn en het gebruik van het Nederlands in het politieke krachtenveld'. *De Zeventiende Eeuw*, *10*, 1 (1994); M. Gosman, '"A chaque nation sa langue" ou le triomphe du vulgaire'. In R. Nip (Ed.), *Media Latinitas: A Collection of Essays to Mark the Occasion of the Retirement of L. J. Engels* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996), esp. 66.

[10] G. Rutten, 'Waarom verscheen de Twe-Spraack in 1584?' In T. Van Hal, L. Isebaert, & P. Swiggers (Eds.), *De tuin der talen: Taalstudie en taalcultuur in de Lage Landen, 1450–1750* (Leuven: Peeters, 2013).

[11] See: J. D. Janssens, 'Het humanisme en de volkstaal (in het 16e-eeuwse Brabant)'. In J. D. Janssens, C. Matheeussen, & L. Verbesselt (Eds.), *Humanisme in Brabant* (Leuven: Acco, 1985); R. Waswo, *Language and Meaning in the Renaissance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), 136; L. Formigari, *A History of Language Philosophies* (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2004), 100-101; T. Van Hal, *"Moedertalen en taalmoeders": Het vroegmoderne taalvergelijkende onderzoek in de Lage Landen* (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 2010); T. Deneire, 'Ruzie in het Latijn over de volkstaal? Een poëtische dialoog tussen Caspar Barlaeus en Constantijn Huygens herbezien'. *Spiegel der Letteren*, *54*, 1 (2012); J. Leonhardt, *Latin: Story of a World Language* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 194; P. Swiggers, 'Taalonderricht en taalstudie in de vroegmoderne periode: Het pad naar de volkstalen'. In J. Papy (Ed.), *Het Leuvense Collegium Trilingue 1517–1797: Erasmus, humanistische onderwijspraktijk en het nieuwe taleninstituut Latijn – Grieks – Hebreeuws* (Leuven, Paris, & Bristol CT: Peeters, 2017), 71-73.

[12] See the following two projects of Jan Bloemendal: 'Latin and Vernacular Cultures: Theatre and Public Opinion in the Netherlands, ca. 1510–1621' (2004-2009), which resulted in a volume published in 2015, and 'Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular' (2010-2014), which led to the publication of a collection of articles in 2014. J. Bloemendal, 'Introduction: Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular: Some Thoughts Regarding Its Approach'. In T. Deneire (Ed.), *Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular: Language and Poetics, Translation and Transfer* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2014); T. Deneire, 'Introduction: Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular: History and Introduction'. In T. Deneire (Ed.), *Dynamics of Neo-Latin and the Vernacular: Language and Poetics, Translation and Transfer* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2014); J. Bloemendal, 'Introduction: Bilingualism, Multilingualism and the Formation of Europe'. In J. Bloemendal (Ed.), *Bilingual Europe: Latin and Vernacular Cultures, Examples of Bilingualism and Multilingualism c. 1300–1800* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2015). See further: J. Bloemendal, A. van Dixhoorn, & E. Strietman (Eds.), *Literary Cultures and Public Opinion in the Low Countries, 1450–1650* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2011).

[13] On the historicity of the notion of national pride and its connection to one or multiple languages, see: D. A. Bell, 'Lingua Populi, Lingua Dei: Language, Religion and the Origins of French Revolutionary Nationalism'. *American Historical Review*, *100*, 5 (1995); D. A. Bell, *The Cult of the Nation in France: Inventing Nationalism, 1680–1800*

Branden's idea of patriotism, however, is one that rejects other languages and that is only interested in the French model in so far as it can be surpassed. This narrow conception of love for the fatherland does injustice to the open-minded and multilingual ways in which inhabitants of the Low Countries, such as Lambrecht, supported both their local languages. The debates on the French language stood in continuity with those on Dutch, as ideas and arguments circulated and were assessed critically before they were adapted and adopted.

Besides Van den Branden's work on the language debates, histories of Dutch have appeared at regular intervals over the past century, generally tracing the development of standard Dutch.[14] This approach was applied by, among others, Guy Janssens, Ann Marynissen, Nicoline van der Sijs, and Roland Willemyns. They have laid the groundwork for scholars engaging with historical forms of Dutch while also appealing to members of the broader public wishing to learn the story of their mother tongue. By their very nature, however, their works rarely engaged with the fundamentally multilingual context in which the Dutch language evolved. A study by Ulrike Vogl on the terminology used in a selection of these overview works even revealed that they often harbour a negative attitude towards contact with French and Latin.[15] Guy Janssens and Ann Marynissen, for instance, described French as a 'threat' to Dutch, and in general the term 'Frenchification' is often used to pejoratively describe French influence on the presumed purity and homogeneity of Dutch.[16]

(Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2001); D. Cowling, 'Constructions of Nationhood in the Latin Writings of Henri Estienne'. *Renæssanceforum*, *8*, (2012).

[14] M. J. van der Wal, *De moedertaal centraal: Standaardisatie-aspecten in de Nederlanden omstreeks 1650* (The Hague: Sdu Uitgevers, 1995); N. van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk: Het ontstaan van het ABN* (The Hague: Sdu Uitgevers, 2004); G. Janssens & A. Marynissen, *Het Nederlands vroeger en nu* (Leuven: Acco, 2005); N. van der Sijs, *Calendarium van de Nederlandse taal: De geschiedenis van het Nederlands in jaartallen* (The Hague: Sdu Uitgevers, 2006); Van der Wal & Van Bree, *Geschiedenis van het Nederlands*; R. Willemyns, *Dutch: Biography of a Language* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

[15] This negative modern view on language mixing neglects the fact that, at heart, no modern language ever knew a state of purity, as they are all, to some degree, derived from pre-existing ones. Langer & Nesse, 'Linguistic Purism', 609-610.

[16] U. Vogl, 'Standard Language Ideology and the History of Romance-Germanic Encounters'. In C. Peersman, G. Rutten, & R. Vosters (Eds.), *Past, Present and Future of a Language Border* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015). Einar Haugen, Peter Burke, and David Cowling have studied the negative view on loanwords hidden in the modern terminology on borrowing in general, including the terms 'loanword', 'borrowing', and 'purification' themselves. E. Haugen, 'The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing'. *Language*, *26*, 2 (1950); P. Burke, 'Langage de la pureté et pureté du langage'. *Terrain*, *31*, (1998); D. Cowling, '"Mendier les langues étrangères" : histoire d'une métaphore née de crises économiques (et autres)'. In X. Bonnier (Ed.), *Le Parcours du comparant : pour une histoire littéraire des métaphores* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2014). On the term 'Frenchification', see: W. T. M. Frijhoff, 'Verfransing? Franse taal en Nederlandse cultuur tot in de revolutietijd'. *Bijdragen en mededelingen betreffende de geschiedenis der Nederlanden*, *104*, 4 (1989); W. T. M. Frijhoff, 'Multilingualism and the Challenge of Frenchification in the Early Modern Dutch Republic'. In C. Peersman, G. Rutten, & R. Vosters (Eds.), *Past, Present and Future of a Language Border*. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015).

Until a few decades ago, an important topic of interest in the fields of Dutch historical linguistics and the history of the Dutch language was the process of standardization.[17] Scholars in these fields succesfully traced the movement from a plurality of language forms to one uniform language, based on a model designed by Einar Haugen. The four core processes of standardization proposed by Haugen are: the selection of a preferred language variety; the codification of this variety; the expansion of the function of this language form in public and private domains; and finally the acceptance of the selected and codified variety by the community.[18]

Over the past decades, historical linguists like Marijke van der Wal have come to realize that the concept of standardization alone does not suffice to grasp the variety of historical reality.[19] Their research has now shifted to complement studies of uniformity with studies of variation.[20] This book builds on this shift to show that such a level of diversity was equally present in metalinguistic discourse, that is, reflections on language, on what the rules of a language should be or in what contexts it should be used.[21]

Until now, the early modern debates on language have been studied primarily by historical linguists and historians of language, while understanding them is an essential prerequisite for appreciating the literary culture of the time. They largely played out within the

---

[17] See the titles of the language histories of Marijke van der Wal and Nicoline van der Sijs: *De moedertaal centraal: Standaardisatie-aspecten in de Nederlanden omstreeks 1650* (1995) and *Taal als mensenwerk: Het ontstaan van het ABN* (2004).

[18] On the process of standardization, see: E. Haugen, 'Dialect, Language, Nation'. *American Anthropologist*, *68*, 4 (1966); J. E. Joseph, *Eloquence and Power: The Rise of Language Standards and Standard Languages* (London: Frances Pinter Publishers, 1987); Van der Wal, *De moedertaal centraal*; R. Appel & P. Muysken, *Language Contact and Bilingualism*, second edition, (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), 46-55. For additions to Haugen's four central processes, see: J. Milroy & L. Milroy, *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription & Standardisation*, second edition, (London & New York: Routledge, 1991), 26-28.

[19] R. J. Watts & P. Trudgill (Eds.), *Alternative Histories of English* (London: Routledge, 2002); M. J. van der Wal, *Onvoltooid verleden tijd: Witte vlekken in de taalgeschiedenis* (Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2006), esp. 6-7; M. J. van der Wal, 'Standaardtalen in beweging: Standaardisatie en destandaardisatie in Nederland, Vlaanderen en Zuid-Afrika'. In M. J. van der Wal & E. Francken (Eds.), *Standaardtalen in beweging* (Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU, 2010); U. Vogl, 'Multilingualism in a Standard Language Culture'. In M. Hüning, U. Vogl, & O. Moliner (Eds.), *Standard Languages and Multilingualism in European History* (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2012), 19-20; R. J. Watts, 'Language Myths'. In J. M. Hernández-Campoy & J. C. Conde-Silvestre (Eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012).

[20] See, for instance: W. Ayres-Bennett, *A History of the French Language Through Texts* (London & New York: Routledge, 1996); W. Ayres-Bennett, *Sociolinguistic Variation in Seventeenth-Century France: Methodology and Case Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); M. J. van der Wal & G. Rutten, 'Ego-Documents in a Historical-Sociolinguistic Perspective'. In M. J. van der Wal & G. Rutten (Eds.), *Touching the Past: Studies in the Historical Sociolinguistics of Ego-Documents* (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, 2013); G. Rutten & M. J. van der Wal, *Letters as Loot: A Sociolinguistic Approach to Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Dutch* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2014). See also the project 'Language Dynamics in the Dutch Golden Age', which studies the variety of language forms within the works of individual authors from the seventeenth century.

[21] On the notion of metalinguistic thought, see: S. Auroux, 'Pour une histoire des idées linguistiques'. *Revue de Synthèse*, *4*, 3-4 (1988).

literary domain and for the most part concerned the language of writing. This book aims to look at the reflections on language from a literary historical perspective, placing them in their multilingual literary context rather than in a temporal development towards modern language forms. In the same way that Van den Branden's study matched the contemporary paradigm of the search for the standardization of individual languages, this book stands within the current paradigm that looks for syntheses between a variety of approaches, in this case historical (socio)linguistics and historical literature, and research into standardization and diversity, monolingualism and multilingualism.

*Multilingual Research Axis*

In the last few decades, scholars have increasingly ventured to adopt a multilingual scope.[22] Historical multilingualism is now an established field of research, mapping the presence of multiple languages in specific environments, as well as the impact of that presence.[23] A general

[22] K. Braunmüller & G. Ferraresi, 'Introduction'. In K. Braunmüller & G. Ferraresi (Eds.), *Aspects of Multilingualism in European Language History* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2003); P. Burke, *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); C. Peersman, G. Rutten, & R. Vosters (Eds.), *Past, Present and Future of a Language Border: Germanic-Romance Encounters in the Low Countries* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015). This development is also visible in the project 'Medieval Francophone Literary Cultures Outside France' (2011-2015), led by Simon Gaunt. Claire Kappler and Suzanne Thiolier-Méjean have even ventured to break free from the disproportionate focus on Europe in a volume on medieval multilingualism: C. Kappler & S. Thiolier-Méjean (Eds.), *Le Plurilinguisme au Moyen Âge : Orient-Occident, de Babel à la langue une* (Paris: L'Harmattan, 2008).

[23] L. Forster, *The Poet's Tongues: Multilingualism in Literature* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1970); D. Trotter, 'Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain: Introduction'. In D. A. Trotter (Ed.), *Multilingualism in Later Medieval Britain* (Cambridge: Brewer, 2000); A. Knauth, 'Literary Multilingualism 1: General Outlines and the Western World'. In L. Block de Behar, A. Knauth, D. R. Lopez, P. Mildonian, & J.-M. Djian (Eds.), *Comparative Literature: Sharing Knowledges for Preserving Cultural Diversity* (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2007); W. T. M. Frijhoff, *Meertaligheid in de gouden eeuw: Een verkenning* (Amsterdam: KNAW Press, 2010); A. Putter & K. Busby, 'Introduction: Medieval Francophonia'. In C. Kleinhenz & K. Busby (Eds.), *Medieval Multilingualism: The Francophone World and its Neighbours* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010); P. Pahta & A. Nurmi, 'Multilingual Discourse in the Domain of Religion in Medieval and Early Modern England: A Corpus Approach to Research on Historical Code-Switching'. In H. Schendl & L. Wright (Eds.), *Code-Switching in Early English* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011); A. Classen, 'Multilingualism in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Age: The Literary-Historical Evidence'. *Neophilologus*, *97*, 1 (2012); M. Sebba, *Language Mixing and Code-Switching in Writing: Approaches to Mixed-Language Written Discourse* (New York: Routledge, 2012); J. Hsy, *Trading Tongues: Merchants, Multilingualism, and Medieval Literature* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2013); C. Joby, *The Multilingualism of Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687).* Amsterdam Studies in the Dutch Golden Age 4 (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2014); A. Classen (Ed.), *Multilingualism in the Middle Ages and Early Modern Age: Communication and Miscommunication in the Premodern World* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016); W. T. M. Frijhoff, 'Codes, Routines and Communication: Forms and Meaning of Linguistic Plurality in Western European Societies in Former Times'. In W. T. M. Frijhoff, M.-C. Kok Escalle, & K. Sanchez-Summerer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, Nationhood, and Cultural Identity* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017); W. T. M. Frijhoff, M-C. Kok Escalle, & K. Sanchez-Summerer, 'Languages and Culture in History: A New Series'. In W. T. M. Frijhoff, M.-C. Kok Escalle, & K. Sanchez-Summerer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, Nationhood, and Cultural Identity* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017); P. Pahta, J. Skaffari, & L. Wright (Eds.), *Multilingual Practices in Language History: New Perspectives* (Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2017). See also the project 'Multilingualism: Empowering Individuals, Transforming Societies' (2016-2020), led by Wendy Ayres-Bennett.

acceptance has emerged of Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of the 'inter-animation of languages'.[24] With this term Bakhtin referred to the heightened awareness of and interest in language caused by the intensity of language contact in the early modern period. He stated that through the 'complex intersection of languages, dialects, idioms, and jargons the literary and linguistic consciousness of the Renaissance was formed'.[25]

Indeed, it has become more and more clear that the large corpus of sixteenth-century European works studying and reflecting on language cannot be understood without taking into account the multilingualism that characterized this region.[26] Learning to speak or simply encountering another language besides one's mother tongue seems to create a certain distance with regard to the native language that allows one to question its form and nature.[27] Of course, language comparison is not even possible without the knowledge of at least two languages, and thus by definition is unavailable to monolinguals. In the Low Countries, the multilingualism that could foster language awareness was present on all levels of society. This is no less true for the literary culture in which the language debates took place.

In light of this realization, there is a need to recontextualize the sixteenth-century debates on the Dutch language and consider them against the backdrop of the existing vernacular situation, which equally included French. This consideration makes it possible—or even logical—for the author of this book, having a background in French literary history, to

---

[24] In the original Russian text, Bakhtin used the terms 'interaction' and 'interorientation' next to 'inter-animation'. M. M. Bakhtin, *Rabelais and His World* (H. Iswolsky, Tr.), (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984), 470-471; P. Burke, 'Cultures of Translation in Early Modern Europe'. In P. Burke & R. Po-chia Hsia (Eds.), *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 36.

[25] Bakhtin, *Rabelais*, 470-471.

[26] S. Delesalle & F. Mazière, 'Meigret, la langue française et la tradition grammaticale'. In G. Defaux (Ed.), *Lyon et l'illustration de la langue française à la Renaissance* (Lyon: ENS Éditions, 2003), 48-49; V. Law, *The History of Linguistics in Europe: From Plato to 1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 58-60; Burke, *Languages and Communities*, 29, 67; C. Maass, 'Mehrsprachigkeit: Sprachbewusstsein in der Renaissance zwischen Ideal und textueller Praxis'. In C. Maass & A. Volmer (Eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeit in der Renaissance* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2005), 14-15; S. Van Rossem, 'Leven voor taal: Een portret van Cornelis Kiliaan'. In S. Van Rossem (Ed.), *Portret van een woordenaar: Cornelis Kiliaan en het woordenboek in de Nederlanden* (Antwerp: Provincie Antwerpen, 2007), 14; P. Burke, *Cultural Hybridity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009), 31; Van Hal, *"Moedertalen en taalmoeders"*, 67; B. Ramakers, 'As Many Lands, As Many Customs: Vernacular Self-Awareness Among the Netherlandish Rhetoricians'. In J. P. Keizer & T. M. Richardson (Eds.), *The Transformation of Vernacular Expression in Early Modern Arts* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2012); T. Van Hal, L. Isebaert, & P. Swiggers, 'Taaldiversiteit en taalfascinatie in de Renaissance: Een inleiding tot, en rondleiding door, de "tuin der talen"'. In T. Van Hal, L. Isebaert, & P. Swiggers (Eds.), *De tuin der talen: Taalstudie en taalcultuur in de Lage Landen, 1450–1750* (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), xii-xiii; T. Gruber, *Mehrsprachigkeit und Sprachreflexion in der Frühen Neuzeit: Das Spanische im Königreich Neapel*. Romanica Monacensia 81 (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2014); M. Saenger, 'Introduction'. In M. Saenger (Ed.), *Interlinguicity, Internationality, and Shakespeare* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014); J. Gallagher, *Learning Languages in Early Modern England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming).

[27] Delesalle & Mazière, 'Meigret', 48-49; Law, *The History of Linguistics in Europe*, 58-60; Gallagher, *Learning Languages in Early Modern England*. See also: R. B. Le Page & A. Tabouret-Keller, *Acts of Identity: Creole-Based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), esp. 3.

engage in this study on the literary culture of the Low Countries, thus strengthening the vital connection between French and Dutch literary studies. This book aims to show that reflections on both vernacular languages of the sixteenth-century Low Countries were connected to and shaped by the local multilingual praxis, in which two vernaculars coexisted next to Latin. Paying attention to the multilingual reality in which these considerations emerged reveals that the sixteenth-century discussions on language in the Low Countries were part of a Europe-wide fascination with language characterized by an interest in both local and foreign languages.

The central contention that language encounters sparked reflection and debate in the multilingual Low Countries can be illustrated on a micro-scale by adopting a spatial approach. Zooming in on particular places where individuals dealt with different languages makes it possible to trace the connections between their experiences and the degree and form of their language awareness. A translator of songs might be expected to reflect on tonality and sound structure, while a language teacher would be more interested in spelling.

Four sites or *lieux* have been selected: French schools, where mostly Dutch-speaking children learned French: Calvinist churches; printing houses; and chambers of rhetoric, fraternities whose members, called rhetoricians, gathered regularly to practise and discuss the art of rhetoric in the vernacular and thus produced many literary works. They furnish case studies of how the interaction of people, languages, objects, and practices in a particular environment gave rise to certain questions in the sixteenth-century Low Countries. Each of these environments will be analysed in a separate chapter.

To shed light on the everyday experiences and practices within these four environments, key individuals have been chosen who were plurilingual, about whose lives and language experiences some information is known, and who played a central role in discussions on language. These individuals are: the schoolmaster and rhetorician Peeter Heyns; the printer of French origin Christophe Plantin (Christoffel Plantijn); and the Calvinist leader and psalm translator Philips of Marnix, Lord of Sainte-Aldegonde. All three of them were strongly engaged in the literary circles and culture of their time and wrote their share of literary texts. Their works and lives function as a starting point to examine the four *lieux*. From there, the debates in the environments connected to the key individuals are traced, expanding to their friends, acquaintances, sympathizers, opponents, and predecessors, such as Joos Lambrecht. Through these steps it is shown that the sixteenth-century reflections on language in the Low Countries, which were part of a Europe-wide fascination with language, were shaped by local multilingual experiences.

*Debate*

Instead of using the notion of language progress as a framework for this study, it is the notion of debate that will be applied as a heuristic key to understand the sixteenth-century field of language reflection. This concept allows for an approach that takes into consideration all different voices and opinions, rather than the ones that came out on top. Whereas the term 'dynamics' has been proposed to study the interplay of different languages within the literary scene of this period, it hides the individuals behind it.[28] The concept of debate brings them back to the stage.

Applying the notion of debate, moreover, is consistent with the observation of a culture of discussion in the more general sense in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Low Countries, where discussion was fundamental to society.[29] Historians of science have further shown that in this period, knowledge was generated and spread through debate and exchange, while the social element ensured the creation of communities of learning.[30] Not all of the texts under scrutiny had explicit polemical purposes, but they all built on and added to the broader discourse on language that took shape in this period. Some authors introduced an element of play by mocking other language debaters through their rhetorically written contributions. Individuals such as Marnix thus used reflections on language to criticize others, in his case Catholics. His case further shows that the exchanges on language also harboured an ideological aspect. By pursuing the improvement of the language situation in the fatherland, they strove to benefit the common good.

---

[28] L. Nauta, 'Introduction'. In L. Nauta (Ed.), *Language and Cultural Change: Aspects of the Study and Use of Language in the Later Middle Ages and the Renaissance* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006); Deneire, 'Introduction', 5; E. Kammerer & J.-D. Müller, 'Avant-Propos. Vorwort'. In E. Kammerer & Müller (Eds.), *Imprimeurs et libraires de la Renaissance : le travail de la langue. Sprachpolitik der Drucker, Verleger und Buchhändler der Renaissance* (Geneva: Droz, 2015), 15.

[29] W. T. M. Frijhoff & M. Spies, *1650, Bevochten eendracht: Nederlandse cultuur in Europese context* (The Hague: Sdu Uitgevers, 1999), 218-224; A. van Dixhoorn, *Lustige geesten: Rederijkers in de Noordelijke Nederlanden (1480–1650)* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009), 30-33. See also: K. Conermann, 'Das Deutsche und die Vielsprachigkeit in der Frühzeit der Fruchtbringenden Gesellschaft: Der Köthener Hof als Laboratorium der Sprach- und Versarbeit'. In J. Balsamo & A. K. Bleuler (Eds.), *Les cours comme lieux de rencontre et d'élaboration des langues vernaculaires (1480–1620). Höfe als Laboratorien der Volkssprachigkeit (1480–1620)* (Geneva: Droz, 2016), 335-336, 354; S. Dessì Schmid & J. Hafner, 'Die italienischen und französischen Akademien als Zentren frühneuzeitlicher höfischer Sprachdiskussion'. In J. Balsamo & A. K. Bleuler (Eds.), *Les cours comme lieux de rencontre et d'élaboration des langues vernaculaires (1480–1620). Höfe als Laboratorien der Volkssprachigkeit (1480–1620)* (Geneva: Droz, 2016), 395-396.

[30] R. Buys, *Sparks of Reason: Vernacular Rationalism in the Low Countries 1550–1670* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2015), 31-37. P. H. Smith & P. Findlen, 'Introduction: Commerce and the Representation of Nature in Art and Science'. In P. H. Smith & P. Findlen (Eds.), *Merchants and Marvels: Commerce, Science, and Art in Early Modern Europe* (London: Routledge, 2002), 4-7; P. H. Smith, *The Body of the Artisan: Art and Experience in the Scientific Revolution* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 2004), 25, 66-67; D. E. Harkness, *The Jewel House: Elizabethan London and the Scientific Revolution* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2007), xvii, 6.

This is a story of plurality and debate rather than of linear progress. It wishes to incorporate diversity, contradictory opinions, and the viewpoints of seemingly marginal figures.[31] It thus also considers supporters of the other vernacular of the country, French. All those who expressed their views on language had a particular vision to improve communication, to find a golden mean among the many proposals for language change, and therefore they all deserve to be heard. These different voices came forth from diverse environments in which specific observations of language and language contact could be made. Combining the central notion of debate with a spatial approach allows the inclusion of previously overlooked individuals. This approach makes it possible to present the sixteenth-century history of the languages of the Low Countries as one of diversity and multilingualism.

*Language Fascination and Interconnectedness*

The sixteenth-century Europe-wide attention to language has been the object of study for an array of historians. Despite various efforts to conceptualize it, no suitable terminology has yet been developed to describe this intensifying early modern interest in all aspects of modern and ancient languages. Here, the notion of 'fascination with language' is proposed to describe and refer to the shifting attitude towards language in the early modern period.

Traditionally, the discussions on the form and status of the vernaculars are seen as starting with the Italian *questione della lingua* (debate on language), concerning the question of whether Latin or a vernacular dialect should be used as the language of writing.[32] Allegedly, this *questione* ended in the consensus that the Tuscan dialect of the *tre corone* (three crowns)—Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio—was to be adopted. From Italy, this debate then supposedly spread all over the continent, resulting in the *question de la langue* in France, which in its turn influenced the Dutch *taalkwestie*, the English *language question*, the German *Frage nach der Sprache*, and so forth.[33] However, it has become increasingly clear in recent decades that for

[31] See also: B. Cerquiglini, *La genèse de l'orthographe française (XII^e–XVII^e siècles)* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2004), 31, 49; A. Moyer, 'Distinguishing Florentines, Defining Italians: The Language Question and Cultural Identities in Sixteenth-Century Florence'. In Philip Soergel (Ed.), *Nation, Ethnicity, and Identity in Medieval and Renaissance Europe* (New York: AMS Press, 2006), 131-135, 153.

[32] Van der Wal, *De moedertaal centraal*, 5; J.-L. Fournel, 'La question de la langue comme la question des langues'. In E. Kammerer & J.-D. Müller (Eds.), *Imprimeurs et libraires de la Renaissance : le travail de la langue. Sprachpolitik der Drucker, Verleger und Buchhändler der Renaissance* (Geneva: Droz, 2015), 34-35. On the *questione della lingua*, see: B. Migliorini & T. G. Griffith, *The Italian Language* (London: Faber, 1966), 215-224.

[33] R. F. Jones, *The Triumph of the English Language: A Survey of Opinions Concerning the Vernacular from the Introduction of Printing to the Restoration* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953); D. Trudeau, *Les inventeurs du bon usage (1529–1647)* (Paris: Les éditions de minuit, 1992), 20-23; Gosman, '"A chaque nation sa langue"'; M. Tavoni, 'Renaissance Linguistics'. In G. Lepschy (Ed.), *History of Linguistics.* Vol. 3. *Renaissance and Early Modern Linguistics* (London & New York: Longman, 1998), 14-17; W. Hüllen, 'Reflections on Language in the

each of these regions, starting with the Italian case, this depiction of the reflections on language is reductionist.[34] The discussions were not just concerned with the defence of the vernaculars against Latin and the selection of the best dialect, they were part of a much wider interest in language.

Terms such as the 'rise of the vernaculars', the 'vernacular revolution', and the 'vernacular turn', which were proposed as equivalents for the 'language question', as well as the latter term itself, have all been gradually abandoned in recent decades as they do injustice the diversity of the debates on language.[35] Peter Burke proposed the term 'discovery of language' to describe the heightened interest shown in in language in the sixteenth century.[36] With this term, Burke expressly does not wish to imply that in earlier ages language was in an 'undiscovered' state, and that no one in Antiquity or the Middle Ages was studying languages. Unfortunately, that is exactly what the term risks suggesting: it cannot disentangle itself from the implication of a breach with earlier centuries, which is why it will not be adopted here.

Instead, the term 'fascination with language' is used to describe the changing attitudes towards language in the sixteenth century.[37] A lively culture of interaction, exchange, and debate on language came into being that was present—or at least visible—to a lesser degree in earlier centuries. People like Marnix started collecting and debating fragments of exotic and ancient languages, while print shops such as Plantin's met the growing demand for works displaying and commenting on languages. Instead of pointing out an opposition with earlier times, the notion of fascination expresses how the already existing interest in language

---

Renaissance'. In M. Haspelmath & E. König (Eds.), *Language Typology and Language Universals*. Vol. 1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2001); J. Trabant, *Mithridates im Paradies: Kleine Geschichte des Sprachdenkens* (München: C. H. Beck, 2003), 112-113; H. Sanson, 'The Romance Languages in the Renaissance and After'. In A. Ledgeway, M. Maiden, & J. C. Smith (Eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages*. Vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 245.

[34] B. Richardson, 'Questions of Language'. In Z. Baranski & R. West (Eds.), *The Cambridge Companion in Modern Italian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); P. Cohen, 'L'imaginaire d'une langue nationale : L'État, les langues et l'invention du mythe de l'ordonnance de Villers-Cotterêts à l'époque moderne en France'. *Histoire Épistémologie Langage*, *25*, 1 (2003); Trabant, *Mithridates im Paradies*, 86; P. Burke, *Towards a Social History of Early Modern Dutch* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2005), 28-29; Moyer, 'Distinguishing Florentines'.

[35] W. K. Percival, 'Understanding the Vernacular Turn'. In G. Hassler & P. Schmitter (Ed.), *Sprachdiskussion und Beschreibung von Sprachen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert* (Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1999); B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, revised edition, (London: Verso, 2006).

[36] Burke, *Languages and Communities*, 15-16. See also: H. Pedersen, *The Discovery of Language: Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century* (J. Webster Spargo, Tr.), (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1962).

[37] Toon Van Hal, Lambert Isebaert, and Pierre Swiggers used the term 'language fascination' ('taalfascinatie') in the title of the introduction to their 2013 collection of articles on the study of languages in the early modern Low Countries. However, they did not conceptualize it, using, rather, Burke's notion of the 'discovery' of languages and Van den Branden's terms 'construction' and 'purification'. Van Hal, Isebaert, & Swiggers, 'Taaldiversiteit en taalfascinatie', x, xiv-xv.

significantly heightened and intensified in this period. Although it is impossible to deduct from the extant source material how far this fascination really stretched, in practice it probably mostly concerned urbanized environments, and particularly those cities in which multilingualism was an everyday phenomenon.

Because of the vastness of the early modern discussions on language on the European continent, students of this topic face the difficult task of clearly delineating and defining the object of their research. Focusing on only a particular part, however, necessarily maintains a level of artificiality. Past scholars chose for the most part to demarcate their topics of research by following modern-day political or linguistic borders. Historians of the French language were thus in large part preoccupied with what happened in the present Hexagone.[38] Their colleagues working on Dutch stuck largely to the Dutch-speaking Low Countries. In each case, attention was paid to foreign influence in as far as it followed the supposed chain of emulation starting with the *questione della lingua*. French emulations of Italian, and Dutch emulations of French were thus emphasized.

Ulrich Beck and Natan Sznaider have pointed out the pitfalls of confining historical research to the borders of (present-day) nations, terming this approach 'methodological nationalism'.[39] A characteristic mistake of this approach, they state, is to assume the 'collapse of social boundaries with state boundaries'.[40] For the sixteenth-century Low Countries, this assumption is certainly erroneous. Plantin was a Frenchman who settled down in Antwerp, Heyns fled from Brabant to Germany to Holland, and Marnix's diplomatic travels brought him all over Europe. The solution to this pitfall offered by Beck and Sznaider, as well as by the founders of the scholarly fields of *Histoire croisée* and Transfer Studies, is multi-perspectivity: studying topics not only within the set confinements, but also across them, in multiple directions.[41] Rather than solely studying the influence of French thinkers in the Low Countries, the possibility of reverse influence should also be considered. In this manner, a glimpse of the

[38] See, notably: F. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900.* Vol. 1. *De l'époque latine à la Renaissance* (Paris: Colin, 1905); F. Brunot, *Histoire de la langue française des origines à 1900.* Vol. 2. *Le seizième siècle* (Paris: Colin, 1906).

[39] U. Beck & N. Sznaider, 'Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda'. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *57*, 1 (2006). See also: J. Marjanen, 'Undermining Methodological Nationalism: Histoire Croisée of Concepts as Transnational History'. In M. Albert, G. Bluhm, J. Helmig, A. Leutzsch, & J. Walter (Eds.), *Transnational Political Spaces: Agents – Structures – Encounters* (Frankfurt & New York: Campus Verlag, 2009).

[40] Beck & Sznaider, 'Unpacking Cosmopolitanism', 3.

[41] Beck & Sznaider, 'Unpacking Cosmopolitanism'; M. Werner & B. Zimmermann, 'Beyond Comparison: *Histoire croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity'. *History and Theory*, *45*, 1 (2006); Marjanen, 'Undermining Methodological Nationalism'; Deneire, 'Introduction'.

interconnectedness of the European debates can be caught through a focus on this particular region.

For several decades now, scholars have sought ways to consider the early modern attention to language as a European whole. Marie-Luce Demonet, Jürgen Trabant, and Peter Burke included examples from all over Europe and beyond in their monographs on sixteenth-century language reflections.[42] More recently, the notion of a 'Republic of Languages' has been coined by Fabien Simon to refer to the early modern European level, parallel to the Republic of Letters, on which discussions on the perfect language took place.[43] The willingness to adopt a multilingual and multidirectional approach is certainly growing. In many cases, however, attempts to transcend the confines of national borders still take the form of a series of monolingual overviews. Addressing the Dutch, French, English, Spanish, and Italian cases consecutively, such studies confirm the importance of a multilingual outlook, but they do not yet take the next step and reveal the interconnectedness of these various cases.[44]

Paying attention to the relations with the Europe-wide discussions is imperative but should not obscure the link with the local debates. There was a sense of competition towards other languages and cultures as much as towards local predecessors.[45] Lambrecht's *Naembouck* built on both word lists produced in the Low Countries and French spelling debates. Competitive attitudes did not lead to a complete rejection, but to conscious reflections on how the example set by the local and European competitors could be used to benefit a particular language.

### 1.2. Scope and definitions

It is important to problematize some of the parameters that have been chosen for this book. Although something was obviously happening in the second half of the sixteenth century, the dates 1540 and especially 1620 form no absolute frontiers, nor can any breach with previous and later ways of dealing with language be distinguished. Similar remarks can be made on

[42] M.-L. Demonet, *Les voix du signe : nature et origine du langage à la Renaissance (1480–1580)*, (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1992); Trabant, *Mithridates im Paradies*; Burke, *Languages and Communities*. See also the Franco-German Eurolab project 'Dynamique des langues vernaculaires dans l'Europe de la Renaissance : acteurs et lieux. Dynamik der Volkssprachigkeit im Europa der Renaissance: Akteure und Orte', led by Elsa Kammerer and Jan-Dirk Müller.

[43] F. D. Simon, *Sortir de Babel : une République des Langues en quête d'une "langue universelle" à la Renaissance et à l'Âge classique ?* Unpublished dissertation (Rennes: Université Rennes 2, 2011).

[44] See, for instance: Van der Wal, *De moedertaal centraal*, 5-21; S. Baddeley & A. Voeste (Eds.), *Orthographies in Early Modern Europe* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012).

[45] Rutten, 'Waarom verscheen de Twe-Spraack in 1584?'.

geographic frontiers. The French-Dutch language border was not a clear one, making vernacular multilingualism an essential characteristic of the culture of the Low Countries.

The discussions on language were not, furthermore, confined by the political frontiers of the Low Countries, not even where it concerned Dutch. On the British Isles, too, interest was shown in the relationship between Dutch and English. In a more general sense, ideas, arguments, and theories circulated throughout Europe. Individuals who defended their mother tongue were frequently interested in the debates on other languages as well. Although some boundaries, be they artificial or otherwise, need to be set and respected in order to create a viable research topic, it is important to remain aware of their fluid, vague, and sometimes arbitrary nature.

*Periodization*

The particular interest in language in the sixteenth century did not arise in a vacuum. In fact, it built on discussions that dated back to ancient times, and which were maintained throughout the medieval period.[46] Discussions about loanwords, for instance, can be found in the works of both classical and medieval orators and grammarians, such as Quintilian, Priscian, and Donatus.[47] Even the famous sixteenth-century expression by defender of French Joachim Du Bellay that 'every language has I do not know what belonging only to itself' seems to have a medieval predecessor: in a text written around the year 1282, translator Jean D'Antioche stated that 'every language has its characteristics and way of speaking'.[48]

---

[46] J. Kaimio, *The Romans and the Greek language.* Commentationes humanarum litterarum 64 (Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1979); P. Burke, 'Introduction'. In P. Burke & R. Porter (Eds.), *The Social History of Language.* Cambridge Studies in Oral and Literate Culture 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 2; E. Ruijsendaal, *Letterkonst: Het klassieke grammaticamodel en de oudste Nederlandse grammatica's* (Amsterdam: VU Uitgeverij, 1991); P. Wackers, 'Opvattingen over taal en taalgebruik'. In M. Stoffers (Ed.), *De middeleeuwse ideeënwereld, 1000–1300*. Middeleeuwse studies en bronnen 63 (Hilversum: Verloren, 1994); Law, *The History of Linguistics in Europe*, 112-115; Burke, *Languages and Communities*, 15; W. K. Percival, *Studies in Renaissance Grammar* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 231; W. M. Short, *Sermo, Sanguis, Semen: An Anthropology of Language in Roman Culture*. Unpublished dissertation (Berkeley: University of California, 2007), 62-63, 72-73; Van Hal, *"Moedertalen en taalmoeders"*, 37-39; S. E. Harris, *The Linguistic Past in Twelfth-Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 11-23.

[47] O. A. Dull, '"Escumer le latin" : statut et fonctions de la barbarolexie dans le théâtre comique du XV$^{e}$ siècle : enjeux théoriques'. *Le Moyen Français*, *39-41*, (1996-1997), 211-212; Short, *Sermo, Sanguis, Semen*.

[48] 'chacune Langue à ie ne scay quoy propre seulement à elle'. Du Bellay, *La deffence* (1549), sig. b2r. 'chascune lengue si a ses proprietez et sa maniere de parler'. Jean D'Antioche quoted by: F. Berriot, 'Langue, nation et pouvoir : les traducteurs du XIV$^{e}$ siècle précurseurs des humanistes de la Renaissance'. In M. T. Jones-Davies (Ed.), *Langues et nations au temps de la Renaissance* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1991), 113-114; C. Boucher, *La mise en scène de la vulgarisation : les traductions d'autorités en langue vulgaire aux XIII$^{e}$ et XIV$^{e}$ siècles*. Unpublished dissertation (Paris: École pratique des hautes études, 2005), 515-517. Jean D'Antioche made this remark, which targets the impossibility of equalling the original in a translation, in the preface to his translation of Cicero's *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. It seems to be a very early reflection of the notion of the 'genius' of language, although Jean D'Antioche does not mention this term explicitly.

At the other end of the temporal scale, continuing to the present day, many of the discussions that occupied the scholarly environments of the sixteenth century are still going strong. The debate on loanwords is one of these. Just think of the French *Commission générale de terminologie et de néologie* (General Committee for Terminology and Neology), established by official decree in 1996, which holds the task of proposing French equivalents for loanwords entering the French language.[49] The position of Dutch as a scientific language, also, is currently a topic for lively discussion, strongly reminiscent of engineer Simon Stevin's promotion of Dutch as a learned language in the sixteenth century.[50] How to handle the variety of languages in present-day Belgium or Europe as a whole is another question that still has no ready-made answer.[51]

Despite the obvious continuity with earlier and later times, the widespread and far-reaching interest in language in the sixteenth century stands out. As remarked by Lodi Nauta: 'No subject was more central to Renaissance culture than language'.[52] Various factors contributed to this language awareness.[53] The previous century had witnessed major events, such as the invention of printing from movable type. This made rapid and widespread distribution of language theories and excerpts of exotic and ancient languages possible, an opportunity that was seized by printers like Plantin. While the printing press thus fuelled language awareness, it also increased the chances that writings on the topic survived to become the subject of modern studies. The discovery of unknown territories across the Atlantic brought Europe in contact with new, awe-inspiring languages. Furthermore, a stream of Byzantine

[49] G. Defaux, 'Présentation'. In G. Defaux (Ed.), *Lyon et l'illustration de la langue française à la Renaissance* (Lyon: ENS Éditions, 2003), 28; *Nederlands, tenzij… Tweetaligheid in de geestes- en de gedrags- en maatschappijwetenschappen: Rapport van de Commissie Nederlands als wetenschapstaal* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2003), 19-21. For the text of the decree, see: <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr>. Accessed July 2017.

[50] T. Koopmans (Ed.), *De toekomst van het Nederlands als wetenschapstaal: Themabijeenkomst van de Afdeling Letterkunde van maandag 9 mei 1994* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1995); *Nederlands, tenzij…*; *Nederlands en/of Engels? Taalkeuze met beleid in het Nederlands hoger onderwijs* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2017).

[51] On the language issue in modern Belgium, see: E. Witte & H. Van Velthoven, *Strijden om taal: De Belgische taalkwestie in historisch perspectief* (Kapellen: Uitgeverij Pelckmans, 2010); R. Janssens, 'Language Conflict in Brussels: Political Mind-Set Versus Linguistic Practice'. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *2015*, 235 (2015); R. Willemyns, 'Trilingual Tug-o'-War: Language Border Fluctuations in the Low Countries'. In C. Peersman, G. Rutten, & R. Vosters (Eds.), *Past, Present and Future of a Language Border* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015). On the multilingual situation in the present-day Netherlands, see: *Talen voor Nederland* (Amsterdam: Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, 2018). On the language policies of the European Union, see: Vogl, 'Multilingualism', 1-3.

[52] Nauta, 'Introduction', ix.

[53] S. Auroux, 'Introduction : le processus de grammatisation et ses enjeux'. In S. Auroux (Ed.), *Histoire des idées linguistiques*. Vol. 2. *Le développement de la grammaire occidentale* (Liège: Mardaga, 1992), 24-27; Van Hal, Isebaert, & Swiggers, 'Taaldiversiteit en taalfascinatie', vii-viii; E. Frederickx & T. Van Hal, *Johannes Goropius Becanus (1519–1573): Brabants arts en taalfanaat* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2015), 103-104.

intellectuals came West, bringing with them their knowledge of Ancient Greek and thus access to the treatises on language philosophy it harboured. All these events and developments resulted in early modern people being confronted with little-known and unknown languages. Meanwhile, a new philological attitude towards the classical languages developed in academic environments that has often been linked to the notion of humanism.[54] Additionally, these humanist and other interregional networks progressively gave expression to interregional competition, trying to outdo others.

At the same time, Europe faced an array of conflicts, such as the Italian Wars and the Anglo-Spanish war. Particularly important for the Low Countries is, of course, the Dutch Revolt, with a rebellious faction in the Low Countries in opposition with the supporters of the Habsburg Lord of the Netherlands, the Spanish King Philip II, in the second half of the century. Besides these armed conflicts, the century was marked by religious turmoil in the form of the Reformation.[55] Attitudes towards language and translation of the sacred texts of Christianity were issues that were emphasized in the religious quarrels. Contributing to the language debates, nevertheless, did not depend on confessional preference: Heyns converted to Protestantism, while his close friend Plantin—at least outwardly—remained Catholic.[56] The various troubles of the early modern era are likely to have further stimulated language reflection, as several early modern individuals expressed the idea that miscommunication led to political and religious conflict.[57]

Neither the early modern wars nor the rise of the printing press or humanism was singlehandedly responsible for the increase in interest in language. Together, nonetheless, they created the optimal conditions to precipitate a thriving debate at least as early as the 1540s. From this decade onwards, a steady flow of works was written and published that reflected on the mother tongues of the Low Countries, starting with a Dutch Livy translation that appeared in 1541, of which the preface defended the Dutch vernacular.[58] It is likely that these topics had already been widely discussed before this date, but there is no extant source material to confirm

[54] W. T. M. Frijhoff, 'L'État et l'éducation (XVI$^{e}$–XVII$^{e}$ siècles) : une perspective globale'. In: *Culture et idéologie dans la genèse de l'État moderne. Actes de la table ronde de Rome (15–17 octobre 1984)* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1985), 107-108 ; Nauta, 'Introduction', ix.

[55] Dessì Schmid & Hafner, 'Die italienischen und französischen Akademien', 382-383.

[56] There has been much debate about Plantin's religious views. Alastair Hamilton connected him to the Family of Love, a heterodox sect. A. Hamilton, *The Family of Love in Antwerp* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); A. Meskens, 'Liaisons dangereuses: Peter Heyns en Abraham Ortelius'. *De Gulden Passer*, *76-77*, (1998-1999).

[57] Buys, *Sparks of Reason*, 15-20; Kammerer & Müller, 'Avant-Propos. Vorwort', 16-17.

[58] T. Livy, *Titus Liuius, Dat is, de Roemsche historie oft Gesten* (Antwerp: Joannes Grapheus for Jan Gymnick, 1541).

that assumption. The stream of writings certainly did not end in 1620, but the height of the discussions had passed by that time. Many participants repeated ideas that had already been formulated earlier, until new stimuli for language reflection were given by the likes of René Descartes and Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz.

*The Low Countries*

Although it is important to be aware of cross-European connections in the exchanges on language, it is impossible to undertake an in-depth study of the entire European language field. The chosen focus on the multilingual Low Countries comes forth from the idea that in every region, the particular local context influenced the debates to some extent.[59] Thus, while all the discussions are parts of a greater whole, local conditions incited an emphasis on specific elements. In the Low Countries, the language situation differed, for example, from that in France, where the language of the court had a much wider reach.[60]

The particularities of the selected geographical scope deserve further explanation. The term Low Countries refers to the geographical areas that came under the reign of Philip II in 1555. However, the majority of the sources discussing languages originate from the provinces of Holland, Zeeland, Flanders, and Brabant. These four provinces constituted the economic and cultural heartland of the Low Countries. In these core regions, language encounters were frequent because of a thriving international trade, the presence of important administrative institutions, and aristocratic communities. Last but certainly not least, the language border passed right through Brabant and Flanders. Both French and Dutch furnished the sounds of everyday life there, stimulating language awareness.

In the northeastern provinces, multilingualism was certainly not absent. There were strong cultural and political ties with areas where Low and High German was spoken, while French enjoyed considerable prestige among the elite.[61] The Hanseatic trade network had brought the cities along the Rhine and IJssel in contact with speakers of an array of Low German

[59] Kammerer & Müller, 'Avant-Propos. Vorwort', 12.

[60] C. A. J. Armstrong, 'The Language Question in the Low Countries: The Use of French and Dutch by the Dukes of Burgundy and Their Administration'. In J. R. Hale, J. R. L. Highfield, & B. Smalley (Eds.), *Europe in the Late Middle Ages* (London: Hambledon Press, 1965), 388-389; K. J. S. Bostoen, *Dichterschap en koopmanschap in de zestiende eeuw: Omtrent de dichters Guillaume de Poetou en Jan vander Noot* (Deventer: Sub Rosa, 1987), 11; J. Jansen, 'De taal van het hof'. *De Zeventiende Eeuw*, *8*, 1 (1992).

[61] A. Noordzij, 'Against Burgundy: The Appeal of Germany in the Duchy of Guelders'. In R. Stein & J. Pollmann (Eds.), *Networks, Regions and Nations: Shaping Identities in the Low Countries, 1300–1650* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2010). S. Reinders, *De mug en de kaars: Vriendenboekjes van adellijke vrouwen, 1575–1640* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2017), 148-162. For the particular cultural position of Guelders, see also: W. T. M. Frijhoff, 'Erasmus' Herigate: Priestly Doubts of the Magical Universe'. *Erasmus Studies*, *35*, (2015), 11-12.

language forms. The wars of the sixteenth century and the soldiers speaking a variety of languages they brought to the northern regions added further language encounters. However, in these regions, vernacular networks of knowledge such as the chambers of rhetoric were much rarer than in Holland, Zeeland, Flanders, and Brabant, and the number of surviving works reflecting on language that have been produced there is substantially lower.[62]

*Languages*

The early modern Low Countries were marked by various languages: Latin, Dutch, French, and Frisian. The last of these, spoken in the Lordship of Friesland, played a minor role as a written language, and there are no traces of a lively discussion about its form and status in the sixteenth century.[63] It will therefore remain largely outside the scope of this study, which will instead focus on the principal vernaculars Dutch and French.

While some individuals called for uniform Dutch and French languages, such standard forms were not yet available in the sixteenth century. Both languages were still in a fluid state, even though language debaters tried to forge them into particular shapes. The terms 'Dutch' or 'French', when applied to this period, refer to an array of different dialects, regional varieties, and ways of spelling and pronunciation that were not a uniform entity at the time but that were, by contemporaries, considered as a group that could be distinguished from others. Whenever the term 'Dutch' is used here, the whole of Low Germanic dialects used within the Low Countries is meant. In the fifteenth and especially the sixteenth century, an awareness was taking shape of the differences between Dutch and German, which began to differentiate particularly in their written form.[64] This awareness was also reflected in the shifts regarding the terminology that was used to refer to these tongues.[65] Attention to Low German as it was spoken in present-day Germany will therefore only be paid when it is mentioned in the source material.

---

[62] Van Dixhoorn, *Lustige geesten*, 36-48.

[63] For early modern literary works in Frisian, see: M. Spies, 'Friese literatuur en de Nederlandse canon in de zeventiende eeuw'. In P. Boersma, P. H. Breuker, L. G. Jansma, & J. van der Vaart (Eds.), *Philologia Frisica anno 1999: Lêzingen fan it fyftjinde Frysk filologekongres 8, 9 en 10 desimber 1999* (Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy).

[64] L. De Grauwe, 'Emerging Mother-Tongue Awareness: The Special Case of Dutch and German in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period'. In A. R. Linn & N. McLelland (Eds.), *Standardization: Studies from the Germanic Languages*. Vol. 23 (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2002), 104-107; L. De Grauwe, 'The Germanic Vernaculars'. In M. Goyens & W. Verbeke (Eds.), *The Dawn of the Written Vernacular in Western Europe* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 473; Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 100-101. See: Chapter 2.1.

[65] W. de Vreese, 'Over de benamingen onzer taal inzonderheid over "Nederlandsch"'. *Verslagen en Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie voor Taal- en Letterkunde*, (1909); J. Hafner, 'Comment désigne-t-on les langues vernaculaires au XVI$^{e}$ siècle'. In E. Kammerer & J.-D. Müller (Eds.), *Imprimeurs et libraires de la Renaissance : le travail de la langue. Sprachpolitik der Drucker, Verleger und Buchhändler der Renaissance* (Geneva: Droz, 2015). See: Chapter 2.1.

The term 'French', similarly, refers here to all variants of French as they were spoken both within and outside the Low Countries. It is worth emphasizing that French was not, in the sixteenth century, a foreign language from the point of view of native speakers of Dutch in the Low Countries. To refer to speakers of French and to the area where French was the native language, the term 'francophone' is applied. It is used in clear distinction from the political notion of *Francophonie*, with a capital F, which targets the whole of countries that are currently bound by the French language.[66] The term 'francophony' is used here as an objective marker, accounting for the existence of a French-speaking community outside of France before the age of colonialism.

Concerning the notion of dialect, it is important to mention that in the period under study, this term did not have the meaning it has today. The terms *lingua* and *dialectus* were both used to cover a wide range of frequently overlapping meanings.[67] In the now often used definition of Haugen, a language is a dialect that has been standardized.[68] In the sixteenth century, Dutch and French had not gone through this process. The term 'language' is therefore conceived here in the definition of John Earl Joseph as 'a system of elements and rules conceived broadly enough to admit variant ways of using it'.[69] These variant ways include the different local dialects of the language, which themselves also admit some variation. In fact, Mireille Huchon has suggested that in the case of French, it is more suitable to speak of regional varieties than of dialects.[70] The term 'vernacular' here designates any non-classical language that was spoken as a mother tongue in early modern Europe.[71]

---

[66] The literature on this concept is vast. For a clear overview of the possible meanings of the term 'francophonie', see: S. Farandijs, 'Repères dans l'histoire de la francophonie'. *Hermès*, *3*, 40 (2003). Earlier students of the pre-colonial French-speaking world have also struggled with terminology. Ad Putter and Keith Busby, for instance, opted for the term 'Medieval Francophonia' without wishing to deny a continuity with modern times. Putter & Busby, 'Introduction', 11-12.

[67] Haugen, 'Dialect, Language, Nation', 922-923; Burke, *Languages and Communities*, 36; G. J. Metcalf, *On Language Diversity and Relationship from Bibliander to Adelung*. (T. Van Hal & R. Van Rooy, Eds.) (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2013), 72; P. Cohen, 'Qu'est-ce que c'est que le français? Les destins d'une catégorie linguistique, XVI$^{e}$–XVIII$^{e}$ siècle'. In D. Lagorgette (Ed.), *Repenser l'histoire du français* (Chambéry: Université de Savoie, 2014); Frederickx & Van Hal, *Johannes Goropius Becanus*, 117; T. Van Hal & R. Van Rooy, '"Differing only in Dialect", or How Collocations can co-shape Concepts'. *Language & Communication*, *56*, (2017), 98-104; R. Van Rooy, *Through the Vast Labyrinth of Languages and Dialects: The Emergence and Transformations of a Conceptual Pair in the Early Modern Period (ca. 1478–1782)*. Unpublished dissertation (Leuven: Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2017), 79-103.

[68] Haugen, 'Dialect, Language, Nation'; Van der Wal, *De moedertaal centraal*, 1-2, 23-41.

[69] Joseph, *Eloquence and Power*, 1.

[70] M. Huchon, *Le français de la Renaissance* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1988), 18.

[71] J. Green, *Chasing the Sun: Dictionary-Makers and the Dictionaries They Made* (London: Jonathan Cape, 1996), 76. Only the notion of vernacular language will be used, discarding the difference made in modern French between 'langues vulgaires' and 'langues vernaculaires', the first simply being a local language, while the second refers to a language that strives to become fully accepted as a unified and standardized tongue apt for written use in any domain. The English term 'vernacular language' is considered to comprise both meanings. Kammerer & Müller, 'Avant-Propos. Vorwort', 11n1.

While varieties of both French and Dutch acted as mother tongue to a particular part of the population, many people, such as Lambrecht, Heyns, Marnix, and Plantin, spoke both, and thus acted as go-betweens.[72] Whenever an individual is said to have been bilingual, the reader should be attentive to the fact that knowledge of non-native languages comes in different degrees and forms and can change over time.[73] Plantin only learned Dutch after settling in Antwerp in his late twenties, for instance. To give another example, if Heyns's schoolchildren learned Latin verses by heart without having learned the language, they can hardly be said to have any competence in the language, while they did use it.[74] Language competencies cannot be considered in binary terms. They can be passive or active, concern speaking and listening or reading and writing, and they are not stable over time.

Finally, some remarks should be made on the terminology surrounding the coexistence of multiple languages on a societal and on an individual level. It is important to avoid false implications about connections between the two.[75] If an individual possesses knowledge of multiple languages, this does not imply that these languages are spoken widely in the society or region to which that individual belongs. Marnix was an exception in the Low Countries for knowing Greek, Hebrew, Spanish, and Italian. Vice versa, if two local languages, such as French and Dutch, are spoken in a region, this does not mean that every individual speaks both.

Using a clear terminology helps to separate the language situation on a societal and an individual level. To refer to the language abilities of individuals, therefore, the term 'plurilingual' is used, whereas the term 'multilingual' is applied to regions where more than one language is present.[76] Texts will be called 'bilingual' when they meet the definition of

---

[72] On the notion of 'go-between', see: C. Berkvens-Stevelinck & H. Bots, 'Introduction'. In C. Berkvens-Stevelinck, H. Bots, & J. Häseler (Eds.), *Les grands intermédiaires culturels de la République des Lettres : études de réseaux de correspondances du XVI^e^ au XVIII^e^ siècles* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2005); P. Burke, 'The Renaissance Translator as Go-Between'. In A. Höfele & W. Von Koppenfels (Eds.), *Renaissance Go-Betweens: Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005); A. Höfele & W. Von Koppenfels, 'Introduction'. In A. Höfele & W. Von Koppenfels (Eds.), *Renaissance Go-Betweens: Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005).

[73] Braunmüller & Ferraresi, 'Introduction', 3; Appel & Muysken, *Language Contact*, 2-4.

[74] See, for a discussion of this question: V. Reinburg, *French Books of Hours: Making an Archive of Prayer, c. 1400–1600* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), esp. 87-88; A. Adamska, 'Latin and Three Vernaculars in East Central Europe from the Point of View of the History of Social Communication'. In M. Garrison, A. P. Orbán, & M. Mostert (Eds.), *Spoken and Written Language: Relations between Latin and the Vernacular Languages in the Earlier Middle Ages*. Utrecht Studies in Medieval Literacy 24 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 335.

[75] Appel & Muysken, *Language Contact*, 1-6.

[76] As pointed out by Pierre Swiggers, an additional reason to adopt this terminology is that the Council of Europe also follows it. Following this example permits speaking in equal terms of both the history and the future of the language situation in Europe. P. Swiggers, 'Capitalizing Multilingual Competence: Language Learning and Teaching in the Early Modern Period'. In W. T. M. Frijhoff, M. C. Kok Escalle, & K. Sanchez-Summerer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, Nationhood, and Cultural Identity* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017), 52n9; P. Swiggers, S. Szoc, & T. Van Hal, 'Le multilinguisme vertical et le multilinguisme horizontal : la complexité des

J. N. Adams: 'texts written in two languages in which the two versions are physically discrete and have a content which is usually, at least in part, common to both'.[77] Whenever this is the case for more than two languages, the term 'multilingual' applies. The complex interplay between languages on various levels marked the early modern debates on language in the Low Countries, making them impossible to capture in a monolingual net.

### 1.3. Methods and Sources

The questions asked here relate to the disparate fields of historical French and Dutch literature, cultural history, and historical sociolinguistics. These questions can only be addressed by combining approaches developed within these various fields. Until recently, the subject of the early modern reflections on language was studied almost uniquely within the domains of historical linguistics and language history.[78] From the 1980s onward, historians such as Peter Burke and Roy Porter started to call for a more holistic approach to historical language, attentive to contemporary and local cultural, social, and political contexts.[79] Around the same time, a number of historical linguists explored a new form of research that incorporated sociolinguistic methods, and was interested in language use rather than language structure.[80] Since then, the field of historical sociolinguistics has greatly expanded, incorporating any type of enquiry into the way languages were used and thought of.[81] This book will add a literary historical

---

rapports de langues en Flandre au XVI[e] siècle à Anvers'. In R. Béhar, M. Blanco, & J. Hafner (Eds.), *Villes à la croisée des langues (XVI–XVII[e] siècles) : Anvers, Hambourg, Milan, Naples et Palerme. Städte im Schnittpunkt der Sprachen (16.–17. Jh.): Antwerpen, Hamburg, Mailand, Neapel und Palermo* (Geneva: Droz, 2018), 180-181. For more reflections on the distinction between plurilingualism and multilingualism, see: Kammerer & Müller, 'Avant-Propos. Vorwort', 15n3; Frijhoff, Kok Escalle, & Sanchez-Summerer, 'Languages and Culture in History', 12.

[77] J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 30. See also: D. Verbeke, 'Polyglotte publicaties in de vroegmoderne tijd'. In T. Van Hal, L. Isebaert, & P. Swiggers (Eds.), *De tuin der talen: Taalstudie en taalcultuur in de Lage Landen, 1450–1750* (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 72.

[78] Examples of historians of the Dutch language who have studied the topic are Geert Dibbets, Nicoline van der Sijs, and Marijke van der Wal.

[79] P. Burke & R. Porter (Eds.), *The Social History of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987); P. Burke & R. Porter (Eds.), *Language, Self, and Society: A Social History of Language* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991); Burke, *Languages and Communities*; Burke, *Towards a Social History of Early Modern Dutch*.

[80] S. Romaine, *Socio-Historical Linguistics, its Status and Methodology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), esp. 7; T. Nevalainen & H. Raumolin-Brunberg, 'Historical Sociolinguistics: Origins, Motivations, and Paradigms'. In J. M. Hernández-Campoy & J. C. Conde-Silvestre (Eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 22-24. It was also in this decade that the Henry Sweet Society for the History of Linguistic Ideas was founded.

[81] J. C. Conde-Silvestre & J. M. Hernández-Campoy, 'Introduction'. In J. M. Hernández-Campoy & J. C. Conde-Silvestre (Eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Sociolinguistics* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 1.

perspective to these developments in the field of historical sociolinguistics and language history.[82]

*Approaching Metalinguistic Discussions*

Any study of (meta)linguistic discourse from the distant past relies on written records. Since the early modern language reflections, as they have come down to us, took the form of a discussion through texts, linguistic concepts of speech and discussion can further our understanding of them. When dealing with a range of texts constituting a debate, the notion of discourse analysis is particularly useful.[83]

The method of critical discourse analysis, developed by, among others, Norman Fairclough, proposes that every utterance should be analysed on three levels: as a text, focusing on its linguistic features; as a discursive practice, focusing on the conditions of its production and reception; and as a social practice, focusing on the people and discourses with which it enters into debate.[84] If several language utterances or, in this case, texts, react to one another, it is possible to map the so-called 'intertextual chain' which they form.

Combining attention to the content of the text and its practical use of language makes it possible to determine whether language debaters practised what they preached.[85] Indeed, when studying the reflections on language, it is important not to focus solely on what people say about language, but also on whether they provide examples to support their view or actually undermine it in their own writing, which was often the case in early modern texts.[86] Discourse analysis also demands that attention be paid to the fact that opinions should not be treated as fixed entities, but as being prone to change according to time or context.[87] Heyns was known for his pure language, for instance, but in recently discovered handwritten poems he used a plethora of loanwords.[88]

---

[82] On this gap between the fields of historical sociolinguistics and history, see: S. Lusignan, *Essai d'histoire sociolinguistique : le français picard au Moyen Âge* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2012), 41; Gallagher, *Learning Languages in Early Modern England*.

[83] On the use of discourse analysis for the study of literary texts, see: R. De Beaugrande, 'Discourse Analysis and Literary Theory: Closing the Gap'. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, *13*, 2 (1993); D. Maingueneau, 'Literature and Discourse Analysis'. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, *42*, 1 (2010).

[84] N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 231-238; M. Jørgensen & L. Philips, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (London: Sage, 2002), 68-69.

[85] Jørgensen & Philips, *Discourse Analysis*, 103.

[86] For an example of research that combines attention to remarks on language and language practice, see: Ayres-Bennett, *Sociolinguistic Variation*.

[87] Jørgensen & Philips, *Discourse Analysis*, 102, 112-113.

[88] See: Chapter 4.1.

Importantly, Fairclough stipulates discourse analysis cannot be considered a method on its own, but only as part of an interdisciplinary approach.[89] The sources used here are first and foremost historical texts produced within the literary culture of the sixteenth-century Low Countries.[90] In this context, if an author claims to find a particular language difficult, for instance, such a statement should not be taken at face value, as it could stem from the omnipresent topos of modesty. Studying these historical, literary texts requires the long-established hermeneutic tools of literary criticism and close reading. These approaches are, however, supplemented with a particular attention to their linguistic characteristics, the process through which they came into being, and their historical, social, and textual contexts. Ultimately, combining approaches from literary history and historical linguistics will yield insights applying to both fields.

## Lieux

Where earlier research focused on the standardization of one particular language, this book zooms in on the situation in particular environments at a particular time, instead of tracing developments to a later status quo. A spatial framework is thus used here, tying in with what has been called a 'spatial turn' in historiography.[91] The notion chosen as organizational category for this research is that of *lieu*. This term refers to material or non-material locales, which can be professional or social environments and which are fundamentally multilingual. They form, in other words, a contact zone of different languages.[92]

The adoption of the concept of *lieu* is in line with references by Toon Van Hal, Lambert Isebaert, and Pierre Swiggers to *loci* as places of early modern language reflection.[93] It is also closely related to the notion of the 'linguistic laboratory' adopted in the Franco-German project 'Dynamique des langues vernaculaires dans l'Europe de la Renaissance : acteurs et lieux', which ran from 2010 to 2013. This project described laboratories as 'sites [*lieux*] of

---

[89] N. Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, second edition, (Harlow: Pearson, 2010), 4-7, 225-226.

[90] Paul Cohen has demonstrated that several key texts of the history of the French language have been misinterpreted by modern scholars because of a lack of attention to their literary conventions. P. Cohen, 'Langues et pouvoirs politiques en France sous l'Ancien Régime : cinq antilieux de mémoire pour une contre-histoire de la langue française'. In S. Lusignan, F. Martineau, Y. C. Morin, & P. Cohen (Eds.), *L'introuvable unité du français : contacts et variations linguistiques en Europe et en Amérique (XII<sup>e</sup>-XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval, 2012), esp. 122-125.

[91] L. Jerram, 'Space: A Useless Category for Historical Analysis?' *History and Theory*, *52*, 3 (2013), 404.

[92] M. L. Pratt, 'Arts of the Contact Zone'. *Profession*, *91*, (1991); Hsy, *Trading Tongues*, 4-5.

[93] T. Van Hal, L. Isebaert, & P. Swiggers, 'Het "vernieuwde" taal- en wereldbeeld van de vroegmoderne tijd: Bakens en referentiepunten'. In T. Van Hal, L. Isebaert, & P. Swiggers (Eds.), *De tuin der talen: Taalstudie en taalcultuur in de Lage Landen, 1450–1750* (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 15-16.

experimentation and elaboration of the vernacular languages'.[94] Because of the undesirable connotation of a purposely created setting which is attached to the notion of the laboratory, however, only the element of *lieu* will be taken up here.[95] An intentional link is established with the theoretical notion of *lieu de savoir*, conceptualized by Christian Jacob.[96] He, too, defined *lieux* as both material and immaterial locales connected to the production, circulation, and discussion of ideas and knowledge. In these locales, encounters between people as well as encounters between individuals and their material environment and particular practices stimulate the birth of ideas.

Jacob's theoretical premises match insights yielded by historians of science stating that in the early modern period, experiment and practice became increasingly important for intellectual reflection.[97] Moreover, they emphasize the situated character of knowledge production, which is marked by its material and social environment.[98] The same holds true for reflections on language.[99] Dutch-speaking schoolmasters teaching French had to code-switch on a daily basis to help students on all different levels of language learning and worked with schoolbooks that put forward different views on spelling and grammar. It is the growth and circulation of ideas connected to such local contexts and social networks that is targeted by the use of the notion of *lieu*.

The choice of the four central *lieux* is in part based on the outcomes of earlier research. Indeed, this book builds strongly upon the existing studies to which it aims to add a multilingual outlook. The different studies tracing the history of the Dutch language point in the direction of

---

[94] 'lieux d'expérimentation et d'élaboration des langues vernaculaires'. Kammerer & Müller, 'Avant-Propos. Vorwort', 15.

[95] Adrian Johns uses the term 'domain' to refer to 'distinct social spaces generating different practices fertile of new knowledge. The knowledge fashioned in such places answers the needs of the moment, addresses the questions of the time, and satisfies the standards of local culture'. A. Johns, *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 41.

[96] There is also a link with Pierre Nora's *lieu de mémoire*, which used the term *lieu* in the same manner. On this notion, see: P. Nora (Ed.), *Les lieux de mémoire*. 3 Vols. (Paris: Gallimard, 1984-1992), especially vol. 1, 1984, vii-xiii, xv-xlii. On the connection between the term *lieu de mémoire* and language, see Marc Fumaroli's contribution to Nora's volume on the 'genius' of the French language: M. Fumaroli, 'Le génie de la langue française'. In P. Nora (Ed.), *Les lieux de mémoire*. Vol. 3. *Les France* (Paris: Gallimard, 1992). See also: Cohen, 'Langues et pouvoirs politiques'. For *lieu de savoir*, see: C. Jacob, *Lieux de savoir*. Vol. 1. *Espaces et communautés* (Paris: Michel, 2007); C. Jacob, *Qu'est-ce qu'un lieu de savoir ?* (Marseille: OpenEdition Press, 2014).

[97] E. Zilsel, 'The Sociological Roots of Science'. *American Journal of Sociology*, *47*, (1942); P. H. Smith, 'Vital Spirits: Redemption, Artisanship, and the New Philosophy in Early Modern Europe'. In M. J. Osler (Ed.), *Rethinking the Scientific Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Smith, *The Body of the Artisan*, 6-7, 18-24; Harkness, *The Jewel House*, esp. xvii, 1-10.

[98] A. Ophir & S. Shapin, 'The Place of Knowledge: A Methodological Survey'. *Science in Context*, *4*, 1 (1991); Johns, *The Nature of the Book*, esp. 8, 41, 59; S. Shapin & S. Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life*, second edition (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), 332-337.

[99] A. Lifschitz, *Language and Enlightenment: The Berlin Debates of the Eighteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), esp. 9-11, 65.

French schools, Calvinist churches, printing houses, and chambers of rhetoric as places where language was discussed.[100] Individuals in these *lieux* were also identified in the contemporary debate as potentially having a large impact on language. The first printed grammar of Dutch, the 1584 *Twe-spraack* (*Dialogue*), calls on 'the court poets, civic scribes, printers, and schoolmasters'.[101] Joos Lambrecht held exactly these people, the 'schoolmasters, writers, and book printers', accountable for unwanted language change.[102] Members of the four *lieux* were '(wo)men of words': language was central to their profession or activities, making it a core topic of reflection.[103] This is what qualifies these four cases rather than others to obtain a central place in this book. Different languages stood in strong interplay in these environments, there was a strong reflection on these languages, and these reflections have been amply preserved in handwritten and printed documents.

These *lieux*, and in particular the French schools and the chambers of rhetoric, illustrate that a learned discourse around language developed not only in academic environments, but also in the middle classes. For the chambers of rhetoric, the premise that they form a potential site of language reflection is a recent development. The chambers of rhetoric have long been considered as being conservative, and contrasting with the humanist attitude of which the early modern language fascination was one particular manifestation. Such a humanist outlook was attributed solely to later poets, who have been qualified as 'Renaissance' authors for their allegedly innovative interest in classical poetry and contemporary foreign developments. Studies on the culture of the rhetoricians by Bart Ramakers and Arjan van Dixhoorn have demonstrated, however, that the same can be said for a great number of rhetoricians.[104]

---

[100] Lode Van den Branden identified printers, schoolmasters, rhetoricians, humanists, and religious men as being most influential. Geert Dibbets wrote articles about schoolmasters, printers, proofreaders, and rhetoricians. Marijke van der Wal and Nicoline van der Sijs identified the printing press, the literary culture, and religion as important fields of language change. Van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking*, 65; Van der Wal, *De moedertaal centraal*; Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*. For the identification of chambers of rhetoric as *lieux de savoir*, see: B. Ramakers, 'Between Aea and Golgotha: The Education and Scholarship of Matthijs de Castelein (c. 1485–1550)'. In K. Goudriaan, J. van Moolenbroek, & A. Tervoort (Eds.), *Education and Learning in the Netherlands, 1400–1600: Essays in Honour of Hilde de Ridder-Symoens* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2004), 182-183.

[101] 'de hófschryvers, stadschryvers, druckers, ende schoolmeesters'. *Twe-spraack vande Nederduitsche Letterkunst, ófte Vant spellen ende eyghenscap des Nederduitschen taals* (Leiden: Christophe Plantin, 1584), 26.

[102] 'schoolmeasters, schrívers ende boucprenters'. J. Lambrecht, *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe, uutghesteld by vrághe ende andwoorde* (Ghent: [Joos Lambrecht], 1550), sig. A2r; G. R. W. Dibbets, 'Lambrechts *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe*: Fonologie in de Steigers'. *Meesterwerk*, *20*, (2001), 15.

[103] Willemyns, *Dutch*, 87.

[104] B. Ramakers, 'De mythe van de grote vertraging: Naar aanleiding van: Mireille Vinck-van Caekenberghe, *Een onderzoek naar het leven, het werk en de literaire opvattingen van Cornelis van Ghistele (1510/11–1573), rederijker en humanist*. Gent, 1996'. *Queeste*, *5*, 1 (1998); A. van Dixhoorn, 'In een traditie gevangen? Hollandse rederijkerskamers en rederijkers in de recente literatuurgeschiedschrijving'. *Tijdschrift voor Geschiedenis*, *112*, (1999); Van Dixhoorn, *Lustige geesten*; A. van Dixhoorn, S. Mareel, & B. Ramakers, 'The Relevance of the Netherlandish Rhetoricians'. In A. van Dixhoorn, S. Mareel, & B. Ramakers, *Rhetoricians and the Shaping of a Netherlandish Culture of Knowledge*. Special issue of *Renaissance Studies*, *32*, 1 (2018).

Reserving the term ‘Renaissance’ for the poets who succeeded the sixteenth-century rhetoricians thus makes no sense, since the chambers also adopted humanist ideals, including an interest in language. In order to emphasize the fact that the term ‘Renaissance’ poet has been hollowed out, it is put between quotation marks. Studying the language reflections within the *lieu* of the chambers of rhetoric will provide further evidence that this term has become obsolete.

To unlock the four chosen *lieux*, the three chosen key individuals act as a point of anchorage for mapping the debates. Peeter Heyns’s life constitutes the prism through which both the French schools and the chambers of rhetoric will be considered. This double focus on the rhetorician-schoolmaster serves to illustrate that individuals were not confined to specific *lieux*, and that they were confronted with different language situations whenever they had multiple professional or recreational occupations. Heyns’s case indeed shows how in each particular context, the attention of these individuals could then be drawn to particular aspects of language.

In choosing these four *lieux*, this book first and foremost wishes to shed new light on the Dutch and French literary texts that were produced in these environments. In order to be able to understand and study the literary culture of the early modern Low Countries, it is a prerequisite that one understands the implications of the language choices that have been made. This study gives literary historians the tools to deepen this understanding. This is particularly useful to gain a new appreciation for the literary productions of the chambers of rhetoric, now that they are no longer seen as being in contrast with humanist movements, but as interacting with them.

Moreover, the examination of source material from the four *lieux*, French schools, Calvinist churches, printing houses, and chambers of rhetoric, also brings forward new insights into related fields of historical study. Consideration of the texts produced in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century French schools provides insights into the history of education. By studying the frequent references of schoolmasters to the notion of *patria* in both languages of the Low Countries it also adds to the history of nations, and the history of the Dutch Revolt. The latter fields are further enriched by an exploration of Marnix’s use of the language debates and of both French and Dutch to support the Revolt, while his efforts for the Calvinist community add to religious history. The printing house, as a distribution centre of textual material, touches upon all these issues, although it holds value primarily for the history of books. Language is a key issue in virtually all aspects of historical study, and historians should always be aware of the implications and connotations of particular language choices in the material they study.

*Sources*

The bulk of sixteenth-century discussions on language as they have come down to us are part of the contemporary literary culture in the widest sense of the term, comprising not just *les belles lettres* (prose, verse, and drama), but also, for example, religious and educational texts and other fields of vernacular learning.[105] All these texts, in their style of writing, incorporate contemporary views on the art of rhetoric, and studying them requires a certain sensibility for the literary customs and context of the time. Marnix's psalm translations, for instance, give insight into views on the use of the vernacular as a language of religious worship, but also on versification. The corpus of primary source material that has been identified by following the intertextual chains that start with the writings of Heyns, Marnix, and Plantin covers several different types of texts, almost all of them printed works.

It concerns firstly, and most obviously, treatises on language, such as Lambrecht's orthographical work and a French grammar by Heyns. Such texts were produced within all four of the *lieux*, although schoolmasters make up the largest percentage. Secondly, an important part of the sources concern paratexts, such as prefaces and dedications in which typically the author, the editor, or the printer of a particular text comments on the work. Frequently, the books in which such statements can be found are literary translations, multilingual texts, or other works in which language plays a particular role.[106] These paratexts functioned as introductory guides to the main text, while simultaneously offering an opportunity for the author, editor, or printer of the text to introduce himself.[107] It allowed him to take a stance within the literary scene, and thus also in the debates on language.[108] Almost everything that can be deduced about Plantin's stance on language comes from prefaces.

---

[105] H. Pleij, 'Is de laat-middeleeuwse literatuur in de volkstaal vulgair?' In J. Fontijn (Ed.), *Populaire literatuur* (Amsterdam: Thespa, 1974), 41-42; Bostoen, *Dichterschap en koopmanschap*, 29; W. K. Percival, 'Renaissance Grammar'. In A. Rabil (Ed.), *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy.* Vol. 3. *Humanism and the Disciplines* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1988), 78-79.

[106] Van der Wal, *De moedertaal centraal*, 52-59; T. Hermans, *Door eenen engen hals: Nederlandse beschouwingen over vertalen 1550–1670* (The Hague: Stichting Bibliographia Neerlandica, 1996), 9.

[107] G. Genette, *Seuils* (Paris: Seuil, 1987). See also : J. Balsamo, 'Les traducteurs français d'ouvrages italiens et leurs mécènes, 1574–1589'. In P. Aquilon, H.-J. Martin, & F. Dupuigrenet-Desroussilles (Eds.), *Le livre dans l'Europe de la Renaissance : actes du XXVIIIe colloque international d'études humanistes de Tours* (Paris: Promodis, 1988), 122.

[108] D. Verbeke, 'Inleiding: Een paratekst over (de studie van) parateksten'. In T. Deneire, D. Verbeke, & D. Sacré (Eds.), *De verhoudingen tussen auteur, drukker en gededicaceerde bij Neolatijnse publicaties*. <https://www.arts.kuleuven.be/sph/acta> (2005), i-iv. Accessed July 2017, ii; K. Porteman & M. B. Smits-Veldt, *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse literatuur: Een nieuw vaderland voor de muzen* (Amsterdam: Bakker, 2008), 258-259; Prandoni, 'Vive la France', 182-183.

Through the choice of three male key figures, male contributions to the language discussions are strongly privileged. This foregrounding of the male voice is a direct effect of the (un)availability of source material. Unfortunately, very few traces are left of the participation of women in the debates on language of this period.[109] Nevertheless, the wide variety of sources that have been selected does occasionally provide windows on the neglected elements. In the case of women, such windows are offered by Peeter Heyns's French school for girls. It was for his female pupils that he produced several works on the French language.

A strong emphasis in the studied material lies on the written text. Spoken language is only visible through glimpses that can be caught in the mostly printed corpus. These can be found in particular in the *lieu* of the French school, where the spoken word and correct pronunciation was highly important, and in Calvinist churches, with their emphasis on psalm singing.[110] Similar remarks can be made on visual and gestural communication, which particularly interested the rhetoricians as possible supplements to the spoken and written word. Rebuses and emblems, which offered possibilities to experiment with the potential of images to convey meaning, increased swiftly in popularity as the sixteenth century progressed.[111]

The relative absence of orality is, however, not so much a deficit as an inherent trait of the central questions asked here. They focus not on language use, but on literary debates about language. Of course, such subjects must surely have been discussed in oral situations as well.[112] The chambers of rhetoric are an obvious example. As no records of such discussions are known to exist, the debates can only be accessed insofar as they are reflected in and played out through published material. It is important to stress that the outcomes of this research necessarily map the attitudes of only a very small portion of the population of the Low Countries at that time, being those fortunate individuals who had enough education and agency to be able to make their opinions known to a geographically and chronologically disparate audience.

---

[109] W. Ayres-Bennett, 'Avant-Propos'. *La grammaire des dames*. Special issue of *Histoire épistémologie langage*, *16*, 2 (1994); H. Sanson, *Women, Language and Grammar in Italy, 1500–1900* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). For reflections on the historical role of the mother as language instructor to her children, see: R. Haas, 'Femina: Female Roots of "Foreign" Language Teaching and the Rise of Mother-Tongue Ideologies'. *Exemplaria*, *19*, 1 (2007).

[110] J. Wesley, 'Rhetorical Delivery for Renaissance English: Voice, Gesture, Emotion, and the Sixteenth-Century Vernacular Turn'. *Renaissance Quarterly*, *68*, 4 (2015); Gallagher, *Learning Languages in Early Modern England*. For studies of early modern spoken language and the relation between textuality and orality, see: W. Ayres-Bennett, 'Voices from the Past: Sources of Seventeenth-Century Spoken French'. *Romanische Forschungen*, *112*, 3 (2000); M. Jeanneret, 'La littérature et la voix : attraits et mirages de l'oral au XVI$^{e}$ siècle'. In F. Lestringant & M. Zink (Eds.), *Histoire de la France littéraire*. Vol. 1. *Naissances, Renaissances, Moyen Âge–XVI$^{e}$ siècle* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 2006); Van der Wal & Rutten, 'Ego-Documents'.

[111] A. van de Haar, 'Language Games: The Multilingual Emblem Book and the Language Question in the Low Countries'. *Literature and Multilingualism in the Low Countries (1100–1600)*. Special issue of *Queeste*, *22*, 1 (2015).

[112] Sanson, *Women, Language and Grammar in Italy*, 65.

### 1.4. Outline

The organization of this book reflects the central argument that language debaters in the Low Countries were inspired by their local multilingual context and the Europe-wide fascination with language. It is therefore divided into two parts. The first of these sketches the local and European context, ensuring that connections with this context can be made later. First, an overview of the multilingual landscape of the sixteenth-century Low Countries is given, filling a lacuna that has made it difficult for historians to contextualize their research on the level of language.[113] This chapter is strongly rooted in historical sociolinguistics, as it tries to define who spoke what language in what situation, and where different languages were used next to each other. In other words, it will be determined to what extent the famous—but probably apocryphal—anecdote that Charles V spoke French to the ladies and (Low) German to his horse or his soldiers would also have been true for his subjects in the Low Countries.[114]

---

[113] Much work has been done on the language situation concerning the Dutch language in the seventeen provinces, including studies on the dispersal of the different dialects and their particularities. See, notably: Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 45-46; Van der Wal & Van Bree, *Geschiedenis van het Nederlands*; Willemyns, *Dutch*. Current understanding of the variants of French that were spoken in these regions is much more limited, but valuable contributions have been made by Serge Lusignan in recent years: S. Lusignan, 'Espace géographique et langue : les frontières du français picard (XIII$^{e}$–XV$^{e}$ siècle)'. *Actes des congrès de la Société des historiens médiévistes de l'enseignement supérieur public*, *37*, 1 (2006); Lusignan, *Essai d'histoire sociolinguistique*. See also: M. Francard, 'Entre Romania et Germania : la Belgique francophone'. In D. De Robillard & M. Beniamino (Eds.), *Le Français dans l'espace francophone* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1993), 318-320. For the language border itself, see: Armstrong, 'The Language Question', 389-392; M. Gysseling, 'Ontstaan en verschuiving van de taalgrens in Noord-Frankrijk'. *De Franse Nederlanden. Les Pays-Bas français*, *1*, (1976); L. Milis, *Rijkdom en armoede van cultuurcontact: De taalgrens als resultante* (Antwerp: De Orde van den Prince, 1983); Peersman, Rutten, & Vosters, *Past, Present and Future of a Language Border*.

[114] The oldest known reference to this anecdote can be found in Girolamo Fabrizi d'Acquapendente's *De locvtione et eivs instrvmentis*, which was published in 1603, 45 years after Charles's death: 'As I hear, Emperor Charles V used to say that German was a military language, Spanish amatory, Italian oratorical, French noble. But someone else, a German, reports that this same emperor sometimes used to say that if he had to speak with God, he spoke in Spanish, because Spanish had the most gravitas and majesty; if he was among his friends, he spoke Italian, because he was familiar with Italian dialects. If he had to flatter, he used French, because there was no softer language than French, and if he had to threaten someone, German, because the whole language is menacing, harsh, and vehement'. 'Vnde solebat, ut audio, Carolus V. Imperator dicere, Germanorum linguam esse militarem: Hispanorum amatoriam: Italorum Oratoriam: Gallorum nobilem. Alius uerò, qui Germanus erat, retulit, eundem Carolum Quinctum, dicere aloquando solitum esse; Si loqui cum Deo oporteret, se Hispanicè locuturum, quod lingua Hispanorum grauitatem, maiestate*m*que pręseferat: si cum amicis Italicè, quod Italorum Dialectos familiaris sit: si cui blandiendum esset, Gallicè; quod illorum lingua nihil blandiùs: si cui minandum, aut asperius loquendum, Germanicè; quod tota eorum lingua minax, aspera sit, ac uehemens'. G. Fabrizi d'Aquapendente, *De locvtione et eivs instrvmentis* (Padova: Lorenzo Pasquato, 1603), 23. Translated by: I. D. Rowland & N. Charney, *The Collector of Lives: Giorgio Vasari and the Invention of Art* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2017), 373n12. Later varieties started mentioning the language in which the emperor would have spoken to his horse. See further: E. Buceta, 'El juicio de Carlos V acerca del Español y otros pareceres sobre las lenguas romances', *Revista de Filología Española*, *24* (1937), 13-14; L. De Grauwe, 'Quelle langue Charles Quint parlait-il ?' In M. Boone & M. Demoor (Eds.), *Charles V in Context: The Making of a European Identity* (Brussels: Brussels University Press, 2003); Burke, *Languages and Communities*, 28-29.

From the local multilingual context, the focus will then shift towards the reflections on language. This next chapter departs from research that has already been done on the growing attention to language in sixteenth-century Europe, supplementing it with primary source material. It maps different themes that are addressed in the discussions in this region, such as the problem of language diversity in general and different solutions that were proposed. For each subject, different points of view, both from authors writing in the vernacular and from those writing in Latin, are discussed to show the pluralism of the debates. It must be noted that in this chapter, the emphasis is placed on the connections between the Dutch, French, English, and German cases, and less so on Italian, Spanish, and other languages. This is due both to the fact that the three former cases have been mapped extensively in earlier research, and to the language abilities of the author of this book. There is some irony in this constraint in a study on the communication problems caused by language diversity.

The second part consists of four analytical chapters, each based on the extensive analysis of primary source material connected to one of the four *lieux*, which will be approached through the aforementioned key figures. Each chapter thus starts with a short biographical note on the key individual who has been chosen for that particular *lieu*, with a strong focus on that person's language abilities, the multilingual experiences of his daily life, and the language practices within the *lieu* in question. Subsequently, the different themes connected to the language debates that have emerged from the study of the written production of these individuals and the intertextual chains connected with them, are addressed. In this thematic treatment, references will be made to the discussions on a European level, the multilingual situation in the Low Countries as a whole, and the multilingual practices specific to the *lieu* in question.

As an important *lieu* where French and Dutch met, and also where some of the bilinguals who were active in other environments were trained, the analytical part of the present work starts with a chapter on French schools. In this *lieu*, which will be approached through the master of the most famous girls' school of his time, Peeter Heyns, bilingualism itself was the objective of the clients. Schoolmasters were the ultimate go-betweens. Through a large corpus of educational material published in the context of these schools, schoolmasters took a stance on language that simultaneously acted as a form of self-promotion for their establishments. They displayed their knowledge of the traditional, widely accepted language forms their customers were interested in, while also suggesting improvement for both French and Dutch.

In the following chapter, addressing the *lieu* of the developing Calvinist churches through Philips of Marnix, Lord of Sainte-Aldegonde, the topic of translation is central. In these religious environments, language was not a purpose in itself, as it was in the French schools,

but the medium through which the Word of God was conveyed. Moreover, the newly forming Calvinist communities were struggling to establish cohesion and solidarity through and in spite of language differences. Those who, like Marnix, translated sacred texts into Dutch had to take into account the links with the Holy Scripture, the French-speaking Calvinists, and coreligionists speaking a variety of Dutch dialects. An awareness was present, in this *lieu*, of how language could unite and divide. Marnix, going one step further, used accusations related to language to defame his Catholic opponents.

The third analytical chapter treats the highly multilingual *lieu* of the printing houses. Links on an interregional level are particularly strong here, as is exemplified by the central individual of this *lieu*, the native Frenchman Plantin, who went on to become an important figure in the histories of both the French and the Dutch language. Printing houses played a crucial part in the language debates by distributing texts that took part in them, feeding the demand for texts on language curiosities. As the case of Plantin shows, however, printers were not always passive mediators, as they could also take part in these exchanges themselves. Plantin took an active stance regarding the issue of spelling, which has traditionally been seen as being strongly connected to the printing houses. A closer look reveals, however, that he formed the exception rather than the rule.

The final chapter returns to the key individual Peeter Heyns. In doing so, this last analytical part establishes connections with the earlier chapters. Many of the learned men of the early modern Low Countries, including schoolmasters like Heyns, came together in the *lieu* of the chambers of rhetoric. In effect, the chambers functioned not just as literary fraternities, but also as vernacular knowledge networks, as recent developments in the research on early modern rhetoricians, and in particular studies by Arjan van Dixhoorn, have shown.[115] Frequently, rhetoricians reflected critically on ways to improve their language. They often concluded, however, that particular innovations that were being proposed were a step backward rather than forward.

Throughout the four analytical chapters, connections will be made with the first, contextual part. This demonstrates the strong links that existed between the discussions on language on the one hand, and the language situation in the early modern Low Countries and the Europe-wide debates on the other. A new view of the fascination with language in this period is presented by shedding light on those early modern individuals who did not strive for a standardized form of Dutch. At the same time, this work will offer new insights into the

[115] Van Dixhoorn, *Lustige geesten*; Van Dixhoorn, Mareel, & Ramakers, *Rhetoricians*.

multilingual experiences of the sixteenth-century inhabitants of the Low Countries, as well as into their interest in language in general and their openness to other languages and cultures in this period that was crucial for the development of Dutch and other vernaculars.

## 4. French Schools

### 4.1. Introduction

In 1531, humanist pedagogue Juan Luis Vives, who was originally from Spain but spent most of his life in the Low Countries, wanted schoolmasters to act as 'Prefect[s] of the treasury of [their] language'.[116] The perception of teachers as protectors and distributors of language norms explains why, in the sixteenth century, various language debaters called for their aid in disseminating ideas and proposals. Joos Lambrecht, a schoolmaster himself, thus expressed the hope that with the help of his book on Dutch spelling, 'from now on, the same will be presented and taught to youngsters in all Dutch schools'.[117]

In line with these remarks, scholars have studied and interpreted the role of teachers in the discussions on Dutch mostly in terms of the distribution and mediation of rules.[118] The conclusions of these studies were critical: Dutch schoolmasters did not always succeed in imposing rules, and teachers of French might have been a source of French loanwords in Dutch.[119] By studying their contributions to the language debates from a non-teleological point of view respecting diversity rather than tracing the process of standardization, a different image emerges that places schoolmasters at the cutting edge of language reflection and innovation. These teachers show that middle-class individuals who had not necessarily enjoyed an academic education also contributed to the learned discourse on language.

In 1610, rhetorician Jasper Bernaerds wrote a Dutch poem for a volume titled *Den Nederduytschen Helicon*. The poem praised individuals who had taken the first steps in the construction of the 'pure mother tongue'.[120] Strikingly, many names of schoolmasters feature in this list of language defenders. Bernaerds, who was a teacher himself, mentions, to name but

---

[116] Juan Luis Vives, translated by F. Watson: J. L. Vives, *Vives on Education: A Translation of the* De Tradendis Disciplinis *of Juan Luis Vives* (F. Watson, Tr.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1931), 103.

[117] 'van nu voord an, tzelfdę in alle schólen van Néderlandscher spráke, den ionghers zoude móghen voorghehauden endę onderwézen werden'. Lambrecht, *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe*, sig. A2v.

[118] See, notably, Marijke van der Wal's study on the extent to which first language education stimulated the dissemination of newly formed rules for the Dutch language: Van der Wal, 'De mens als talig wezen'.

[119] Van der Wal, 'De mens als talig wezen', 15-16; Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 583.

[120] 'reyne Moeders tael'. In his poem, Bernaerds praises a Dutch language free of loanwords. His definition of a 'pure' language does not necessarily have to confine itself to being 'loanword-free', however. It could also refer to other qualities of the language. *Den Nederduytschen Helicon*, 73-74.

a few, 'the clever Peeter Heyns', and Heyns's colleagues and friends Jan Borrekens and Gabriel Meurier.[121] Meurier was from Hainaut and was not even a native speaker of Dutch, but apparently this did not hamper his ability to aid the Dutch tongue.[122]

Indeed, French schools provided the optimal conditions for awakening language awareness, reflection, and debate, and thus also for supporting Dutch. Each schoolmaster had to decide which rules for vocabulary, grammar, spelling, and pronunciation he or she wished to teach.[123] In other words, teaching demands defining and reflecting. Moreover, the classroom was an ideal observatory for the process of language learning. Schoolmasters witnessed on a daily basis which parts of the language caused children to struggle and how their abilities evolved. Teaching thus at the same time allowed the study of language development. This everyday work environment incited teachers to compare Dutch and French and to reflect on the qualities of both languages in French schools.

In the French schools, a predilection for certain topics can be discerned that show the link with the daily language practices in these establishments. It concerns the importance of both first and second language learning as well as normative issues, notably orthography. In an age in which knowledge of the art of rhetoric was deemed crucial for one's social and professional standing, teachers also had to reflect on the topic of eloquence and on how this could be achieved through monolingual or bilingual education. Strikingly absent in the sources related to the educational scene is the topic of loanwords.

For various reasons, the life and works of Peeter Heyns are particularly illuminating with regard to these processes. They are extraordinarily well documented: part of the administration of his school has been preserved, and he was a prolific author of schoolbooks and literary works that shed light on his life as a schoolmaster and his views on language. Heyns was involved in a broad array of topics related to the language debates, and he was connected through friendships and professional and familial ties with many other schoolmasters who expressed their opinions on the vernacular, such as Gabriel Meurier. Heyns's case therefore

---

[121] 'Den kloecken Pieter Heyns'. *Den Nederduytschen Helicon*, 74. Other schoolmasters who are mentioned are Eduard Mellema from Leeuwarden and Felix van Sambix, a calligrapher and teacher of French active in Delft. A certain 'De Vyver' also figures in the list. Boukje Thijs, in her dissertation on *Den Nederduytschen Helicon*, has suggested this might refer to Jacobus Viverius, but schoolmaster Gerard de Vivre (de Vivere, du Vivier) seems a more likely possibility. Contrary to Viverius, De Vivre was a contemporary of the persons mentioned in the surrounding lines. A similar remark can be made on the name 'Coster', for whom Thijs proposes the names of Abraham Coster and Jan de Coster. An option she did not mention is Wouter de Coster, a prominent Antwerp schoolmaster and contemporary of Heyns, Meurier, and Borrekens. Thijs, *De hoefslag van Pegasus*, 175-190.

[122] On Meurier's life, see: De Clercq, 'Gabriel Meurier, een XVI-eeuws pedagoog en grammaticus in Antwerpen', 29-30.

[123] Kibbee, 'Institutions and Multilingualism', 72.

forms an excellent starting point to trace the extensive discussions that took place in the surroundings of French schools.

*Teaching Languages, Teaching Language Reflection*

Daily life in the French schools was marked by bilingualism and comparison, two key stimulators of language reflection. The type of instruction offered in these institutions depended on the gender and age of the students. In general, they prepared children between the ages of seven and fifteen for a life in a trading centre, such as Antwerp.[124] They trained children in their formative years to move between languages and reflect on their differences, creating a large community of non-academically educated men and women sensitive to the key themes of the discussions on language and ready to take part in them.

Early modern education was set up in a gradual manner, despite the fact that children rarely spent more than a few months consecutively at school. It started with the alphabet and spelling, then reading, followed by writing. Pupils were given lessons in counting, arithmetic, and often bookkeeping and other topics that are useful for the sharpening of the mind, such as rhetoric, history, and geography.[125] In the French schools, after learning how to read Dutch, students were taught the differences between Dutch and French pronunciation and learned how to read French texts out loud.[126] They then received writing lessons in French and Dutch and were trained in translating from one language into the other. Comparing languages and switching from one language to another characterized these institutions, where the language of instruction was, if possible, French.[127] Comparison and reflection on language differences, which were key practices in the early modern language debates, became second nature to children trained in these schools.

It is important to remark that in many French schools, pupils also learned to expand and employ their knowledge of Dutch, which most of them had as their native tongue. This is illustrated by a record in the municipal archive of Leiden, relating that teacher Magdalena

---

[124] Dodde & Esseboom, 'Instruction and Education in French Schools', 40; K. Heyning, *Turbulente tijden: Zorg en materiële cultuur in Zierikzee in de zestiende eeuw* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2017), 54. For a dated though still useful overview on the development of French schools in the Low Countries, see: Riemens, *Esquisse historique*.

[125] Peeters, 'Taalopvattingen van D. V. Coornhert', 61; Van der Wal, 'De mens als talig wezen', 11-13; W. T. M. Frijhoff, 'Frans onderwijs en Franse scholen'. In M. Koffeman, A. Montoya, & M. Smeets (Eds.), *Literaire bruggenbouwers tussen Nederland en Frankrijk: Receptie, vertaling en cultuuroverdracht sinds de Middeleeuwen* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017).

[126] Dodde & Esseboom, 'Instruction and Education in French Schools', 47.

[127] Frijhoff, 'Multilingualism and the Challenge of Frenchification', 120; H. Uil, *De scholen syn planthoven van de gemeente: Het onderwijs in Zeeland en Staats-Vlaanderen 1578–1801* (Bergschenhoek: Marberg Media, 2015), 549.

Valery (Valerius), herself a former pupil of Peeter Heyns, requested permission to set up a school. Her goal was to teach girls the 'French language as well as teaching them to write Dutch perfectly'.[128] Even in educational practices, attention to one language did not exclude the other, as the two vernaculars were taught in symbiosis, supporting the thesis that this was also the case in the discussions on language.

Both men and women, such as Heyns's wife, Anna, and his former student Magdalena Valery, could fulfil the role of teacher in a French school.[129] A few women like Magdalena also wrote and published schoolbooks containing both French and Dutch, but the rare extant works contain very little reflection on the language debates.[130] Among the schoolmasters were both native speakers of a Dutch dialect, such as Heyns and Anna, and native speakers of French who generally originated from francophone areas in the Low Countries, such as Gabriel Meurier.[131] An interesting case is that of David Beck, who was born in Cologne and later led French schools in The Hague and Arnhem.[132] His life illustrates the strong connections between the northeastern regions and the German lands, as well as those between the Germanic and Romance languages. In his spare time, Beck, who kept a journal, mostly read books in French and Dutch, but also in German and Latin.[133]

Manuals existed to aid with each aspect of the programme. As books describing, comparing, and codifying languages, they were central to the discussions on language. For the initial stages of reading and writing, model books were used that gathered examples of different types of handwriting that the children could imitate. Heyns produced such an abecedarium. He made both a Dutch and a French version, printed by Plantin, so children could train in both

---

[128] 'fransche spraecke mitsgaders de zelve oock de nederduijtsche perfectelic te leeren scrijven'. Municipal Archives Leiden, *Secretarie-archief 1575–1851*, nr. 9253, fol. 64r-64v; B. van Selm, *Een menighte treffelijcke boecken: Nederlandse boekhandelscatalogi in het begin van de zeventiende eeuw* (Utrecht: HES Publishers, 1987), 314n281; Van de Haar, 'Van "nimf" tot "schoolvrouw"'.

[129] Van de Haar, 'Van "nimf" tot "schoolvrouw"'.

[130] See the multilingual works of Maria Strick and Magdalena Valery, who was probably a sister of Adriaen Valerius, the author of the *Neder-landtsche gedenck-clanck* (1626): Valery, *La montaigne des pvcelles*; M. Strick, *Tooneel Der loflijcke Schrijfpen. Ten dienste vande Const beminnende Ieucht* (Delft: s. n., 1607); M. Strick, *Schat oft Voorbeelt ende Verthooninge van Verscheyden Geschriften ten dienste vande Liefhebbers der hooch-loflijcker konste der Penne: Mitsgaders de fondamenten der selve Schrifte* (s. l.: s. n., 1618); Van de Haar, 'Van "nimf" tot "schoolvrouw"'.

[131] For an overview of the possible places of origin of Antwerp schoolmasters in general (not just those related to French schools) see: Groote, H. L. V. de. 'De zestiende-eeuwse Antwerpse schoolmeesters'. *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis, inzonderheid van het Oud Hertogdom Brabant*, *19 & 20*, (1967 & 1968), 191-193.

[132] J. Blaak, 'Een schoolmeester in Arnhem: Het *Journael ofte Dag-boeckje* van David Beck, 1626–1628'. *Arnhems Historisch Tijdschrift*, *32*, 4 (2012), 168-185; D. Beck, *Mijn voornaamste daden en ontmoetingen: Dagboek van David Beck, Arnhem 1627–1628* (J. Blaak, Ed.), (Hilversum: Verloren, 2014).

[133] J. Blaak, *Geletterde levens: Dagelijks lezen en schrijven in de vroegmoderne tijd in Nederland 1624–1770* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2004), 79-80; Van de Haar, 'Liefde voor lezen', 145-146.

languages.[134] Students used grammar books, such as a French grammar written by Heyns, to understand the structure of the language. Dictionaries and vocabulary books, ordered alphabetically or, in the case of the latter, often thematically, helped to enlarge their lexical stock. So did conversation manuals, books that contained examples of questions and answers on useful topics.[135] For the practice of written communication, books containing examples of letters were published.[136]

Edifying and moralizing literature and biblical texts were used to practise reading French and for translation exercises.[137] Popular in educational settings were collections of proverbs and sayings, such as the famous distichs of Cato and the proverbs of Salomon.[138] These collections were used to train translation, and they also improved students' eloquence by providing them with sayings that they could use to adorn a text or support an argument.[139] Finally, Heyns and some of his colleagues used theatre plays in French or Dutch that allowed the students to practise public speaking in their first or second language.[140]

Contributions to the debates on language can be found especially in the prefaces and dedications of vocabularies, dictionaries, and conversation manuals. It is not unlikely that this use of schoolbooks as a platform for language discussions was partially due to commercial reasons: as people who made a living 'selling' language skills, schoolmasters could not stay

---

[134] P. Heyns, *ABC, oft Exemplen om de kinderen beqvamelick te leeren schryuen, inhoudende veel schoone sentencien tot onderwysinghe der ionckheyt* (Antwerp: Christophe Plantin, 1568); P. Heyns, *ABC, ov Exemples propres povr apprendre les enfans a escrire, contenants plusieurs sentences morales pour l'instruction de la ieunesse* (Antwerp: Christophe Plantin, 1568).

[135] Examples of conversation manuals are: Meurier, *Commvnications familieres non moins propres qve tresutiles à la nation Angloise*; G. de Vivre, *Dovze dialogves et colloqves, traitants de diverses matieres, tres-propres aux Nouueaux Apprentifs de la Langue Françoise* (Antwerp: Jan I van Waesberghe, 1574). See further: E. Ruijsendaal, 'Mehrsprachige Gesprächsbüchlein und Fremdsprachengrammatiken: Vom Niederländischen zum Italienischen und das Französische in der Mitte'. *Heilige und profane Sprachen: Die Anfänge des Fremdsprachenunterrichts im westlichen Europa. Holy and Profane Languages: The Beginnings of Foreign Language Teaching in Western Europe*. Wolfenbütteler Forschungen 98 (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 2002).

[136] Meurier 1573; Bourlier, *Lettres commvnes et familieres*; G. de Vivre, *Lettres missives familieres, entremeslees de certaines confabulations non moins vtiles que recreatiues. Ensemble deux liures de l'vtilité du train de Marchandise* (Antwerp: Jan I van Waesberghe, 1576).

[137] See, for instance: *Die historie vanden ouden Tobias ende van zijnen sone den Ionghen Tobias […]. L'histoire de l'ancien Tobie, & de son filz le jeune Tobie […]* (Antwerp: Ameet Tavernier & Hans de Laet, 1557). Van Selm, *Een menighte treffelijcke boecken*, 239; Van de Haar, 'Liefde voor lezen'.

[138] G. Meurier, *Thresor de sentences dorees, proverbes et dicts communs, reduits selon l'ordre alphabeticque. Auec le Bouquet de Philosophie morale, reduit par Demandes et Responses* (Rouen: Nicolas Lescuyer, 1578); J. Bosquet, *Flevrs morales et sentences preceptives. Seruantes de rencontres à tous propos. Auec autres Poëmes graues, & fructueux : Pris des plus Excellens Autheurs Grecs & Latins. Et reduis en Ryme Françoise, pour l'vtilité de la Ieunesse* (Mons: Rutger Velpius, 1581).

[139] Meadow, *Pieter Bruegel the Elder's Netherlandish Proverbs*, 69.

[140] G. de Vivre, *Comedie des amovrs de Thesevs et Dianira* (Paris: Nicolas Bonfons, 1578); Heyns, *Le miroir des mesnageres*; P. Heyns, *Le miroir des vefves. Tragedie sacrée d'Holoferne & Iudith* (Haarlem: Gillis Rooman for Zacharias Heyns, 1596); P. Heyns, *Iokebed. Miroir des vrayes meres* (Haarlem: Gillis Rooman for Zacharias Heyns, 1597).

silent. They had to demonstrate their expertise and skill and defend the languages that provided their bread and butter. Fittingly, John Gallagher has proposed the term 'language merchant' to frame the work of early modern schoolmasters.[141]

Marijke van der Wal has expressed doubts as to whether schoolbooks containing language reflection were actually used by students, who by reading them, might have come into contact with the discussions.[142] Indeed, some of the grammars and orthographical treatises written by schoolmasters target an audience of colleagues and other interested intellectuals rather than students, as they lack extensive explanations.[143] Historian of book ownership Rob Resoort further claimed that even in cases where students used these books, only the teacher possessed a printed copy, which would then be copied in writing by students.[144]

This is contradicted, however, by Heyns's extant administration, which confirms that he regularly purchased books for his students, including school plays, catechisms, and primers, but also dictionaries, conversation manuals, and even his own French grammar.[145] Heyns's colleague Anthoni Smyters provides another example. After his death in 1625 or 1626, Smyters's books were sold. The extant auction catalogue shows that he owned 48 copies of his own *Epitheta* (1620), a dictionary of Dutch epithets in which he also reflects on the form and status of Dutch. It is likely that Smyters had hoped to sell these copies to his students.[146] Pupils in a school like Heyns's or Smyters's would thus certainly have had the opportunity to learn about these discussions, which were not necessarily reserved for their teachers alone. The *lieu* of the French school, which reached a broad group of middle-class youngsters, provides a firm reminder that the reach of the language debates should not be underestimated.

### *Peeter Heyns*

While Heyns's name is rarely lacking in studies on early modern education, his value for the literary culture of the Low Countries has only become acknowledged slowly. Important for this development was the publication of several articles by Hubert Meeus that focused on the

[141] Gallagher, *Learning Languages in Early Modern England*.
[142] Van der Wal, 'De mens als talig wezen'.
[143] For the difference between scholarly treatises and works with a pedagogical aim, see: Baddeley, *L'Orthographe française*, 354.
[144] Resoort, 'Een proper profitelijc boec', 41-42.
[145] The grammar book, titled *Cort ondervvijs*, is mentioned in: Museum Plantin-Moretus, Antwerp, M240, fol. 3r; Sabbe, *Peeter Heyns*, 63-118. Sie also: Heyning, *Turbulente tijden*, 53, 56-57, 62-63.
[146] Van Selm, *Een menighte treffelijcke boecken*, 348, 363n61; P. J. Smith, 'Les *Epitheta* (1620) d'Anthoni Smyters'. In A.-P. Pouey-Mounou (Ed.), *L'Épithète, la rime et la raison : la lexicographie poétique en Europe, XVI^e–XVII^e siècles* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2015), 227.

political and religious topicality of Heyns's writings.[147] A large part of Heyns's persona still remains understudied: his bilingual authorship in French and Dutch, from which follows his ability to compare and study these vernaculars and connect the discussions on both tongues. As to Heyns's contributions to the language debates, historians of the Dutch language Lode Van den Branden and Geert Dibbets have paid particular attention to those works that were related to standardization and purification.[148] This concealed how broad Heyns's language reflections were and how central his position in the discussions was.

Born in or around 1537, Peeter Heyns's active life as author and teacher coincided with the heyday of the discussions on language.[149] From 1555 to 1585, he and his wife, Anna Smits, ran a successful French school for girls in Antwerp, named the *Lauwerboom* (*Laurel Tree*).[150] When the metropolis was retaken by royal forces in 1585, they fled to Frankfurt, Stade, and finally Haarlem, where Heyns died in 1598.[151] He described his professional activities as 'teaching and receiving at my table some fifty young girls from respectable parentage'.[152] Indeed, the extant administration of his school confirms that he instructed around fifty girls per year in reading and writing in Dutch and French, preparing them for a life as a merchant's wife.[153] The *Lauwerboom* grew into a famous centre for female education, attracting girls from the well-off echelons of society.[154] The daughter of the mayor of Brussels and several noble girls are mentioned in his accounts, alongside daughters of foreign merchants, bakers, butchers,

---

[147] Meeus, 'Peeter Heyns, a "French schoolmaster"'; H. Meeus, 'Peeter Heyns' *Le miroir des vefves*, meer dan schooltoneel?'. In T. Venckeleer & A. M. S. Vanneste (Eds.), *"Memoire en temps advenir": Hommage à Theo Venckeleer* (Leuven: Peeters, 2003).

[148] Van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking*, 48-50; G. R. W. Dibbets, 'Une grammaire importante : le *Cort onderwijs* de Peeter Heyns (1571/1605)'. In J. De Clercq, N. Lioce, & P. Swiggers (Eds.), *Grammaire et enseignement du français, 1500–1700* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000).

[149] In his account books, Heyns states he was 18 years old in 1555, when he opened his school, and he ends the dedication of one of his books with 'From Haarlem, this first of August, 1597. The sixtieth year of the birth of […] Peeter Heyns'. 'De Harlem, ce premier d'Aoust, 1597. L'An 60. de la nativité de […] Pierre Heyns'. Museum Plantin-Moretus, Antwerp, M394, fol. 1v; Heyns, *Iokebed*, sig. A2r; Meeus, 'Peeter Heyns, a "French schoolmaster"', 302-303; Van de Haar, 'Van "nimf" tot "schoolvrouw"', 13.

[150] C. P. Burger, *Nieuwe bijzonderheden over Peeter Heyns en zijn school "Den Lauwerboom"* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1929), 92; Meeus, 'Peeter Heyns, a "French schoolmaster"', 302.

[151] After a visit to a whale that had washed ashore in early 1598, Heyns fell ill. He died in February of that year. Heyns, *Le miroir dv monde, ov, epitome dv Theatre d'Abraham Ortelivs*, fol. 2r; L. Guicciardini & C. Kiliaan, *Beschryvinghe van alle de Neder-landen, anderssins ghenoemt Neder-Dvytslandt* (Amsterdam: Willem Jansz. [Blaeu], 1612), 91; G. R. W. Dibbets, 'Peeter Heyns: "een ghespraecksaem man, van goede gheleertheydt"'. *Taaldidactiek in Historisch Perspectief.* Special issue of *Meesterwerk*, *1*, 1 (1994), 4; Van de Haar, 'Beyond Nostalgia'.

[152] 'enseigner et entretenir à ma table vne cinquantaine de ieunes filles de bonne maison'. Heyns, *Le miroir dv monde, redvict premierement en rithme Brabançonne*, sig. †3v.

[153] Two account books of the *Lauwerboom* are kept at the Museum Plantin-Moretus in Antwerp. They contain Heyns's administration for the years 1576 to 1584, presenting overviews of the names of the students and their outstanding fees. Museum Plantin-Moretus, Antwerp, M240 & M394.

[154] The administrative sources show that Heyns taught pupils from Brabant, Flanders, and Limburg, but also from Amsterdam, Middelburg, Deventer, and Zierikzee. An initial survey of these sources, which deserves to be expanded, can be found in: Sabbe, *Peeter Heyns*, 21-22.

and brewers.[155] Heyns welcomed both externals, who left after class, and girls who lived at the *Lauwerboom* for a period of time.

It is unclear what education Heyns himself had received.[156] In any case, he knew Latin, as he translated several works from Latin into French.[157] He was interested in classical philosophy and literature and followed recent trends in Latin education.[158] He wrote vernacular school plays, for instance, in the style of the plays performed at Latin schools.[159] In the last few decades, various studies by historians such as Hilde De Ridder-Symoens have demonstrated that schoolmasters—not just those in Latin schools but those in French schools as well—were often part of the intellectual elite.[160] Heyns and many of his colleagues, such as Jacob van der Schuere and Anthoni Smyters, were members of chambers of rhetoric and acted as editors, translators, or authors of language manuals and poetry outside of school hours.[161]

Heyns formed a node in the network of schoolmasters participating in the language debates. He was a prominent figure in the educational scene, as he was a dean of the Antwerp

---

[155] There were Portuguese girls among his ranks, as well as German girls from Frankfurt and Hamburg, and even a girl from Danzig. Sabbe, *Peeter Heyns*, 21-23; Dibbets, 'Peeter Heyns: "een ghespraecksaem man, van goede gheleertheydt"', 5-6.

[156] No specific vocational training existed for the profession of schoolmaster. According to a laudatory poem in one of his schoolbooks, Heyns 'never saw France', so he did not travel to France to perfect his language skills. This does not exclude the possibility of a visit to a French-speaking area in the Low Countries. 'Vranckrijc noyt en sach'. Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. A3r. In archival sources, Heyns is referred to as 'Mr' multiple times, which might indicate that he attended university. The abbreviation 'Mr' does not seem to indicate his position as a teacher, as he is sometimes called 'Mr Peeter Heyns Schoolmr'. See, for example, Felixarchief, Antwerp, R2209, fol. 49r-49v; Felixarchief, Antwerp, R2225, fol. 13v.

[157] It concerns the *Divinarvm nvptiarvm conventa et acta* (1573) and *Christi Jesu Vitae Admirabiliumque Actionum Speculum* (1573), written originally in Latin by Benito Arias Montano, and the preface to Abraham Ortelius's *Theatrvm Orbis Terrarvm* (1570). For this preface, see: W. Waterschoot, 'The Title-Page of Ortelius's *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum*: A Comment'. *Quærendo*, *9*, 1 (1979).

[158] Marcus Antonius Gillis dedicated his translation of a Stoic work by Epictetus to Heyns because of the interest the schoolteacher had shown in the project. Similarly, Gerard de Vivre, a fellow schoolmaster, dedicated a school play to him because of his love of classical literature. M. A. Gillis, *Epictetvs Hantboecxken Leerende na der Stoischer Philosophen wyse hoe elc in sinen roep gherustelyck leuen sal* (Antwerp: Jan I van Waesberghe, 1564), 6; De Vivre, *Comedie*, fol. 2r; Buys, *Sparks of Reason*, 108; A. van de Haar, 'Both One and the Other: The Educational Value of Personification in the Female Humanist Theatre of Peeter Heyns (1537–1598)'. In W. S. Melion & B. Ramakers (Eds.), *Personification: Embodying Meaning and Emotion.* Intersections, Interdisciplinary Studies in Early Modern Culture 41 (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2016), 263.

[159] Van de Haar, 'Both One and the Other'.

[160] J. G. C. A. Briels, 'Zuidnederlandse onderwijskrachten in Noordnederland 1570–1630: Een bijdrage tot de kennis van het schoolwezen in de Republiek'. *Archief voor de geschiedenis van de Katholieke Kerk in Nederland*, *14*, (1972), 122; Frijhoff, *Meertaligheid in de gouden eeuw*, 41-42; M. A. Sullivan, *Bruegel and the Creative Process 1559–1563* (London: Ashgate, 2010), 5; H. de Ridder-Symoens, 'Rhetoricians as a Bridge Between Learned and Vernacular Culture'. In B. Ramakers (Ed.), *Understanding Art in Antwerp: Classicising the Popular, Popularising the Classic (1540–1580)* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 199.

[161] For the role of schoolmasters in the chambers of rhetoric, see: Van Dixhoorn, 'Writing Poetry', 213; Van Dixhoorn, *Lustige geesten*, 104, 113-114; A. van Dixhoorn, 'Soorten rederijkers: Rederijkers en hun plaats in het intellectuele veld, 1550–1650'. *Met eigen ogen: De rederijker als dichtend individu (1450–1600).* Special issue of *Jaarboek De Fonteine*, *58*, (2009). Examples of teachers who were also active in the world of book production are—besides the aforementioned Peeter Heyns and Joos Lambrecht—Étienne de Walcourt and Antoine Tiron, who worked for Christophe Plantin's *Officina Plantiniana* as editors and correctors.

schoolmasters' guild for several years.[162] The various texts dedicated to him by colleagues demonstrate that he had created an extensive network of fellow schoolmasters who were equally interested in language, including Van der Schuere and Smyters.[163]

Heyns's school was only a few streets away from the *officina* of his good friend Christophe Plantin. Inquisitive as he was, he must have paid regular visits to the printing house to discuss matters of language and other shared interests with the learned men from all over Europe who frequented the printing workshop, among whom were Justus Lipsius and Johannes Goropius Becanus. It is worth noting that the daughters of Becanus as well as those of merchant-grammarian Johannes Radermacher were sent to Heyns's school.[164] It is unknown whether Becanus, the great defender of Dutch, had indeed wanted his daughters to learn French, as the administrative sources only shed light on the period after his death. Nevertheless, it is telling that in the circles of these language-savvy men, Heyns's language and teaching skills were esteemed so highly that he was entrusted with the education of their daughters.

Heyns probably knew Becanus personally, and he fiercely supported his ideas. This becomes most clear from texts written by Heyns for various editions of a pocket-sized atlas based on the works of royal cartographer Abraham Ortelius, the Dutch *Spieghel der werelt* (1577) and the French *Miroir dv Monde* (1579). Heyns wrote descriptions of the regions shown on the maps in the atlas [Figure 5]. The 1577 and 1579 texts describing Germany both mention Becanus and his *Hermathena*, which was posthumously printed in 1580, and thus after the publication of the atlases.[165] Plantin, who conveniently printed both the pocket atlases and the *Hermathena*, might have allowed or even encouraged Heyns to consult the manuscripts.[166]

---

[162] It concerns the years 1574 to 1575, 1579 to 1580, and 1584 to 1585. Museum Plantin-Moretus, Antwerp, M394, fol. Iv; De Groote, 'De zestiende-eeuwse Antwerpse schoolmeesters', 220-222, 266.

[163] See, for instance: De Vivre, *Comedie*; *Recveil et eslite de plvsievrs belles chansons joyeuses, honnestes & amoureuses, partie non encore veües, & autres, colligées des plus excellents Poëtes François, par I.VV. Livre premier* (Antwerp: Jan I van Waesberghe, 1576); Meurier, *La gvirlande*.

[164] Lynken and Beelken Becanus are mentioned in Heyns's administration for the year 1576; Maeyken Radermacher is listed in 1581. Museum Plantin-Moretus, Antwerp, M394, fol. 1r, fol. 105v; Dibbets, 'Peeter Heyns: "een ghespraecksaem man, van goede gheleertheydt"', 5-6; Dibbets, 'Une grammaire importante', 290; Frederickx & Van Hal, *Johannes Goropius Becanus*, 62.

[165] P. Heyns, *Spieghel der werelt, ghestelt in ryme door M. Peeter Heyns: Waer inne letterlyck ende figuerlyck de gheleghentheyt, natuere, ende aert aller landen claerlyck afghebeeldt ende beschreuen wordt* (Antwerp: Christophe Plantin, 1577), fol. 18v; Heyns, *Le miroir dv monde, redvict premierement en rithme Brabançonne*, fol. 20r.

[166] It is possible that commercial reasons were at the basis of Heyns's mention of Becanus's text. In fact, in the 1579 French *Miroir du monde*, his abundant appraisal of the forthcoming work indeed seems to have an ulterior motive: 'his written *Hermathena*, that surpasses by far and cannot be compared with the already printed *Becceselanes*, as do his *Hieroglyphiques* and his commentaries on the *Vertumnus* of Propertius, all forthcoming'. Nevertheless, the positive description of Becanus's theories was maintained in an updated form in the 1598 edition of the *Miroir*, which was not printed by the *Officina Plantiniana* but by Heyns's son Zacharias. 'son Hermathena escrite (qui surpasse de beaucoup & sans comparaison les Becceselanes, ià mises en lumiere, comme aussi font ses Hieroglyphiques & ses Commentaires sur le Vertumnus de Properce, toutes encores à imprimer)'. Heyns, *Le miroir*

It is also conceivable that the schoolmaster had discussed them with Becanus himself before the death of the latter.

Figure 5.

Heyns's description of 'Germania' and the accompanying fold-out map in the 1579 *Miroir dv monde*.

In wording that is strongly reminiscent of Becanus's treatises, Heyns's 1579 atlas affirms that '[t]he first and consequently the oldest language, is that which amongst all others is the most perfect'.[167] Heyns goes on to explain the signs of linguistic perfection:

> And we call perfect that [language] which can concisely, clearly, and in a pleasing tone express and make understandable the imaginations of the mind, and their whole structure […].
>
> Et nous appellons parfaicte celle qui sçait brieuement, clairement & d'vne voix conuenable exprimer & donner à entendre les imaginations de l'ame, ensemble la structure d'icelles […].[168]

Heyns thus produced an almost literal translation of Becanus's Latin manuscript, which in the 1580 printed version says:

> The most perfect [language] is that which in the most clear and concise way, and in sounds that are most convenient, makes the images of the mind and their composition understandable […].

*dv monde, redvict premierement en rithme Brabançonne*, fol. 20r; Heyns, *Le miroir dv monde, ov, epitome dv Theatre d'Abraham Ortelivs*, fol. 66v. See also: Frederickx & Van Hal, *Johannes Goropius Becanus*, 81.

[167] 'la premiere, & consequemment la plus ancienne langue, est celle qui entre toutes les autres est la plus parfaite'. Heyns, *Le miroir dv monde, redvict premierement en rithme Brabançonne*, fol. 20r.

[168] Heyns, *Le miroir dv monde, redvict premierement en rithme Brabançonne*, fol. 20r.

> Perfectissimam autem eam dicimus quæ quàm apertissimè, & quàm breuissimè, vnà cum sono conuenientissimo, imagines animi, & earum compositionem dat intelligendas […].[169]

Becanus's Latin and Heyns's French coincide in their choice of words ('brevissimè'/'brièvement', 'sono conuenientissimo'/'voix convenable') and even in their grammatical structure ('dicimus'/'nous appellons'). These statements on language are not present in the original atlas texts by Ortelius, himself a supporter of Becanus, and must thus have been added by Heyns.[170]

In his French atlas, Heyns goes on to explain Becanus's theory on monosyllabic words. He shares Becanus's rejection of Hebrew as an old or perfect language, claiming it was ambiguous and unclear.[171] Heyns can only conclude that the Dutch language 'surpasses Hebrew in clarity and perfection, Greek and Latin in brevity, and any other language in its richness and copiousness of vocables'.[172] Showing himself to be aware of the rhetorical notions that were used to describe languages in the Europe-wide debates, such as *brevitas* and *copia*, Heyns endorses the thesis that Dutch is the pre-Babel language. Therefore, he claims, he is right to choose the Dutch language for his writings, however paradoxical it may seem to make such a statement in a French text by a schoolmaster instructing French.

Heyns's statements in the 1577 and 1579 pocket atlases matter because they show that support of one's mother tongue—in this case Dutch—did not necessarily hamper the use or appreciation of another language—in this case French. The French language could be used to promote views on Dutch and inform a francophone audience of said views, showing the multilingual character of the debates. Ideas circulated between texts in Latin, French, and Dutch, in manuscript and print. Through his atlases, Heyns made Becanus's theories available to an audience that did not read Latin. Moreover, his case shows that discussions on Hebrew were not confined to the academic circles in which this language was studied. Finally, these

---

[169] Becanus, *Opera*, *Hermathena* II, 24.

[170] On the texts written by Ortelius for his folio-size atlas, see: M. van den Broecke, *Ortelius'* Theatrum Orbis Terrarum *(1570–1641): Characteristics and Development of a Sample of* On Verso *Map Texts* (Utrecht: Koninklijk Nederlands Aardrijkskundig Genootschap, 2009).

[171] 'there is no tongue more obscure, ambiguous, and containing more difficulties than that one (witness all those who read it)'. 'il n'y a langue plus obscure, ambigue, ne qui ait plus de difficultez qu'icelle (tesmoings tous ceux qui en font profession)'. Heyns, *Le miroir dv monde, redvict premierement en rithme Brabançonne*, fol. 20r.

[172] 'surpasse l'Ebrieu en clairté & perfection, le Grec & Latin en brieueté, & tout autre langage en richesse et copiosité de vocables'. Heyns, *Le miroir dv monde, redvict premierement en rithme Brabançonne*, fol. 20r.

atlases illustrate the potentially broad audience of the debates, as geographical works like these were used in the classroom, thus reaching an audience of young boys and girls.[173]

This link between the schoolmaster and the humanist physician has been overshadowed in modern studies by Heyns's notoriety as an advocate of purification. Although no treatises written by Heyns on loanwords are known to exist, he built a reputation as a loanword critic that extended far enough to reach the ears of Italian merchant-historian Lodovico Guicciardini, who lived in Antwerp for decades. In the 1581 Italian reedition of his *Descrittione di tvtti i Paesi Bassi*, Guicciardini describes Heyns as a great poet in both French and Dutch, who 'in his poems avoids all foreign words'.[174] Guicciardini considered Heyns's rejection of loanwords in Dutch and French important enough to mention in his Italian description of the Low Countries. Lode Van den Branden has used this reference to argue that Heyns's contributions to the language debates mainly resided in his apparent opposition to borrowing. Geert Dibbets has added to this view by drawing attention to a French grammar book written by Heyns, titled *Cort ondervvijs Van de acht deelen der Fransoischer talen* (1571).[175] Paradoxically, Dibbets has linked this grammar, which will be studied in detail below, to the history of Dutch.[176]

From these first glimpses of Heyns's participation in the sixteenth-century discussions on language, an image emerges of a schoolmaster-poet who was marked by his daily contact with both French and Dutch, as well as by his interest in Latin writings. All three topics of this chapter are united in this schoolmaster: he defended his mother tongue as well as second-language learning, and he debated notions of eloquence and purity concerning not just the vernaculars but also Hebrew. Heyns is the key figure in whom virtually all the important topics come together, but who also, through his extensive network, creates a link between the many schoolmasters debating these issues.

---

[173] Van Selm, *Een menighte treffelijcke boecken*, 239; P. Swiggers & T. Van Hal, 'Anvers, centre de la cartographie'. In R. Béhar, M. Blanco, & J. Hafner (Eds.), *Villes à la croisée des langues (XVI–XVII[e] siècles) : Anvers, Hambourg, Milan, Naples et Palerme*. *Städte im Schnittpunkt der Sprachen (16.–17. Jh.): Antwerpen, Hamburg, Mailand, Neapel und Palermo* (Geneva: Droz, 2018), 484.

[174] 'ne suoi poemi di sfuggire tutte le parole forestiere'. L. Guicciardini, *Descrittione di tvtti i Paesi Bassi, altrimenti detti Germania inferiore* (Antwerp: Christophe Plantin, 1581), 167.

[175] G. R. W. Dibbets, 'Peeter Heyns' *Cort onderwijs*: Een schoolboek voor het onderwijs in de Franse taal uit de tweede helft van de zestiende eeuw'. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, *99,* 2 (1983); Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 413; P. Heyns, *Cort onderwijs van de acht deelen der Fransoischer talen (1571 en 1605)* (E. Ruijsendaal, Ed.), (Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 2006).

[176] See: Chapter 4.3.

### 4.2. Defending Language Learning

In the context of the sixteenth-century debates on language, in which divergent attitudes towards specific languages existed, it was relevant for teachers of French to make explicit why the language they taught deserved instruction. They made use of existing feelings of pride in one's native language and competition with other vernaculars. References to ongoing reflections on creating a well-functioning community through civic virtue and direct quotes from Cicero on the topic are not rare. At the same time, teachers demonstrated an awareness that these trends did not exclude attention to other languages and a cosmopolitan mindset. In their language manuals, schoolmasters like Heyns, who backed Dutch while publishing in both French and Dutch, responded to this complexity. The notion of the language teacher as a defender of the *patria* was widespread in the sixteenth-century Low Countries, with Heyns as the ultimate example.

#### *Valorising Plurilingualism*

'Who ever obtained the friendship of foreign nations with one language? How many have become rich without the knowledge of many languages?'[177] These rhetorical questions were reprinted over and over in the prefaces of vocabulary books in the Berlaimont tradition. They point to the importance of language learning for maintaining good relations with speakers of other tongues. But there were other benefits to plurilingualism. Looking at other languages could help, for instance, to strengthen the mother tongue. Moreover, as the Low Countries were marked by two vernacular languages, learning French as a second-language benefitted internal cohesion as much as external competition.

A single publication by the key figure Peeter Heyns allows for the demonstration of these multidirectional movements and shows how emotionally and politically charged learning both French and Dutch was in the framework of the bilingual Low Countries. The posthumous 1605 edition of his French grammar book contains laudatory poems by Heyns's friends Christophe Plantin and Hendrik Laurensz. Spiegel, presenting complementary views on the value of learning French in a Dutch-speaking context.

---

[177] 'Vvie heeft er oyt met een sprake die vrientschap der vreemder natien vercreghen? Hoe vele isser rijc gheworden sonder kennisse van menigherhande spraken?' N. de Berlaimont, *Dictionaire, colloqves, ov dialogves en qvatres langves, Flamen, François, Espaignol, & Italien, de nouueau corrigé, augmenté, & tellement mis en ordre, que lon peut accorder les quatre langues de reigle à reigle: Tresutil à tous Marchans, ou autres, de quelque estat qu'ilz soient* (Antwerp: Jan Withaghe, 1565), sig. A2v.

Plantin, who probably wrote his poem for the 1581 edition of the grammar which has not been preserved, showed himself to be fully aware of the value of Dutch-French bilingualism in a country marked by both languages.[178] He praised Heyns for allowing his students 'to learn and marry/ The French language, and the Cimbrian Flemish/ Like the Celtic and Belgian nation,/ Under the single name of Gaul is united'.[179] Plantin employs a metaphor of marriage in order to emphasize the unity and internal cohesion that language learning could foster.[180] He treats schoolmasters as bilingual intermediaries or go-betweens that could keep this country, divided by different languages and political and religious views, together. By mentioning the term 'Cimbrian Flemish', the printer places his contribution in the context of the language debates, referring to Becanus's theory on the Pre-Babel Cimbrian past of the Dutch language, of which Heyns was a proponent.

Spiegel equally approves of French-Dutch bilingualism. Using a military metaphor, he describes Heyns as soldier defending both languages of his country

> The best teachers are those who cultivate the knowledge themselves,
>
> From Brutus, one learns virtue, from Caesar war,
>
> Rhetoric from Cicero, Grammar from Priscian.
>
> You, my friend Heyns, rightfully exert this profession.
>
> This is why you were called from the Scheldt, to the Main, then to the
>
> Elbe, and now to the Spaarne,
>
> To teach and instruct the best's most precious treasure,
>
> In good Dutch and good French, like a double soldier.

---

[178] Els Ruijsendaal has argued, based on the administration of Plantin's *officina*, that the text was reprinted in 1581, 1597, and 1601. During the research conducted for this book, the author found a previously unknown edition dating from 1591 in the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha. It was printed in Delft by Bruyn Harmansz. Schinckel. Plantin's poem was not present in the first half of the 1571 edition, which has only partially survived. It does figure in the 1591 edition. Since Plantin died in 1589, it can be assumed Plantin wrote his poem in or before 1581. P. Heyns, *Cort onderwys van de acht deelen der Françoischer talen, tot voorderinghe en*de *profijt der Duytscher ioncheyt* (Delft: Bruyn Harmansz. Schinckel, 1591), sig. A2v; Heyns, *Cort onderwijs* (2006), 14.

[179] 'd'appre*n*dre & marier/ Le langage François, & le Flamand cymbrique/ Comme la nation & Celtique & Belgique,/ Sous le seul nom de Gaule on void s'apparier'. Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. A3v.

[180] The idea of marrying two different languages through a language manual was also used by John Palsgrave in the preface to *Lesclarcissement de la langue françoyse* (1530): 'so to marry our tonge & the french togider'. The preface has been reprinted in Kibbee, *For to Speke Frenche Trewely*, 204-207, esp. 205. For a modern edition of the full text, see: J. Palsgrave, *L'éclaircissement de la langue française, 1530* (S. Baddeley, Ed.), (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2003).

It is not fitting for a halberdier to raise the banner of the art.

But you please here, through two languages, two peoples.

He who only speaks one language, speaks none well.

TLeeraren voeght hem best, die self de leer hanteren,

Van Brutus, salmen deughd: van Caesar t'oorlogh leren,

Cier-spraak van Cicero: Taal-schick van Prisciaan

Diens ampt, voegd u vriend Heyns: te recht hebdijt bestaan

Daerom riep u van't Scheld de Mein: doe d'Elf: nu t Sparen

Der besten beste Schat, te tuchten, en leeraren.

Goed duyts en goed Fransois, als dubbel Soudenier,

Ten past gheen hake-schut te voeren s'kunsts banier.

Maar ghy vernoeght alhier, door twee talen, twee volcken,

Die maar een taal wel kan, kan gheen taal wel vertolken.[181]

Rather than focusing on internal cohesion, like Plantin did, Spiegel places Heyns within the imagery of the schoolmaster as the guardian of good language. Spiegel, who, as the likely author of the *Twe-spraack* has been highly praised for his importance for Dutch, here displays an interest in French, too.

In fact, the *Twe-spraack* does not at all object to teaching French to children. One of the interlocutors of this dialogue is even a French schoolmaster.[182] This grammar of Dutch does, however, express the wish that students acquire a solid basis in their native vernacular before they commence their study of a second language, to prevent confusion and mixing.[183] Rather than dismissing French, Spiegel wishes to safeguard the quality of both Dutch and French.[184]

In his laudatory poem for Heyns, Spiegel even goes one step further in his appreciation of second-language learning with the final key verse: 'He who only speaks one language, speaks

[181] Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. A3r.
[182] Dibbets, *Twe-spraack*, 15.
[183] *Twe-spraack*, 5-6.
[184] Spiegel's concerns for the other vernacular language of the Low Countries have not been mentioned by *Twe-spraack* specialist Geert Dibbets. See: Dibbets, *Twe-spraack*.

none well'.[185] Spiegel seems to express the idea that plurilinguals are more eloquent in their native tongue than monolinguals. This could be explained by the fact that by learning another language, one comes into contact with new figures of speech, metaphors, and proverbs. Plurilinguals can use these new insights to adorn their mother tongue. Moreover, and here Spiegel's poem closely touches upon one of the major arguments of this book, learning another language allows one to take a certain distance from one's native vernacular, to compare it to other tongues and to reflect upon it. Comparison is by definition impossible for monolinguals. Spiegel, who has been treated as a symbol of the defence of Dutch, openly admitted that speaking proper Dutch was impossible without learning another language.

Heyns shared Spiegel's opinion on the importance of teaching good-quality language. In 1580, he wrote in a laudatory poem for his colleague Gabriel Meurier: 'Good to him who teaches French correctly'.[186] Meurier himself stands out because of his cosmopolitan ideas on language. He was born in French-speaking Hainaut but moved to Antwerp to become a French teacher.[187] Initially a close colleague and friend of Heyns's, they got into an argument around the time that Heyns wrote his poem. During the quarrel, which concerned payments to the schoolmasters' guild of Saint Ambrose, Meurier allegedly called Heyns a 'big ass'.[188] In part because of this incident, Meurier is known as a hot-headed individual. The views on language expressed in his schoolbooks were, on the contrary, overtly pacifistic.[189]

In a French-English manual designed for English traders and printed in Antwerp in 1563, Meurier explains his view on the notions of foreigners and foreign languages. He defends the topical view that all men are equally foreign. As they are all banished strangers in the earthly

---

[185] 'Die maar een taal wel kan, kan gheen taal wel vertolken'. The verb 'vertolken' literally means 'to translate'. However, it can also mean 'to express' or 'to speak'. In the context of this poem, the latter meaning is more fitting, as monolinguals, by definition, cannot translate. Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. A3r; *Geïntegreerde Taalbank*, 'vertolken'. Accessed May 2016.

[186] 'Wel hem diet Françoys recht leert'. This verse alludes to Heyns's personal device 'Good to him who trusts in God' ('Wel hem die Godt betrout'/'Bienheureux qui en Dieu se fie'). Meurier, *La gvirlande*, sig. A2r.

[187] For more biographical information on Meurier, see: De Clercq, 'Gabriel Meurier, een XVI-eeuws pedagoog en grammaticus in Antwerpen'; B. Kaltz, 'Gabriel Meuriers *Petite fabrique* (1563)'. In J. De Clercq, N. Lioce, & P. Swiggers (Eds.), *Grammaire et enseignement du français, 1500–1700* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 277-278; Meurier, *La grammaire françoise* (2005), 9-16.

[188] At the time, Heyns, together with Aernout Gillis, acted as dean of the guild. In their report on the matter, Heyns and Gillis wrote down that Meurier had called them 'scummers, scoundrels, and beggars' ('schuymers, rabauwen, ende bedelaers'), as well as 'big asses' ('groote esels'). The term 'scummer' is here used in its meaning of pirate or scrounger, not related to the language debates. See the administration of the guild of Saint Ambrose for the year 1579, edited by: C. P. Serrure (Ed.), 'Memorie van tghene dat ghehandelt is opt faict vander Scholen binnen Antwerpen inden jare 1579, door Peeter Heyns ende Aernout Gielis, als dekens van dien jare'. In *Vaderlandsch museum voor Nederduitsche letterkunde, oudheid en geschiedenis*. Vol. 3 (Ghent: H. Hoste, 1859–1860), 356-357. See also: De Clercq, 'Gabriel Meurier, een XVI-eeuws pedagoog en grammaticus in Antwerpen', 29-30.

[189] For descriptions of Meurier's character, see: De Clercq, 'Gabriel Meurier, een XVI-eeuws pedagoog en grammaticus in Antwerpen', 29-30; Meurier, *La grammaire françoise* (2005), 11.

vale of tears, they are brothers in their shared human condition regardless of origins or language. He condemns those who 'think they owe nothing and are not in any way related to anyone who does not speak their mother tongue'.[190] He thus explicitly attacks those who only paid attention to speakers of their own first language.

In the margins of Meurier's call to love across language borders, Latin phrases have been added. The second sentence is particularly relevant: 'If I spoke the languages of the angels but did not have love, I would be nothing'.[191] This quotation, a paraphrase of 1 Corinthians 13:1, refers to the belief that angels are panglot and thus speak all the languages of the earth. Through this and other Latin references in the margins, Meurier demonstrates his awareness of theological discussions on language variety, placing himself among those who saw plurilingualism as the way out of the post-Babel chaos.

Meurier's case matters for three reasons: firstly, this French-English language manual printed in Antwerp confirms that a scholarly focus on Dutch alone, even when studying a Dutch-speaking region, is insufficient; secondly, Meurier demonstrates how interrelated vernacular and Latin reflections on the language debates were; and thirdly, he exhibits a sense of cosmopolitanism. Meurier aimed for a world in which everyone would speak each other's language. Trying to be the change he wanted to see, the schoolmaster attempted, through his many language manuals, to enhance mutual understanding among speakers of French, Dutch, and English.

### *Defending the* Patria

In his description of Heyns as a 'double soldier', Spiegel emphasized the value of language teaching. Just like soldiers fought for the fatherland, language teachers fought for the quality of the languages of the *patria*, using the term to express local or transregional allegiances. For the Low Countries, this concerned French as much as Dutch. Authors of language manuals frequently claimed their productions served the common good, tying in with the growing interest in good citizenship. Their view of serving the *patria* was not only concerned with improving the form of French and Dutch. It equally targeted the possibility of communicating with communities outside the Low Countries in order to promote exchange and competition.

---

[190] 'n'estiment rien debuoir & nullement estre attenus à celuy qui n'a l'usage de son maternel la*n*gage'. Meurier, *Commvnications familieres non moins propres qve tresutiles à la natio*n *Angloise*, sig. A2r.

[191] 'Si linguas Angelorum loquar & charitas no*n* habeam nihil sum'. Meurier, *Commvnications familieres non moins propres qve tresutiles à la natio*n *Angloise*, sig. A2r.

Traditionally, historians of the Dutch language have connected the increasing number of references to the *patria* in early modern treatises and manuals on language to a supposed focus on Dutch alone. They linked attention for the fatherland and the common good to a rejection of the 'foreign', in which they even included the local French language.[192] A text that, at first glance, seems to support this view was written by Anthoni Smyters, a close friend of Heyns's who, like Spiegel and Plantin, wrote a laudatory poem for his grammar.[193] In 1620, Smyters published his *Epitheta*, an extended translation of a French compilation of epithets by Maurice de La Porte.[194] La Porte's 1571 *Les epithetes* promises on its title page that it is useful 'to adorn every other French composition'.[195]

Nicoline van der Sijs, in the introduction to her modern edition of Smyters's work, places it fully in a context of refusing 'foreign' influence and a growing national consciousness.[196] This assertion is based on the fact that the purpose of the *Epitheta* was, according to its author, to awaken an interest in the Dutch language among the young. In doing so, Smyters claimed to be doing 'our countrymen a service'.[197] He explains that he wishes to improve the Dutch tongue so it can become a 'perfected language', just as praiseworthy and useful as a literary language as the vernacular of 'any other Nation'.[198] Smyters clearly engages in a rhetoric of competition here, wishing to support his own fatherland and fellow countrymen by raising their language to the level of others.

Nevertheless, Smyters did not close himself off from other languages. First of all, he made these remarks in the preface to a Dutch translation of a French text that itself served to adorn French.[199] He thus used his knowledge of French as a springboard to further the Dutch

---

[192] See: Van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking*, 4; Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 31, 357.

[193] Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. A3r. For more information on the friendship between Heyns and Smyters, whose children even got married, see: A. Smyters, *Het versierde woord: De Epitheta of woordcombinaties van Anthoni Smyters uit 1620* (N. van der Sijs, Ed.), (Amsterdam: Contact, 1999), 9-10.

[194] A. Smyters, *Epitheta, Dat zijn Bynamen oft Toenamen* (Rotterdam: Jan II van Waesberghe, 1620). For a translation in modern Dutch, see: Smyters, *Het versierde woord*.

[195] 'pour illustrer toute autre composition Françoise'. M. de La Porte, *Les epithetes de M. de La Porte parisien. Liure non seulement vtile à ceux qui font profession de la Poësie, mais fort propre aussi pour illustrer toute autre composition Françoise* (Paris: Gabriel Buon, 1571), sig. a1r. See also: A.-P. Pouey-Mounou, 'Petite poésie portative : les exercices de style des *Epithetes* de La Porte'. *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance*, *65*, 1 (2003).

[196] In the paragraph introducing Smyters's views on 'Constructing and purifying languages', Van der Sijs does not refer to the French language. She only refers to a growing 'national consciousness', leading to the idea that Dutch 'had to be purified of any foreign influence'. 'het nationale bewustzijn', 'gezuiverd moest worden van vreemde invloed'. Smyters, *Het versierde woord*, 20.

[197] 'vvaer door (als ghezeght is) onse Landtslieden dienst gheschiedt'. Smyters, *Epitheta* (1620), sig. ?6v. Smyters, who like Heyns fled from Antwerp to Holland, felt it was his 'owing duty' to serve his new host community by teaching. 'schuldigen plicht'. A. Smyters, *Arithmetica: Dat is de reken-konste* (Amsterdam: Cornelis de Bruyn, 1661), sig. A2r.

[198] 'als eenighe andere Natien met de hare'. 'volkomen Tale'. Smyters, *Epitheta* (1620), sigs. ?3r, ?6r.

[199] For the way in which Smyters treated his French source, see: Smith, 'Les *Epitheta*'.

language and his nation. Moreover, he wished for his students to do the same. By 'reading, writing, and practising French and Dutch poetry', he hoped they would become 'more inclined to train themselves in their mother tongue'.[200] Smyters argues that reading French can actually stimulate interest in one's mother tongue. Like Spiegel, Smyters claimed for his pupils what can be claimed for the sixteenth-century language debaters in general: bilingualism and interest in languages other than the mother tongue stimulate language awareness and discussion rather than obstruct it. Even in this case, in which the author's main purpose is the construction of Dutch for the good of the fatherland, multilingualism is an integral part of the story.

It is important to emphasize that French not only served as a model for the construction of Dutch. In the bilingual Low Countries, supporting French was just as patriotic as supporting Dutch. Gabriel Meurier thus legitimized a French-Dutch vocabulary from 1557 by referring to Cicero's notion of civic virtue and the idea that citizens have a certain duty to fulfil towards the fatherland.[201] The booklet contains a laudatory poem by Plantin, who printed it, indeed praising Meurier for 'enriching the common good' because of his French teaching.[202] Jean Bosquet, a teacher from Mons, claimed similar virtues for himself in a French grammar printed in 1586.[203] He wished his treatise to 'be of use, both to you [his students], and to my country, and Republic'.[204] Referring to the same passage in Cicero's *De officiis* that was targeted by Meurier, Bosquet then states that everyone lives not just for themselves, but for their parents, fatherland, and friends.[205] Through his French grammar he served his partially francophone *patria*. While the references to the *patria* in the discussions on language have often been interpreted as supporting the Dutch mother tongue and rejecting other languages, the frequent use of the

---

[200] 'lesende, schrijvende en*de* practiserende de Fransche ende Duytsche Poëten […] hun meer gheneghen maect, hun in hunne Moeders Tale t'oeffenen'. Smyters, *Epitheta* (1620), sig. ?6v.

[201] 'Cicero […] says that we are not just born for ourselves […] but also in part for our relatives, friends, and even our compatriots'. 'Ciceron […] dit : q*ue* nous ne sommes pas seulement naiz pour nous, mais que noz parens, amis, voire ceux de nostre pays […] s'en peuuent à bon droict attribuer chacun leur part'. Meurier, *Vocabvlaire françois-flameng*, fol. 2r. In a 1574 publication, Meurier used a reference to Plato to stipulate the importance of being of use for one's city. G. Meurier, *Dictionaire francois-flameng* (Antwerp: Jan I van Waesberghe, 1574), sig. A2r-A2v.

[202] 'enrichir le commun bien'. Meurier, *Vocabvlaire françois-flameng*, fol. 5v.

[203] J. Bosquet, *Elemens ov institvtions de la langve Francoise, propres povr façonner la Ieunesse, à parfaictement, & nayuement entendre, parler, & escrire icelle langue* (Mons: Charles Michel, 1586). For a modern edition, see: J. Bosquet, *Elemens ou institutions de la langue françoise (1586)* (C. Demaizière, Ed.), (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2005).

[204] 'n'estre trouué inutile au corps de la Republique'. 'faire prouffit, ensemble tant à vous, comme à mon Païs, et Republique'. Bosquet, *Elemens ov institvtions de la langve Francoise* (1586), sigs. *2r, *4v.

[205] 'following what Cicero writes in his *De officiis*: that we are not born only for ourselves, but partially for our parents, partially for our country, and partially for our friends'. 'suyuant que recite Ciceron en ses Offices, où il escrit. Que nous, pour nous-mêmes ne sommes pas nez tant seulem*e*nt : mais en partie pour noz parens, en partie pour nostre Pays, & en partie pour noz amis'. Bosquet, *Elemens ov institvtions de la langve Francoise* (1586), sig. *4v.

notion of fatherland by schoolmasters reveals a different image. Studying these schoolbooks thus not only yields new insights into the early modern fascination with language, but also into the history of the notions of fatherland and nation.

### 4.3. Making and Teaching the Rules

In the history of linguistics, the pedagogical language manuals that schoolmasters created in order to benefit the common good are set apart from theoretical, learned treatises on language.[206] Whereas didactic texts are generally considered useful sources for the study of actual language use, only scholarly works, such as the 1581 treatise on Dutch orthography by humanist theologian Pontus de Heuter, are seen as potentially innovative.[207] The extant pedagogical grammar books on French indeed add little to the debates, with the exception of Heyns's *Cort ondervvijs* (1571). Studies of individual texts on Dutch spelling, however, have revealed that the educational manuals of Joos Lambrecht (1550), Jacob vander Schuere (1612), and Anthoni Smyters (1613) did position themselves within ongoing discussions on the topic.[208] Considering these texts together brings to light the pivotal role that teachers of French played in the debates on Dutch orthography, and that their prime contribution lay in introducing French developments to their audience in the Low Countries.

Inversely, schoolmasters in this region also took part in the French *querelle de l'orthographe*. So far, only one of them, Gabriel Meurier, has been studied satisfyingly in this context.[209] The overt statements by his fellow schoolmasters Peter Haschaert (Pierre Haschart) and Jean Bosquet have received much less from modern scholars. The publication of a modern edition of Bosquet's text in 2005 did not succeed in sparking scholarly interest in the schoolmaster from Mons.[210] It is to be hoped that the 2018 edition of Haschaert's text by Susan Baddeley will have a different effect.[211] These texts show the transregional side of the French

---

[206] Swiggers 1992; Van der Wal, 'De mens als talig wezen', 14-15; B. Colombat, 'La *Gallicae linguae institutio* de Jean Pillot : comment adapter le cadre grammatical latin à la description du français'. In G. Defaux (Ed.), *Lyon et l'illustration de la langue française à la Renaissance* (Lyon: ENS Éditions, 2003), 77. See also: W. Dahmen (Ed.), *"Gebrauchsgrammatik" und "Gelehrte Grammatik": Französische Sprachlehre und Grammatikographie zwischen Maas und Rhein vom 16. bis zum 19. Jahrhundert* (Tübingen: Narr, 2001).

[207] P. de Heuter, *Nederdvitse orthographie, Dat is: Maniere houmen opreht Nederduits spellen ende schriven zal, niet alleen nut ende nootelic die opreht begeren te schriven, maer al die zulx de ioincheit zouken te leren* (Antwerp: Christophe Plantin, 1581).

[208] J. van der Schuere, *Nederduydsche spellinge* (F. L. Zwaan, Ed.), (Groningen: Wolters, 1957), 53-84; G. R. W. Dibbets, 'Anthoni Smyters over de spelling van het Nederlands (A° 1613)'. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsche Taal- en Letterkunde*, *102*, 2 (1986); Dibbets, 'Lambrechts *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe*'.

[209] Catach, *L'Orthographe française à l'époque de la Renaissance*, 233-234.

[210] Bosquet, *Elemens ou institutions de la langue françoise (1586)* (2005).

[211] S. Baddeley, 'Pierre Haschaert. *La maniere d'escripre, par abbreuiations : Auec vn petit traicté de l'orthographe Françoise* (1544)'. *Le français préclassique*, *18*, (2018).

orthographical quarrels and have repercussions on its chronology. Much alike the English case, where manuals for French language instruction became important for discussions on that vernacular, schoolbooks on Dutch or French from the Low Countries engaged in and shaped the debates on both languages.

*Traditional French Spelling*

While the French quarrel on spelling was still at its height, a schoolmaster from the Low Countries, Peter Haschaert, produced an educational text on French orthography.[212] Haschaert taught French in Lille for some time.[213] He wrote a treatise on French abbreviations and spelling for 'studious schoolchildren'.[214] It was printed in 1544 by his colleague Joos Lambrecht, who six years later published a work on Dutch spelling himself. Haschaert explicitly presented himself as taking part in the debates on French spelling. The structure of research on language histories, however, has caused his contribution and that of his colleague Jean Bosquet to fall between two stools: that of discussions on French within France, and that of discussions on Dutch in the Low Countries.[215]

Haschaert generally favours traditional, etymological spelling.[216] He rejects, for instance, the use of the 'k' in cases where the 'c' was pronounced as /k/, such as in 'comment' ('how'), and he maintains the unpronounced letters 's' and 'p' in 'escripre' ('to write').[217] The schoolmaster from Lille was aware of the fact that the etymological French spelling posed problems for native speakers of Dutch trying to learn French, 'who often create three or four syllables when pronouncing our said letters'.[218] He clearly acknowledges this problem, which was pointed out by supporters of reformed spelling, but he does not propose a solution.

---

[212] For the French *querelle de l'orthographe*, see: Chapter 3.4.

[213] On Haschaert, see: Baddeley, 'Pierre Haschaert'. Baddeley has pointed out that the schoolmaster Pierre Haschaert should not be confounded with the contemporary astronomer and physician with the same name. For the latter, see: A. Delva, 'Has(s)cha(e)rt (Hascar, Hassard, Haschard), Pieter (Pierre), arts, chirurgijn en astroloog'. *Nationaal biografisch woordenboek*. Vol. 13 (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1990); S. Vanden Broecke, 'The Ideal of a Knowledge Society in Dee's *Monas Hieroglyphica* (1564) and Other Productions by Willem Silvius'. *Ambix*, (2017), 12-14.

[214] 'studieux Escoliers'. P. Haschaert, *La maniere d'escripre par abbreuiations : Avec vn petit traicté de l'orthographe Francoise* (Ghent: Joos Lambrecht, 1544), sig. A1r.

[215] Haschaert is not mentioned in the seminal overview work on French orthography by Nina Catach. Overviews of the history of Dutch spelling do not refer to his work either: Catach, *L'Orthographe française à l'époque de la Renaissance*; Dibbets, 'Anthoni Smyters'; Baddeley, *L'Orthographe française*. Only recently, Baddeley devoted an article to Haschaert's text, which she also reproduced in full: Baddeley, 'Pierre Haschaert'.

[216] See: Chapter 3.4.

[217] Haschaert, *La maniere d'escripre par abbreuiation*s, sigs. B7v-B8r.

[218] 'Ie me tais encoire des Flamengs quy font bien souuent 3. ou 4. sillabes en prononçant noz dictes lettres'. Haschaert, *La maniere d'escripre par abbreuiation*s, sig. B2v.

Indeed, Haschaert was reluctant to change the spelling. Referring to French printer Geoffroy Tory's remarks on this topic in the *Champ flevry* (1529), Haschaert expresses the fear that without fixed rules, the spelling and vocabulary of the vernacular would swiftly change over time.[219] This changeability might cause great problems: 'That would be a great confusion for all literature and science, which God would not want'.[220] It would imply that future readers could not benefit from the writings of their predecessors because their language would have changed too much. Haschaert thus shows himself aware of the debates on the idea that the vernacular languages changed more quickly than Latin and might therefore be less stable.

Moreover, five years before Du Bellay's famous *La deffence, et illvstration de la Langue Francoyse* was published, Haschaert had already stated in the preface for his pupils that he wished to 'illustrate our mentioned noble and excellent language'.[221] Using the buzzword 'illustrate', that is, to render illustrious, Haschaert shows that he is alert to the language discussions in France and Italy.[222] He further mentions works on the topic by French authors Estienne Dolet and Clément Marot, designating them in the margins as 'Modern authors, illustrators of our language'.[223] The schoolmaster from Lille placed his own work within the French discussions, despite the fact that he was active outside of French territory.[224] He wrote in French, about French, when the quarrels in France were still vivid.

The only schoolmaster in the Low Countries discussing French spelling who has been studied by *querelle de l'orthographe* specialist Nina Catach is Gabriel Meurier. He became sympathetic to the debates in the 1550s, when interest in them in France was dwindling. Catach's studies of the spelling of Meurier's books printed by Plantin have revealed that he

[219] Tory, *Champ flevry*, fols. 3v-10r.
[220] 'Quy seroit vne grosse co*n*fusion pour toutes bones lettres & scie*n*ces: ce que Dieu ne vœulle'. Haschaert, *La maniere d'escripre par abbreuiatio*n*s*, sig. B2r.
[221] 'illustrer nostre dict noble & excellent langaige'. Haschaert, *La maniere d'escripre par abbreuiatio*n*s*, sig. A1v.
[222] Dante had already used the term in his *De vulgari eloquentia* (c. 1305). See: Book I, Chapter XVIII. Dante Alighieri, *Dante: De vulgari eloquentia* (S. Botterill, Ed. & Tr.), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 42-43.
[223] 'Autheurs modernes illustrateurs de nostre la*n*gue'. Haschaert, *La maniere d'escripre par abbreuiatio*n*s*, sig. A2r.
[224] Baddeley, 'Pierre Haschaert', 75-77.

made a relatively extensive use of accents in order to aid his students with pronunciation.[225] Nevertheless, he did support etymological spelling.[226]

In 1584, Meurier expressed himself very clearly in favour of this traditional spelling. When he reissued a dictionary in that year, he added a preface that acts as a manifesto for the traditional orthography, maintaining unpronounced etymological letters. In his opinion, anyone who wishes to 'remove and bastardize French from Latin' in order to facilitate pronunciation is a 'presumptuous idiot'.[227] To him, the Latin origins of French were a source of prestige and quality, and breaking those ties would be foolish. Meurier's preface is a reply to 'dozens of schoolmasters' who opposed the etymological letters that bugged their students.[228] Apparently, the discussions were far from over in the Low Countries.

Being a schoolmaster himself, Meurier could not deny the difficulty of French pronunciation. Echoing Du Bellay's famous words, Meurier states that every language has 'I do not know what something special, peculiar, different from one to another'.[229] As children are used to the pronunciation of their mother tongue, foreign languages often cause problems. For this reason, Meurier explains, he decided to add an accent to the 's' in cases where it should not be pronounced, such as 'chaśteau' ('castle'). After his death, one of Meurier's conversation manuals was reedited by Heyns's son-in-law Christiaan Offermans. As the title page of this 1628 edition indicates: 'To the benefit of the students, the letters that should barely or not be pronounced in the French language have been underscored'.[230] Perhaps following the model of French manuals created by teachers in England earlier in the sixteenth century, these

---

[225] Catach & Golfand, 'L'Orthographe plantinienne', 34. This is also reflected in his titles. Two works printed in 1557 indicate on their title pages that the author 'observed the punctuation, accents, interrogations, and annotations necessary for the said language' and added the 'accents of each word'. 'obserué les punctuations, Accens, Interrogations, & Annotations proprement requises audict Langage'. Meurier, *Colloqves, ov novvelle invention de propos familiers*, sig. A1r. 'Accens de chacun mot'. Meurier, *Vocabvlaire françois-flameng*, fol. 1r. W. de Jonge has argued that Meurier knew Étienne Dolet's treatise on punctuation. W. De Jonge, *Un maître de français à Anvers au XVI· siècle : Gabriel Meurier*. Unpublished dissertation (Ghent: Ghent University, 1965), 87.

[226] J. De Clercq, 'La *Grammaire françoise* (1557) de Gabriel Meurier'. In J. De Clercq, N. Lioce, & P. Swiggers (Eds.), *Grammaire et enseignement du français, 1500–1700* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 242-249.

[227] 'Et sy quelque presumptueux Cocard pretend de reculer & abastardir le Francois du Latin, pensant d'aiser la prononciation, & non ayant esgard à l'origine ou source des vocables, c'est à luy que ma plume en a, & s'addresse'. G. Meurier, *Dictionnaire francoys-flameng* (Antwerp: Jan I van Waesberghe, 1584), sig. *4v.

[228] 'maistres à la dousaine'. Meurier, *Dictionnaire francoys-flameng*, sig. *4r.

[229] 'je ne sçay quoy, de peculier, & different de l'vne à l'autre'. Meurier, *Vocabvlaire françois-flameng*, fol. 3v.

[230] 'Tot behulp der Leerlinghen, zijn de letters, diemen inde Fransoysche Tale weynich of niet prononceren en moet, onderteeckent'. G. Meurier & C. Offermans, *Dialogve, contenant les conivgaisons flamen-francois, par forme de demandes & responses* (Rotterdam: Isaac van Waesberghe, 1628), sig. A1r. The same was done in a 1636 Dutch-French and French-Dutch dictionary by Frisian schoolmaster Eduard Mellema, which contains partial crosses underneath or above unpronounced letters. E. E. L. Mellema, *Le grand dictionaire François-Flamen : Augmenté en ceste derniere edition d'vne infinité de Vocables, Dictions & Sentences tres-elegantes & necessaires: Recueilli des Dictionaires les plus copieux. Item un abregé des lettres qui ne se prononçent point* (Rotterdam: Isaac van Waesberghe, 1636).

schoolbooks attempted to clarify the complex pronunciation of the language by adding signs.[231] They thus reached a middle ground between the complaints of supporters of etymological and phonemic spelling, and between Meurier's personal views on spelling and his duties as a teacher.

Based on her study of Meurier, Nina Catach asserted that the quarrels on French spelling had a much longer afterlife outside of France.[232] This claim can be confirmed by considering another schoolmaster from the Low Countries, Jean Bosquet, whose case reveals that Meurier was not a lone wolf. Bosquet's French grammar was probably published for the first time in 1568, even though only the 1586 edition survives.[233] Its modern editor Colette Demaizière described this grammar book as 'the work of a practitioner rather than a theorist', as it was primarily meant as a pedagogical tool.[234] Nonetheless, Bosquet shows himself to be a spelling debater in the very first pages of the text. He claims that he was willing to 'spend several hours to read [the] controversies' and to react to them, thus keeping the discussion alive.[235]

In the preface to his grammar, addressed to his pupils, Bosquet tries to convince his clientele that he taught them a 'decent and not corrupted spelling'.[236] This decent spelling, to him, was the traditional, moderately etymological orthography: 'more common and simple spelling, and that, which we hold from our fathers since ancient times'.[237] Bosquet, who made a living teaching French, seems to want to make clear that the language as he instructed it was commonly used in France. This spelling thus perfectly suited people who relied on that language for commercial purposes and needed to present themselves as respectable and knowledgeable to their French contacts. Moreover, by referring to the francophone forefathers of the region of Hainaut, he appealed to emotions surrounding the concept of the fatherland. At the same time, this reference to an era long gone undermines complaints about the swiftly changing nature of the vernaculars.

Bosquet repeatedly criticizes the proliferation of different views on French spelling, but he assures his pupils that he is aware of all of them, so he can teach them the very best rules.

---

[231] See: Chapter 3.4.
[232] Catach, *L'Orthographe française à l'époque de la Renaissance*, 234-235.
[233] Bosquet, *Elemens ou institutions de la langue françoise (1586)* (2005), 12.
[234] 'plus un ouvrage de praticien que de théoricien'. Bosquet, *Elemens ou institutions de la langue françoise (1586)* (2005), 17.
[235] 'employer quelques heures, à lire leurs controuerses'. Bosquet, *Elemens ov institvtions de la langve Francoise* (1586), sig. *5r.
[236] 'orthographie decente, & non corrompue'. Bosquet, *Elemens ov institvtions de la langve Francoise* (1586), sig. *5r.
[237] 'orthographe plus commune, & simple, & telle, que nous tenons de noz peres de toute ancienneté'. Bosquet, *Elemens ov institvtions de la langve Francoise* (1586), sig. *5r.

He spends a large part of his preface on this point, suggesting that he expected his customers to be aware of the existence of the debates. Indeed, Bosquet added an overview of frequently asked questions regarding French spelling to his treatise. It discusses several rules that were contested during the quarrels, such as the spelling of the verb 'savoir' ('to know') as either 'sapvoir' or 'sçavoir'.[238] Bosquet also mentions French poet Pierre de Ronsard's preference for 'k' instead of 'c'. The schoolmaster explains that 'k' was used widely in Dutch and German, but he does not support its use in French.[239]

Bosquet both demonstrates his knowledge of the French debates and links it to other languages through comparison, showing the importance of multilingualism. Haschaert's, Bosquet's, and Meurier's orthographical works also matter because they make clear that the issues concerning French were discussed outside France, and in the latter two cases even after the time limit that is traditionally set for those debates. The orthographical quarrel regarding French was not confined to narrow geographical and temporal borders.

*Innovating Dutch Spelling*

Arguments that had been put forward in the *querelle* on French spelling were also adapted to the Dutch case. The debates on Dutch orthography were marked by comparison between French and Dutch, and conscious deliberation on what might or might not be useful for the Dutch language. Not surprisingly, most of the early orthographers of Dutch were schoolmasters, and several among them were teachers of French who could read the French material and were trained in comparing the two languages.[240]

It was a schoolmaster, Christiaen van Varenbraken, who in the 1530s had already written what is now known as the oldest treatise on the spelling of the Dutch language.[241] It is part of a manuscript on the liberal arts. Nevertheless, Van Varenbraken's text does not tie in with the quarrels in France that started around the same time, and it does not seem to have sparked a lively discussion itself. By the middle of the century, the growing fascination with

[238] Etymologists did not agree whether this word had been derived from the Latin word 'sapere' or from 'scire'. Bosquet argues that the 'scire' supporters are right and thus proposes 'sçavoir' rather than 'sapvoir' as the correct spelling. Historical linguists later determined the verb had been derived from 'sapere'. Baddeley, *L'Orthographe française*, 102.

[239] Bosquet, *Elemens ov institvtions de la langve Francoise* (1586), 28-29.

[240] Geert Dibbets has established a list of known orthographical works written before 1613. Six of the eleven treatises he mentions were written by schoolmasters: Joos Lambrecht, Anthoni Smyters, David Mostart, Jacob van der Schuere, Pieter de Berd, and Adriaen vander Gucht. Dibbets, 'Anthoni Smyters'. See also: G. R. W. Dibbets, 'Dutch Philology in the 16th and 17th Century'. In J. Noordegraaf, K. Versteegh, & Konrad Koerner (Eds.), *The History of Linguistics in the Low Countries* (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1992), 46.

[241] W. L. Braekman, 'Twee nieuwe traktaten uit de vroege zestiende eeuw over de Nederlandse spelling'. *Verslagen en Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde*, 2 (1978).

language created the right conditions for debate. In 1550, schoolmaster-printer Joos Lambrecht published his *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe*, strongly inspired by the ideal of a reformed, phonemic writing that was at that time still defended in France. Lambrecht's innovative proposals for Dutch spelling were sure to trigger a response.

Lambrecht wished to propose a new orthographic system for Dutch, in which every sound could be represented by only one sign, and vice versa. He thus, in a way, attempted to formulate universal rules for the spelling of Dutch.[242] In practice, however, Lambrecht realized that every speaker of the language pronounced specific sounds differently. He proposed that everyone should write as they spoke:

> Not that it is my opinion or insight, that Hollanders or Brabanters should change their own pronunciation into the Flemish way, or the Flemish and Frisians change theirs into the Brabantine or Hollandic pronunciation. Rather, that everyone may write those vocables or syllables, as he uses in his mother tongue, with the necessary letters.
>
> Niet dat mijn meanijnghe of verstand zy, dat de Hollanders, of Brábanters haar eighen manieren van uutsprake, op de Vlaamsche wíze, of de Vlámijnghen ende Vriezen haar pronunciacie, op de Brábantsche, of Hollandsche uutsprake veranderen zullen: maar dat elc in tsine zulke termen of silleben van spráken, als hy in zijnder moeder tálen ghebruukt, de zelue déghelic, ende met zulken letters alsser toe dienen, spellen magh.[243]

Lambrecht does not aim to dissolve dialectal variation. He wants to preserve it both in speech and in writing, but with the help of clear rules about the link between sound and sign.

---

[242] For a discussion of Lambrecht's proposals, see: J. Taeldeman, 'Joas Lambrechts *Nederlandsche Spellijnghe* (1550) als spiegel van het (Laat-)Middelgentse vokaalsysteem'. *Naamkunde*, *17*, (1985); Dibbets, 'Lambrechts *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe*', 15-19.

[243] Lambrecht, *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe*, sig. A2v.

As becomes clear in this passage, Lambrecht expanded the existing set of letters and signs. While he does not refer to his French sources of inspiration explicitly, his use of the 'ȩ' to represent the *schwa* or *e muet* seems to indicate that he must have known the work of Peletier du Mans, as it is unlikely that he came up with the same solution independently of Peletier. In 1928 Paul de Keyser had already studied Lambrecht's sources and listed Peletier. Nevertheless, De Keyser and the later students of Lambrecht, J. Taeldeman and Geert Dibbets, did not reflect on the interesting chronology present in this seemingly straightforward case of influence. Although Peletier's *Dialoguȩ Dȩ l'Ortografȩ* contains a privilege for the year 1547, it was not printed until 1550, the same year in which Lambrecht printed his *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe*.[244] It seems that somehow, Lambrecht had learned about the contents of the *Dialoguȩ* immediately after or even before their publication. This suggests that he followed the *querelle* closely and might have read the *Dialoguȩ* in manuscript form or conversed with either Peletier himself or someone familiar with his work.

Lambrecht's elaborate use of the *accent grave* and *accent aigu* and the fact that he proposes the sign 'ę' with cedilla for 'ae' might indicate that he also knew Meigret's *Trętté de la grammęre françoęze*, which also saw the light of day in 1550, or one of Tory's or Meigret's earlier texts on accents (1529 and 1542).[245] Lambrecht was not behind on the French debates; he was right on top of them. The quarrels on French and Dutch spelling were so closely related for this schoolmaster-printer that it is virtually impossible to separate them.

For the parts on punctuation, Lambrecht used Étienne Dolet's 1540 treatise on translation and punctuation marks.[246] Lambrecht follows the exact order in which Dolet discusses the different punctuation marks. Moreover, the *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe* gives almost literal translations of certain passages.[247] While Lambrecht adapted and improved the French proposals for letters and accents thoroughly for the Dutch case, for punctuation such changes were apparently not essential.

---

[244] De Keyser mentions these dates in a footnote but does not reflect on them further. There does not seem to be a lost earlier edition, as Peletier writes in the 1555 edition that he wanted to 'put it on display a second time', making the 1550 edition the first one. 'lȩ mętrȩ an vuȩ pour la sȩcondȩ foęs'. J. Peletier du Mans, *Dialogvȩ dȩ l'Ortografȩ e Prononciacion Françoęsȩ, dȩpartì an deus Liurȩs* (Lyon: Jean de Tournes, 1555), sig. i8r; P. De Keyser, 'De bronnen van Joos Lambrechts *Nederlandsche Spellijnghe*'. *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire. Belgisch tijdschrift voor philologie en geschiedenis*, *7*, 4 (1928), 1355n3.

[245] Lambrecht, *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe*, sigs. A7r-A8r, B3v; De Keyser, 'De bronnen van Joos Lambrechts *Nederlandsche Spellijnghe*', 1354.

[246] Dolet, *La maniere de bien tradvire*.

[247] De Keyser, 'De bronnen van Joos Lambrechts *Nederlandsche Spellijnghe*'.

Finally, it is relevant to remark that Lambrecht, like his colleague Tory in France in the 1530s, was aware of the difficulties posed by the use of 'i' and 'j', and 'u' and 'v'.[248] In his spelling treatise Lambrecht introduced a dot underneath 'i' and 'u' when they are used as consonants [Figure 6].[249] His *Naembouck*, published four years earlier, in 1546, seems to be the first printed book in Dutch which distinguishes 'u' and 'v'.[250] This distinction is also maintained in the French words in the dictionary, through which Lambrecht simultaneously placed himself within the debates on French orthography.

Figure 6.
Lambrecht's remarks on 'i' and 'j', and on 'u' and 'v' in the *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe*.

After Lambrecht's treatise, no French schoolmasters published on Dutch spelling for over half a century, but in the second decade of the seventeenth century there was a sudden surge in interest in the topic. In 1612, Jacob van der Schuere issued his treatise on Dutch orthography. Like Lambrecht, whose work he surely must have known—although he does not mention him—Van der Schuere proposed a reformed spelling of Dutch that was inspired by French defences of phonemic spelling. He does not follow all of Lambrecht's proposals, however. Van der Schuere supports a uniform spelling, regardless of one's dialect.[251] Importantly, the only spelling debater explicitly mentioned by Van der Schuere is Pléiade poet Pierre de Ronsard. Rather than referring to a source on Dutch spelling, he alludes to the French discussions through this poet. Ronsard is usually seen, by students of the French *querelle*, as a disciple of Meigret, who himself is not mentioned by Van der Schuere.[252]

In the preface to his treatise, Van der Schuere quotes a passage from Ronsard's *Abbrege de l'art poëtique François* (1565) that summarizes the poet's main viewpoints on spelling. The most important element is that all superfluous letters should be avoided. Van der Schuere explains that speakers of Dutch are quick to criticize unpronounced letters in French writing, which suggests that French spelling was widely discussed by speakers of Dutch. They fail, however, to see the log in their own eye, that is, the superfluous letters in Dutch.[253] This line of thought incites Van der Schuere to apply reformed spelling in Dutch.

[248] Baddeley, *L'Orthographe française*, 36.
[249] Lambrecht, *Néderlandsche Spellijnghe*, sig. A6r.
[250] Lambrecht, *Naembouck*, sig. A2v; Van der Sijs, *Calendarium*, 77.
[251] Dibbets, 'Anthoni Smyters', 107.
[252] Catach, *L'Orthographe française à l'époque de la Renaissance*; Baddeley, *L'Orthographe française*.
[253] Van der Schuere, *Nederduydsche spellinge*, 4.

Van der Schuere is particularly determined to reject all redundant letters, such as the combinations 'ck' and 'gh', which should be replaced by 'k' and 'g'.[254] Following Ronsard's use of the *accent aigu*, Van der Schuere distinguishes 'e' from 'ee' and 'é'.[255] Like Ronsard, who followed Meigret in this respect, Van der Schuere uses 'v' and 'j' for the consonants and 'i' and 'u' for the vowels.[256] Although no direct links can be found between Van der Schuere's treatise and Meigret, it is possible that the schoolmaster knew his works as well as Ronsard's.[257]

In the year following Van der Schuere's publication, another teacher of French, Anthoni Smyters, felt obliged to react to the proposals concerning his native tongue. His reason for this was that 'they create such confusion for the instructors of the youth, that we could not […] refrain from speaking our thoughts about this'.[258] The phonemic ideal is, in Smyters's opinion, unreachable because of the dialectal variety within the Dutch speech community. Smyters's reference to other schoolmasters suggests once again that these issues were discussed much more widely than the written and printed traces reveal, especially in educational circles.

Smyters called on his fellow debaters to make use of the example of the French discussions, where after years of experiments with phonemic spelling, the traditional orthography had been restored. According to Smyters this had so much impact 'that now in all of France, one uniform orthography is used'.[259] He calls on debaters of Dutch to benefit from the French case and not to try to reinvent this wheel, which would not even work anyway.

To support his call for a traditional spelling, Smyters uses arguments that are similar to those used by the defenders of such orthography for French. Like Haschaert decades earlier, he points out the importance of stability, and thus of maintaining the existing rules rather than

---

[254] The 'h' had probably been added to the 'g' in early Dutch writings in order to distinguish the Dutch letter 'g', pronounced [χ], from the French 'g', pronounced [ʒ]. Willemyns, *Dutch*, 71.

[255] Van der Schuere, *Nederduydsche spellinge*, 5-6, 33.

[256] Van der Schuere, *Nederduydsche spellinge*, 22-23, 29.

[257] Van der Schuere, *Nederduydsche spellinge*, xiv; Dibbets, 'Dutch Philology', 40-41.

[258] 'daer mede (de instrueerders der Ioncheyt) sulcken vverringe toebrengen, dat vvy niet nalaten en connen […] ons gevoelen daer van te seggen'. A. Smyters, *Schryf Kunst Boeck Daerinne gheleert worden Velerleye Nederlandtsche, Italiaensche, Spaensche ende Hooghduytsche handtgheschriften. Met fondamentele onderrichtinghe, hoe men allerhande Zendtbrieven die Lieden van middelen Staet ende sonderlinghe de Coopliden dienende, sal leeren dichten ende ordentlyck byschrift stellen* (Amsterdam: Henric Meurs, 1613), 4. The confusion mentioned by Smyters becomes particularly clear in dictionaries of the time, which were often made and used by schoolmasters. Many of them felt the need to warn readers about spelling or to redirect them in cases where words could be spelled differently, such as words starting with 'ph' or 'f'. See, for example: M. Sasbout, *Dictionnaire francois flameng tresample et copievx, avquel on trouuera vn nombre infini de termes & dictions, plus qu'en ceux qui jusques à present sont sortis en lumiere. Derechef corrigé & augmenté plus de deux mille dictions. Auec vn Traicté singulier de la Nauigation, Venerie, & Fauconnerie, approprié à la langue Flamengue* (Antwerp: Jan I van Waesberge, 1583); Mellema, *Dictionaire ou promptvaire Flameng-Francoys*; Smyters, *Epitheta* (1620), sig. ?8r.

[259] 'dat men nu gheheel Vrancrijck door, eene eenparighe Orthographie siet ghebruycken'. Smyters, *Schryf Kunst Boeck*, 9.

changing them.[260] He refutes, furthermore, the argument of learnability: 'this innovation does not benefit us, our neighbours, or strangers who wish to learn the Dutch tongue'.[261] Whereas the supporters of phonemic spelling claimed that it was easier to learn the rules of writing if sound and sign were connected, Smyters claimed that there were no good reasons to adopt the phonemic style, 'as is demonstrated by the fact that the new French orthographic treatises died before their authors'.[262]

Smyters clearly wishes to incorporate the experiences and arguments from the French debates into the discussions on the Dutch language, using them as a source of inspiration to further discussions on his mother tongue. He also adopts the French language as a medium for reflecting on Dutch and for disambiguation. The following example serves to illustrate this: 'with the word *Goudt*, whether *de l'or* [gold] is meant, or *bon* [good]'.[263] This passage comments on the letter combination 'ou', which could be pronounced in two ways. French becomes a metalanguage, allowing Smyters to speak about Dutch.

Clearly, the role played by schoolmasters in the discussions on Dutch spelling cannot be ignored. These orthoepists kept the legacies of French spelling debaters alive through the adaptation of their ideas to the Dutch cause. They were not simply influenced and inspired by the French quarrels, they actively reflected on ways to apply carefully selected elements to Dutch. A final remarkable element concerns the frequent references of Dutch authors to Ronsard instead of to Louis Meigret, who is now considered to have been the most prominent spelling debater. Could it be that schoolmasters preferred to mention him rather than Meigret because of the literary prestige of his poetry, or was it because of a possible negative reputation of Meigret as having lost the discussion? The visibility of Ronsard within the Dutch spelling debates demands a reconsideration of the French source material. Indeed, studying discussions on Dutch spelling can reveal new information about the French quarrels, not just the other way around.

[260] Smyters, *Schryf Kunst Boeck*, 7.
[261] 'soo men met de nieuvvicheydt gheen voordeel en doet, voor ons selfs, voor onse nabueren ende voor de vremdelinghen, die de Nederduytsche sprake begeiren te leeren'. Smyters, *Schryf Kunst Boeck*, 9-10.
[262] 'ghelijck de hervarentheydt ghetuyght, dat der nieuvver Franse Orthographien Boecken, voor hare Autheuren ghestorven zijn'. Smyters, *Schryf Kunst Boeck*, 10.
[263] 'met het vvoordeken *Goudt*, oftmen *de l'or*, ofte *bon* meyndt'. Smyters, *Schryf Kunst Boeck*, 5.

*Heyns's Exceptional Grammar*

Various masters of French schools, such as Meurier and De Vivre, published grammars of the French language. They contain little explicit reflection on the structure of the language.[264] They have been studied by historians of French grammaticography, who situated them among other grammar books of French and who thus took an important step by incorporating texts from within and outside France in their studies.[265] The value of these school grammars lies in the fact that they adopted elements from texts produced in France and introduced them in the Low Countries. This is also true for Peeter Heyns's *Cort ondervvijs* (1571), which presents the French grammar in eight different parts. However, Geert Dibbets showed the importance of this text in the history of Dutch, after which it received ample attention from historians of that language, such as Els Ruijsendaal and Nicoline van der Sijs, who further contextualized the *Cort ondervvijs*.

Ruijsendaal has described the *Cort ondervvijs* as an integrated grammar book, referring to the fact that it illustrates the rules it proposes with examples of sentences.[266] Dibbets has shown how every rule Heyns formulated and illustrated for French is also exemplified for Dutch, as the schoolmaster provides translations of his examples.[267] In the following citation, Heyns thus gives the nominative, genitive, and dative forms of the name Jacob in both French and Dutch:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Nomi. | Iaques. | Jacob. |
| Geni. | De Iaques. | Jacobs. |

[264] In Meurier's case, this apparent lack of reflection is perhaps caused by the fact that the only known surviving copy of his grammar misses two crucial pages from the dedication. Pierre Swiggers observed that the number of second-language grammars printed in the sixteenth-century Low Countries was remarkably low compared to the number of dictionaries. Meurier, *La grammaire françoise* (1557); G. de Vivre, *Grammaire Françoise, tovchant la lecture, Declinaisons des Noms, et Coniugaisons des Verbe […]. Frantzösische Grammatica. Wie man die Sprach soll lehren lesen und schreiben, Die Nomina Declineren, und die Verba Coniugeren […]* (Cologne: Maternus Cholinus, 1566); G. de Vivre, *Grammaire françoise (1566) suivie de Briefve Institution de la langue françoise expliquée en aleman (1568)* (B. Hébert, Ed.), (Paris: Honoré Champion, 2006); Meurier, *La grammaire françoise* (2005); Swiggers, 'Capitalizing Multilingual Competence', 58-59. See also: P. Swiggers, 'Regards sur l'histoire de l'enseignement du français aux Pays-Bas (XVI$^{e}$–XVII$^{e}$ siècles)'. *Documents pour l'histoire du français langue étrangère ou seconde*, *50*, (2013).

[265] De Clercq, 'La *Grammaire françoise* (1557) de Gabriel Meurier'; G. Holtus, 'Gérard du Vivier: *Grammaire françoise* (1566)'. In J. De Clercq, N. Lioce, & P. Swiggers (Eds.), *Grammaire et enseignement du français, 1500–1700* (Leuven: Peeters, 2000); P. Swiggers, 'Au nom du nom : langage, grammaire et réalité au XVI$^{e}$ siècle'. *Le français préclassique*, *16*, (2014). See also: P. Swiggers & J. De Clercq, 'Franse grammatica en taalonderwijs in de "Lage Landen" tijdens de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw'. *Meesterwerk*, *4*, (1995).

[266] E. Ruijsendaal, '1598–1998: De grammaticus Peeter Heyns herdacht'. *Meesterwerk*, *14*, (1999), 26; Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 413.

[267] Dibbets, 'Peeter Heyns' *Cort onderwijs*'; Dibbets, 'Une grammaire importante'.

Datif. A Iaques. Jacoben.[268]

The format of explained grammatical rules illustrated by Dutch examples makes this French-language grammar book simultaneously a description of the Dutch vernacular. Nicoline van der Sijs has called the first edition of 1571 the oldest printed grammar book of the Dutch language, although not in intention.[269] Heyns himself does not even reflect on the fact that no grammar had been written for Dutch.

Geert Dibbets has traced the main concepts and ideas on which Heyns based his grammar back to treatises on the French language by Louis Meigret, Robert Estienne, and Jean Garnier. Through his integrated grammar, Heyns introduced some of these French grammarians' ideas into the Low Countries. He thus repeats Garnier's reflections on words that only exist in singular form, such as 'la chair' ('the flesh').[270] He later added ideas of authors from the Low Countries. Several reeditions of the *Cort ondervvijs* must have been printed after 1571, but only versions from 1591 and 1605 seem to have survived, the former of which has recently been rediscovered.[271] Dibbets has demonstrated that this later edition was inspired by the *Twe-spraack*, while maintaining the earlier French influences.[272]

Vice versa, the author(s) of the *Twe-spraack* must have known the contents of the *Cort ondervvijs*, as the former work quotes several verse lines from a laudatory poem inserted into Heyns's grammar.[273] Heyns certainly did not operate in a vacuum in the Low Countries. His work has been shown to have influenced publications on the Dutch vernacular by later language debaters Anthonis de Hubert, Christiaen van Heule, Samuel Ampzing, and Petrus Montanus. Traces have also been found in schoolmaster Jacob van der Schuere's treatise on orthography.[274]

Whether Heyns also influenced later French grammars has not yet been studied. Geert Dibbets and Els Ruijsendaal have skilfully examined French and Dutch influences on the text, and the way the grammar itself influenced other Dutch texts.[275] As the *Cort ondervvijs* is first and foremost a grammar of French, it might also be worthwhile to study the ways in which this

[268] Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. B5v.
[269] Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 413; Van der Sijs, *Calendarium*, 87.
[270] Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. B1v.
[271] A copy of the 1591 edition, which was printed in Delft, has been found in the Forschungsbibliothek Gotha by the author of this book. Heyns, *Cort onderwys* (1591).
[272] Dibbets, 'Peeter Heyns' *Cort onderwijs*', 97-99.
[273] Indeed, Spiegel himself wrote a poem for one of the editions of the *Cort ondervvijs*. *Twe-spraack*, 103; Dibbets, *Twe-spraack*, 341; Dibbets, 'Peeter Heyns: "een ghespraecksaem man, van goede gheleertheydt"', 12-13.
[274] Dibbets, 'Peeter Heyns' *Cort onderwijs*', 103-105; Ruijsendaal, 'De grammaticus Peeter Heyns herdacht', 27.
[275] Dibbets, 'Une grammaire importante'; Heyns, *Cort onderwijs* (2006).

work influenced later French works. Heyns's grammar is only one in an array of sources that concern the French tongue but have been produced outside of France, and that deserve to be studied by historical linguists in that context, too.

### 4.4. Teaching Purity and Eloquence

Many schoolmasters' contributions to the early modern reflections on French and Dutch have been unjustly neglected by historians of both languages. One aspect, on the contrary, has been exaggerated. French schools have been described as important sources of French loanwords entering the Dutch tongue.[276] However, rather than defending themselves against supposed accusations concerning their use of loanwords, schoolmasters used eloquence and richness of vocabulary as their selling points. In this *lieu* in which good-quality language was for sale, purity was not what won the hearts of the customers. Eloquence did. Otherwise, an opportunist like Peeter Heyns would certainly have used his reputation as an infrequent user of loanwords to promote his schoolbooks and his school, which saw various periods of financial hardship.[277]

The established methods for training the skill of eloquence were, in the spirit of the time, multilingual. Through often bilingual dictionaries and other collections of language phenomena, students compared languages and figures of speech to broaden their vocabulary. They further practised their skills through translation, the primary tool for language learning in early modern Europe. In dictionaries and translation manuals, schoolmasters could really promote their language materials, using the marketing catchphrases *copia* and *varietas* rather than *puritas*.

#### *Trivial Loanwords*

Heyns's *Cort ondervvijs* has received attention from historians of the Dutch language not only for its importance for Dutch grammar, but also for matters of vocabulary. Heyns created translations for most of the French and Latin grammatical terms he used in the 1571 edition, and even more in the 1605 version. Indeed, in the latter edition almost all French terminology is provided with a Dutch translation, such as 'Voor-setsel' for 'Preposition' ('preposition') and 'inworp' for 'jnterjection' ('interjection').[278] Heyns was among the first to introduce these

[276] Van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking*, 11. See also: Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 583.
[277] On the ways in which Heyns presented himself and his school in his publications in order to establish a good reputation, see: Van de Haar, 'Beyond Nostalgia'.
[278] Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. G4v.

learned neologisms in his mother tongue.[279] Nevertheless, he does not exploit this feature in the liminary texts. The only time he explicitly writes about loanwords in the whole of his extant oeuvre is in the 1605 re-edition of his *Cort ondervvijs*. In the preface, he states without further comment that he had decided to 'take up the pen once more […] to translate the learned terms more clearly into Dutch'.[280]

In general, references to loanwords and purity are remarkably rare in sixteenth-century schoolbooks for French and Dutch language instruction, and most remarks that are made on the topic are superficial. The only teacher who devoted an entire poem to the topic of purity in a schoolbook is Anthoni Smyters, in a 1595 Dutch translation of a French fable book to which Heyns had contributed. However, this poem was dedicated not to colleagues or to his clientele of students, but to 'the lovers of rhetoric', that is, the fellow rhetoricians of this schoolmaster-poet.[281] In his *Epitheta*, too, Smyters only mentions linguistic purity when he describes the efforts that 'our Dutch rhetoricians' have done for the construction of the Dutch tongue.[282]

Gabriel Meurier, not dissimilarly to Heyns, never claimed to avoid borrowings in his schoolbooks. It was not until after he died that his colleague Christiaan Offermans stated in a reedition of one of his books that the work was useful to 'teach pure French to the youth'.[283] And even here, it is important to place a critical note. Offermans does not explicitly refer to loanwords, and it cannot uncritically be assumed that his use of the term 'pure' indeed refers to borrowing. In this context, it might just as well mean 'proper' French in a more general sense.

Showing himself to be aware of the language debates, Offermans goes on to discuss the Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric *De Eglentier*, as well as Marnix, who is described as 'one of the first among the excellent thinkers in his knowledge of multiple languages'.[284] They are applauded for their attempts 'to bring Dutch back to its ancient perfection'.[285] This nostalgic

---

[279] De Clercq, 'Gabriel Meurier, een XVI[e]-eeuws pedagoog en grammaticus in Antwerpen', 37; Ruijsendaal, 'De grammaticus Peeter Heyns herdacht', 26-27.

[280] 'noch een mael de penne in de handt nemen, […] om de Const-woorden wat duydelijcker te verduytschen'. Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. A2v.

[281] 'de liefhebbers der Rhetorijke'. A. Smyters, *Esopvs Fabelen. In rijm ghestelt door Anthoni Smyters. Waer by gevoeght zijn sommighe stichtelijcke veerskens, van H. Guy du Faur, Heere van Pybrac Raetsheere des koninck van Vrancrijc* (Rotterdam: Jan II van Waesberghe, 1604), sig. A1v. This work is a translation of: *Les fables d'Æsope, et d'avtres, en rithme Françoise* (Haarlem: Gillis Rooman for Zacharias Heyns, 1595). P. J. Smith, *Het schouwtoneel der dieren: Embleemfabels in de Nederlanden (1567–ca. 1670)* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2006), 37-38; P. J. Smith, *Dispositio: Problematic Ordering in French Renaissance Literature* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2007), 154-158.

[282] 'onse Nederlandtsche Redenrijckers'. Smyters, *Epitheta* (1620), sig. ?2v.

[283] 'd'enseigner purement le François à la Ieunesse'. Meurier & Offermans, *Dialogve*, sig. A2r.

[284] 'l'un des premiers entre les excellents en l'intelligence de plusieurs langues'. Meurier & Offermans, *Dialogve*, sig. A2r.

[285] 'de ramener le Thyois à son ancienne perfection'. Meurier & Offermans, *Dialogve*, sig. A2r.

description of the Dutch language strongly suggests an allusion to Becanus, with whose works Offermans, as Heyns's son-in-law and successor, would certainly have been familiar.

Both Marnix and *De Eglentier* are symbols of the pursuit of a pure Dutch language. Nevertheless, Offermans's elaborate reference to their works does not serve a discussion on loanwords. They concern a different matter, namely the use of 'du' rather than 'ghy' to refer to the second-person singular, which was defended by both Marnix and *De Eglentier*.[286] This passage is relevant because it shows how well informed Offermans was of the debates on language. Offermans even claims, in the preface, that he discussed the matter regarding 'du' with Heyns.[287] Moreover, Offermans's allusions to *De Eglentier* and Marnix show that their reputations as language debaters reached far beyond their opinion on loanwords.

Two more points deserve to be mentioned with regard to the discussions on loanwords in educational environments. It must be emphasized that pursuit of a rich vocabulary and pursuit of purity are not mutually exclusive. Voices and opinions can be nuanced and complex and should not be reduced to black-and-white thinking. Moreover, discussions on loanwords in the Low Countries and by native speakers of Dutch did not necessarily concern Dutch alone, but can also pertain to the other vernacular of the region, French, or indeed another language altogether.

These two points are illustrated by Gerard de Vivre, a friend and colleague of Heyns's who fled from Ghent to Cologne in the early 1560s. There, he wrote several French manuals for native speakers of German and Dutch, published in Cologne, Antwerp, and Paris, in which he frequently laments the state of his war-torn fatherland.[288] Like Heyns, De Vivre's case transcends linguistic and political borders because of his travels and use of various languages.

In a 1569 book titled *Synonymes*, De Vivre explained his wish 'to demonstrate the richness of the French language'.[289] By providing lists of synonyms for a great number of words, De Vivre shows the extensiveness of the French vocabulary. He hoped this would aid his teaching, as he complained in another schoolbook that no one had more difficulty learning French than the Germans, who apparently were not as famous as speakers of Dutch for their

---

[286] Marnix, *Het Boeck der psalmen Dauids*, sigs. A4v-A5r; *Twe-spraack*, 85-86; Dibbets, *Twe-spraack*, 462; Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 468-469.

[287] 'as I have heard multiple times from my father-in-law Peeter Heyns'. 'selon que i'ay plusieurs fois entendu de mon beau pere M. P. Heyns'. Meurier & Offermans, *Dialogve*, sig. A2r.

[288] G. de Vivre, *Synonymes, c'est a dire plvsievrs propos, propres tant en escrivant qv'en parlant, tirez quasi tous à vn mesme sens, pour monstrer la richesse de la langue Françoise […]. Synonyma. Das ist, ein versamlung viler wort eines gleichen verstandts und meinung, erzeigend die Reichtumb der Franzosischer sprachen, gleich im schreiben als auch im lesen* (Cologne: Heinrich von Aich, 1569), sigs. A1v-A3r; De Vivre, *Lettres missives familieres*, 38v.

[289] 'pour monstrer la richesse de la langue Françoise'. De Vivre, *Synonymes*, fol. 1r.

language skills.[290] In the Dutch-French conversation manual in question, De Vivre explained his wish to 'purify and facilitate' the French language for his students.[291] It thus seems that this schoolmaster combines an attention to eloquence with a rejection of loanwords. Here, too, however, it is not wholly certain that 'purify' actually refers to borrowing, as it might also be interpreted as 'to simplify' or 'to improve'.

One last example suffices to prove that the use of loanwords in French was unquestionably discussed in educational circles in the Low Countries. One year before De Vivre's *Synonymes*, a quadrilingual edition of Berlaimont's multilingual manual was printed in Antwerp that took part in the debates on French more directly. It states on its final page that 'scummers' are increasingly using Italianizing superlatives in French, such as 'benissime' ('very good') and 'lourdissime' ('very heavy').[292] Through its use of the metaphor of scum and the reference to borrowing from Italian, this Antwerp manual displays a familiarity with the discussions on loanwords related to French. Henri II Estienne's famous dialogue criticizing Italian loanwords was not published until a decade later, in 1578, which illustrates the timeliness of the remark in the Berlaimont book.

In the extant language manuals, teachers of French did not feel the need to defend foreign language learning against people who feared that bilingualism might cause language mixing, because individuals with those beliefs seem to have simply been quite rare.[293] If they rejected loanwords in French or Dutch, it was not because this was appreciated by their clientele but because of their own views on language. The wider audience continued to value eloquence and *copia*.

---

[290] De Vivre, *Dovze dialogves*, sig. A2r. On the other hand, the impenetratability of the German language itself was proverbial. Middle French knew the saying 'only hearing German', meaning not understanding anything. It was recorded by François Rabelais. 'n'y entendre que le hault Alemant'. P. J. Smith, 'Les langues de Panurge : une relecture'. In D. Desrosiers, C. La Charité, C. Veilleux, & T. Vigliano (Eds.), *Rabelais et l'hybridité des récits rabelaisiens.* Études rabelaisiennes 56 (Geneva: Droz, 2017), 611.

[291] 'purifier & faciliter'. De Vivre, *Dovze dialogves*, sig. A2r.

[292] 'ecumeurs'. N. de Berlaimont, *Dictionario coloqvios, o dialogos en qvatro lengvas, Flamenco, Frances, Espaiñol y Italiano […]. Dictionnaire colloqves, ov dialogves en qvatre Langues : Flamen, François, Espaignol, & Italien […]* (Antwerp: Jean Bellère, 1568), sig. Hh3v.

[293] One schoolmaster, Jean Bosquet, a native speaker of French from Hainaut, did address a fear of contamination, but it concerned not lexical mixing but influence on pronunciation, and not the connection between French and Dutch, but between French and Latin. According to Bosquet, two supporters of Latin had claimed that teaching French might impair the way in which children pronounced that classical language. Bosquet replied that his own pupils had no problems with their Latin pronunciation. Bosquet, *Elemens ov institvtions de la langve Francoise* (1586), sigs. *2r-*3r.

*Dictionaries: Expanding and Correcting Vocabularies*

Interactive teaching methods existed to train transferable skills and improve students' vocabulary and their knowledge of figures of speech and sayings that could render their speech more copious and eloquent. In the words of schoolmaster Jan van den Velde, sayings added 'grace' to one's language, resonating with the Europe-wide fashionability of this term.[294] In a bilingual conversation manual written by Meurier and dedicated to Heyns, one of the girls proposes to practise eloquence: 'Let everyone recite their proverb'. A classmate zealously replies: 'Who does not deliver some saying shall not eat'.[295] Directly after dinner, the girls in Meurier's dialogues test each other's French skills through a competition. The winner, speaking most elegantly, receives a beautiful wreath, while the loser is forced to wear a fool's cap. The girls challenge each other to find translations and synonyms for Dutch and French words, ending in word games and even the discussion of a French rebus.[296] Through play and competition, children expanded their vocabulary and stock of useful phrases.

Teachers made their pupils collect proverbs and maxims in order to construct a ready corpus of sayings from which they could delve to embellish their texts and speech.[297] This educational tool of the commonplace book has strong ties with the fashion of collecting language specimens.[298] Schoolbooks that were frequently used for eloquence exercises meant to enhance the spoken and written eloquence of children were the alphabetically ordered dictionary or the thematically ordered vocabulary book. These books were used as manuals, studied by pupils to learn new words.[299] It is thus no coincidence that in such lexicographical texts, reflections on eloquence and loanwords are frequent.

---

[294] 'considering the grace and great ornament that the encounter of such short and sententious sayings brings to the language'. 'veu la grace & grand ornement qu'apporte au langage la rencontre de telles dictions tant brieves & sententieuses'. J. van den Velde, *Bovqvet printanier, Contenant plusieurs belles Fleurs de diverses Sentences, recueillies és Iardins des plus excellents Poëtes, tant Anciens que Modernes* (Rotterdam: Jan II van Waesberghe, 1613), sig. *6r.

[295] 'M. Dat een yeghelijc haer spreecwoort segghe. R. Wie niet en seyt eenige spreuke, die en sal niet eten'. 'M. Que chacune recite son prouerbe. R. Qui ne recitera quelque sentence, ne mangera pas'. Meurier, *La gvirlande*, fol. 39r.

[296] Meurier discusses the French rebus 'G a', that is 'G grand, a petit' ('big G, small a'), meaning 'J'ai grand appétit' ('I am very hungry'). This rebus was also mentioned by Geoffroy Tory in his *Champ flevry*. Tory, *Champ flevry*, fol. 42r; Meurier, *La gvirlande*, fol. 43r.

[297] Schoolmaster and calligrapher Jan van den Velde, for instance, explains in a collection of maxims that he tasked his students with bringing a new saying to school every day. Van den Velde, *Bovqvet printanier*, sigs. *3v-*4r. See further: Meadow, *Pieter Bruegel the Elder's Netherlandish Proverbs*, 56-57.

[298] For more information on the commonplace book as educational tool, see: A. Moss, *Printed Commonplace-Books and the Structuring of Renaissance Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996); A. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information Before the Modern Age* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010).

[299] Bierbach, 'Wörterbücher', 141; R. McConchie, 'Introduction'. In R. McConchie (Ed.), *Ashgate Critical Essays on Early English Lexicographers.* Vol. 3. *The Sixteenth Century* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012), xvi.

Thanks to the precious work of Frans Claes, the contours of the vast corpus of monolingual, bilingual, and multilingual word lists that were published in the Low Countries have been mapped.[300] The same is true for the ways in which they were influenced by dictionaries printed in France, such as those by the Estienne family, which was central to Claes's research. However, he did not go so far as to study the conception of language that they conveyed.

The recent work of John Considine has given an important stimulus to research on early modern dictionaries, showing how they gave expression to the shared language heritage of European speech communities.[301] At the same time, Considine argues that the multilingual character of most dictionaries was essential for thinking about community building across language boundaries by providing the possibility of discerning a shared corpus of concepts.[302] He thus demonstrates both the inward-looking and outward-looking movements present in discussions on language, focusing on both the mother tongue and other languages. Studying the prefaces of early modern dictionaries in the Low Countries confirms this two-directional process proposed by Considine. They express a sense of pride in Dutch or French while showing an interest in links with other languages. Rejections of loanwords, moreover, are the exception rather than the rule, which was formed by appraisals of eloquence.

The educational genre of the dictionary got involved in the debates when Joos Lambrecht published his *Naembouck* in 1546.[303] This text has been strongly connected to reflections on purity, as its title announces it to contain a list of 'unscummed Flemish words'.[304] Strangely enough, besides this term in the title, the book does not give any reflections on borrowing. The preface even contains several loanwords, such as 'distincciën' ('differences') and 'affeccie' ('affection').[305] The use of the metaphor of scum reveals that Lambrecht was

---

[300] See, for instance: F. M. Claes, 'Ontwikkeling van de Nederlandse lexicografie tot 1600'. *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde*, *86*, (1970); F. M. Claes, 'De lexicografie in de zestiende eeuw'. In D. M. Bakker & G. R. W. Dibbets (Eds.), *Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taalkunde* (Den Bosch: Malmberg, 1977); F. M. Claes, 'Frans-Vlaamse lexicografen'. *De Franse Nederlanden. Les Pays-Bas français*, *6*, (1981); F. M. Claes, 'Über die Verbreitung lexikographischer Werke in den Niederlanden und ihre wechselseitige [sic] Beziehungen mit dem Ausland bis zum Jahre 1600'. In A. Noordegraaf, K. Versteegh, & E. F. K. Koerner (Eds.), *The History of Linguistics in the Low Countries*. Studies in the History of the Language Sciences 64 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1992); Claes, 'Vocabulaires et livres de conversation'. See further: P. Swiggers & E. Zimont, 'Dutch-French Bilingual Lexicography in the Early Modern Period: A Checklist of Sources'. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft*, *25*, (2015). See further: M. Lindemann, *Die französischen Wörterbücher von den Anfängen bis 1600: Entstehung und typologische Beschreibung* (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1994).

[301] See: Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*; Considine, *Academy Dictionaries*.

[302] Considine, *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe*, 288-313.

[303] On the structure of this text and its qualification as dictionary, see: P. Swiggers, 'Le *Naembouck* (1546–1562) de Joos Lambrecht'. *Cahiers de Lexicologie*, 91 (2007).

[304] Van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking*, 17.

[305] Lambrecht, *Naembouck*, sig. A1v.

familiar with the debates on loanwords, but his own view was seemingly moderate. Since René Verdeyen's 1945 edition of the *Naembouck*, Lambrecht has too easily been placed among opponents of loanwords, despite the fact that his own practice shows a less clear picture.[306]

While dictionaries by sixteenth-century schoolmasters rarely promote themselves on their title page as rejecting loanwords, references to richness and *copia* are commonplace. The tandem 'very rich and copious' is repeated over and over.[307] Through these allusions to rhetorical notions, these dictionaries immediately appeal to the discussions on the question whether the vocabulary of the vernaculars was rich enough to communicate religious, scientific, or literary matters. They promise to allow their speakers to cultivate the rhetorical ideal of *elegantia*, writing in a pleasing and ornate style.[308]

Dictionaries were also used as platforms to take part in the Europe-wide debates on the hierarchy and genealogy of language. This is illustrated by the works of the highly productive lexicographer Eduard Mellema, who was born in Leeuwarden and later taught French in Antwerp, Haarlem, and Leiden in the final decades of the sixteenth century. Mellema produced various bilingual dictionaries containing French and Dutch. Contrary to Heyns, who was a fervent supporter of Dutch, in a 1591 Dutch-French dictionary Mellema defended French as being the best vernacular:

> [T]he very noble and very perfect French language, which has great affinity with Greek, but especially with Latin, and which in my opinion reigns and is used as the most common, the easiest, and even the most accomplished of all those in the Christian world, after the three

[306] For studies describing Lambrecht as opposing loanwords, see: R. Verdeyen, *Het* Naembouck *van 1562: Tweede druk van het Nederlands-Frans woordenboek van Joos Lambrecht* (Paris: Droz, 1945), cxi; Van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking*, 17; Van der Sijs, *Taal als mensenwerk*, 358-359.

[307] 'tres ample et copieux'. These words are mentioned on the title pages of: M. Sasbout, *Dictionaire flameng-francoys tres-ample et copieux, auquel on trouuera vn nombre presque infini de termes & dictions, plus qu'en ceux qui jusques à present sont sortiz en lumiere, auec plusieurs formes & manieres de parler tres elegantes* (Antwerp: Jan I van Waesberghe, 1576); M. Sasbout, *Dictionaire francoys-flameng tresample et copievx, avqvel on trouuera vn nombre presque infini de termes & dictions, plus qu'en ceux qui jusques à present sont sortiz en lumiere, auec plusieurs forms & manieres de parler tres-elegantes* (Antwerp: Jan I van Waesberghe, 1579); G. Verniers, *Dictionaire francois-flamen, Tresample & Copieux* (Ghent: Jean de Salenson, 1580); Mellema, *Dictionaire ou promptvaire Flameng-Francoys*; Mellema, *Dictionaire francois-flamen*.

[308] Mathias Sasbout, for instance, promises that his dictionary teaches 'multiple very elegant ways of speaking'. 'plusieurs formes & manieres de parler tres-elegantes'. Sasbout, *Dictionaire francoys-flameng* (1579), sig. *1r. See also the title page of: Sasbout, *Dictionaire flameng-francoys*; E. E. L. Mellema, *Dictionaire ov promptvaire francoys-flameng, tres-ample et tres-copieux: de nouveau composé, corrigé & enrichi presque d'une infinité de Vocables, Dictions, Sentences, Gnomes ou Phrases tres-elegantes & tres-necessaires* (Rotterdam: Jan II van Waesberghe, 1592).

> mentioned languages [Hebrew, Latin, and Greek] (despite what Italian may think).
>
> [L]a tresnoble & tresparfaite langue Françoise, laquelle di-je apres les trois susdictes (maugré que m'en sçaura l'Italienne :) regne & s'vse pour la plus communne, la plus facile, voire la plus accomplie de toutes autres en la Chrestienté, laquelle a grande affinité avec la Grecque, mais surtout avec la Latine.[309]

This citation shows that, rather than defending his Dutch or possibly Frisian mother tongue, Mellema praises French, while respecting the authority of the *tres linguae sacrae*, Greek, Hebrew, and Latin.

It is clear that Mellema was not some unlearned French enthusiast. In the style of Becanus, with whose work it is very well possible he was familiar, he points out the learnability and low degree of difficulty of a language as a marker of its perfection. He further displays an awareness of the discussions on language in France, as he recognizes competition existed with Italian, which had a stronger claim on the languages' shared Latin heritage because it had remained closer to it in form. Moreover, by pointing out the 'great affinity' between Greek and French, the schoolmaster shows himself conscious of treatises by Henri II Estienne and others on the great similarities between the two tongues and the possible genealogical ties between them.[310] Elsewhere, Mellema comments on the 'fruitful richness' and 'rich structure' of French, which 'guides the secrets of human reason'.[311] To Mellema, the essential point seems to be the richness of the French language, which makes it suitable to act as a medium for all aspects of 'human reason', be they scholarly, religious, or other.

---

[309] Mellema, *Dictionaire ou promptvaire Flameng-Francoys*, sigs. A3v-A4r.

[310] Around 1565, Henri II Estienne published his *Traicte de la conformité du language François auec le Grec*, in which he pointed out to what extent French resembled Greek in both structure and vocabulary. While Estienne commented on the similarities and influence of Greek on French, others before and after him argued, on the basis of the resemblances between the two languages, that there was a familial tie. The political and economic philosopher Jean Bodin and the humanist clergyman Joachim Périon, for example, tried to demonstrate that French had evolved out of Greek. For more information on early modern interest in the links between French and Greek, see: C. Schmitt, 'Gräkomane Sprachstreitschriften als Quelle für die französische Lexikographie'. In M. Höfler & H. Vernay (Eds.), *Festschrift Kurt Baldinger zum 60. Geburtstag, 17 November 1979*. Vol. 2 (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1979); Trudeau, *Les inventeurs du bon usage*, 116-117; Cohen, 'La Tour de Babel', 31; Metcalf, *On Language Diversity*, 119n22.

[311] 'la faconde richesse'. 'sa riche structure'. 'guidant les secrets de la raison humaine'. Mellema 1592, sig. ?1v.

Mellema's case can also be used to shed light on the loanword question. In 1599, his printer Jan II van Waesberghe reissued his French-Dutch dictionary. A passage had been added to it about loanwords, probably by either Mellema or Van Waesberghe, warning that students should be aware that words borrowed from Latin and Italian were maintained in French. Rather than giving a value judgment on the practice of borrowing, the unknown author explains that most of these words are no longer in use. They have not been removed from the dictionary for a very practical reason: 'so that the youth is not left without help when they read somewhere these rare and unknown words and cannot find their meaning in their dictionary'.[312] The treatment of loanwords in this dictionary displays a pragmatism that was omnipresent in the discussions on borrowing, like in Coornhert's use of loanwords in cases where it suited him.[313] This case also matters for showing that the discussions on loanwords in the Low Countries concerned not only Dutch but also French as a target language.

In an earlier example, loanwords were explicitly presented as a source of eloquence. The 1583 edition of a French-Dutch dictionary by Mathias Sasbout, who worked as a corrector for Plantin around that time, explains in a postscript that a preceding edition of the text had generated some complaints regarding loanwords. The topic was, evidently, discussed in educational circles. Regardless of the criticism, in the new edition loanwords were maintained. Instead of giving the loanword's translation, the dictionary redirects the reader to its unborrowed French equivalent. The entry 'Consul' ('consul') thus tells the reader to look under 'Dictateur' ('dictator').[314] The reason for this decision is that 'while searching from one entry to another, one learns to use different names for one and the same thing, which can be greatly useful when translating or writing some text'.[315] Children using this dictionary thus automatically expanded their French vocabulary as they were redirected from one word to another. Because of this method, their speech and writing could become marked by *varietas* and truly become 'ample and copious'. Loanwords—again concerning the French language—were not dismissed by Sasbout, they were welcomed.

It is thus clear that loanwords were not generally rejected. However, it is important not to fall into the same pitfall of generalization that marked previous research by falsely pretending that loanwords were commonly approved. There was debate and disagreement, as well as

[312] 'pour ne laisser la ieunesse en suspens, quand lisant quelque part ces mots rares & incogneus n'en trouve pas l'interpretation en son Dictionnaire'. Mellema, *Dictionaire francois-flamen*, sig. A3r-A3v.
[313] See: Chapter 2.2.
[314] Sasbout, *Dictionnaire francois flameng* (1583), sig. F5r.
[315] 'en cerchant [sic] d'vne diction à l'autre, on apprenne à nommer vne mesme chose en plusieurs sortes : ce qui peut grandement seruir pour traduire ou composer quelque escrit'. Sasbout, *Dictionnaire francois flameng* (1583), sig. Gg1r.

nuance and pragmatism. An anonymous 1595 trilingual dictionary provides a counterexample to the above approvals of borrowing that should not be silenced. The preface explicitly disapproves of 'scummed words' in Dutch.[316] It does list words that are borrowed from French and Latin but, like Sasbout's dictionary, they redirect the reader to the approved Dutch form of the word in question. The entry 'Abandonneren', for example, sends its readers to 'Verlaten' ('to abandon').[317] The preface presents this as a corrective method, stimulating children to replace the loanwords with the promoted Dutch terms.

Dictionaries made by teachers of French correct the image that loanwords were generally rejected, and that they were only discussed with regard to Dutch. They showcase the appreciation of eloquence and *copia* as well as the attention given to French by native speakers of Dutch, like Mellema. The lexical heritage of both Dutch and French was appreciated, but this did not necessarily mean that influence from other languages was feared.

### *Translating Style, Translation Styles*

Another method that was adopted by schoolmasters to train the rhetorical and lexical skills of their pupils was translation.[318] By translating from one language into another and back again, children could expand their vocabulary and learn useful sentence structures. This practice supports Hendrik Laurensz. Spiegel's claim that, 'He who only speaks one language, speaks none well'.[319] Various bilingual schoolbooks in French and Dutch were published in the sixteenth-century Low Countries, enabling the students to verify their translations.[320] Translations allowed students to improve their eloquence and second-language competence while stimulating language comparison. Moreover, the discussions on translation reached educational circles, as teachers debated the question of which method best suited books

---

[316] 'gheschuymden woorden'. *Trium linguarum dictionarivm Tevtonicae, Latinae, Gallicae* (Franeker: Gillis van den Rade, 1595), sig. *2v.

[317] *Trium linguarum dictionarivm*, sig. *2v.

[318] For a discussion on the place of rhetoric in the early modern classroom, see: Wesley, 'Rhetorical Delivery'. On translation, see: Kibbee, *For to Speke Frenche Trewely*, 184; J. M. Pérez Fernández & E. Wilson-Lee, 'Introduction'. In J. M. Pérez Fernández & E. Wilson-Lee (Eds.), *Translation and the Book Trade in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 14; Sumillera, 'Language Manuals', 67; Coldiron, *Printers without Borders*, 260; Gallagher, *Learning Languages in Early Modern England*.

[319] 'Die maar een taal wel kan, kan gheen taal wel vertolken'. Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. A3r.

[320] Examples of bilingual vocabulary books are: De Vivre, *Dovze dialogves*; Meurier, *La gvirlande*. Bilingual prose texts are: G. Luython, *La merueilleuse et ioyeuse vie de Esope […]. Dat wonderlijck en*de *genuechlijck leue*n *van Esop*us *[…]* (Antwerp: Gregorius de Bonte, 1548); *Dbeghintsele der Wijsheyt, sprek*ende *va*n *duechden ende onduechden. Mitsgaders de maniere om altijt wel en*de *wijsselijck te spreken. Le commencemen*t *de Sagesse, parlan*t *des vertus & vices, Ensemble la maniere de tousiours bien & sagement parler* (Antwerp: Jan II van Ghelen, 1552); *De historie vanden ouden Tobias*; J. Florianus & C. Plantin, *Reynaert de vos. Een seer ghenouchlicke ende vermakelicke historie: in Franchoyse ende neder Duytsch. Reynier le renard. Histoire tresioyeuse & recreatiue, en François & bas Alleman* (Antwerp: Christophe Plantin, 1566).

designed for school use: literal, word-for-word translation, or a more free sense-for-sense translation.

A 1565 quadrilingual Berlaimont edition promotes itself by announcing on the title page that it has been 'structured exactly so that the four languages coincide line per line'.[321] The parallel layout enabled the users of the book to easily recognize the equivalent of each word in the other language. This method was also adopted by Glaude Luython, a schoolmaster from Valenciennes who taught French in Antwerp until his death in 1568.[322] Luython created a bilingual edition of the life of Aesop, in which each page contains two columns: French on the left and Dutch on the right [Figure 7].[323] As the schoolmaster explains in the preface, he has taken much care to make the two languages correspond horizontally 'so that every word and sentence, from one to another, always corresponds and synchronizes between two points'.[324] By using this perfectly equilibrated bilingual book, the students could make their Dutch and French speech 'well styled'.[325] Ultimately, one-on-one translation would thus benefit one's style of speaking, according to Luython.

Figure 7.
Luython's parallel translation of the life of Aesop.

Several years later, in 1566, Christophe Plantin teamed up with a Latin schoolmaster from Antwerp, Johannes Florianus, to make a bilingual edition of the story of Reynard the Fox in French and Dutch. They, too, decided to place the languages in separate columns next to each other. Contrary to Luython, however, they did not opt for a literal translation: 'One will not find everything word for word, because that was impossible, as we wished to maintain the nature and individuality of the two languages'.[326] Plantin and Florianus thus support a sense-for-sense

[321] 'tellement mis en ordre, que lon peut accorder les quatre langues de reigle à reigle'. Berlaimont, *Dictionaire*, fol. 1r.
[322] R. Verdeyen, 'Un recueil précieux d'éditions anversoises du XVI[e] siècle : Glaude Luython, le maître d'école de la paroisse de St.-André'. *De Gulden Passer*, *2*, (1924), 182-186 ; Claes, 'Frans-Vlaamse lexicografen', 97.
[323] On the use of parallel texts for language education, see: G. Armstrong, 'Coding Continental: Information Design in Sixteenth-Century English Vernacular Language Manuals and Translations'. *Renaissance Studies*, *29*, 1 (2015), esp. 84.
[324] 'ordonnee tellemen*t*, que chascun mot et sentence lune a lautre, tousiours entre deux pointz respondt et accorde/ gheordineert also, dat elck woort ende sentencie deene op dandere, altijts tusschen twee puncten respondeert en*de* accordeert'. Luython, *La merueilleuse et ioyeuse vie de Esope*, sig. A2r.
[325] 'bien stilez', 'wel gestyleert'. Luython, *La merueilleuse et ioyeuse vie de Esope*, sig. A2r.
[326] 'Niet datme*n* allesins woort tegen woort vinde*n* sal (want ten was niet wel mogelijc, alsoo verre men de nature en*de* proprieteyt wilde houden van beyde de tale*n*/ Non pas qu'on le trouue par tout rendu mot pour mot (car il n'estoit pas bie*n* possible, pourueu qu'on vousist garder la nature & proprieté des deux la*n*gues'. Florianus & Plantin, *Reynaert de vos*, sig. A5r. For a modern edition of the text, see: H. Rijns & P. Wackers (Eds.), *De gedrukte Nederlandse Reynaerttraditie: Een diplomatische en synoptische uitgave naar de bronnen vanaf 1479 tot 1700* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2007).

translation method. Using the same argument as Étienne Dolet in his 1540 treatise on translation, they argue that it is impossible to respect the unique character and style of each language in literal translation.[327] Ironically, Florianus dedicated the text to the very Glaude Luython who had propagated literal translation as the best tool for bilingual stylistic training.

These schoolbooks, like Dolet's treatise, took centre stage in the debates on language. Through their prefaces, even their young users could come into contact with the reflections on language and think about them in their formative years, sparking new generations of language thinkers. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the discussions lasted so long, never reaching a final consensus.

### 4.5. Conclusions

Heyns and the network of friends and colleagues related to him demonstrate the close connections that existed between the debates on the Dutch language and those on the French language. Through publications like Heyns's French grammar and the orthographical treatises of Lambrecht and Van der Schuere, these schoolmasters took on the role of intermediaries, fostering exchange between contributions in and on French, Dutch, and Latin. At the same time, rather than acting as marginal figures, they positioned themselves firmly within the discussions on French as well as Dutch.

Teachers in French schools were so on top of the debates on French and Dutch that multiple cases have come to light in which they appear to have been aware of the content of particular works before or immediately after they were published: Heyns knew the unprinted work of Becanus, and Lambrecht might have been familiar with a Peletier text that came out in the same year as his. Through his schoolbooks, Heyns made francophone and Dutch-speaking audiences aware of the content of Becanus's Latin treatise on Dutch. French schoolmasters were essential plurilingual go-betweens, allowing the debates to become as well informed and transregional as they did. Because of their work, defenders of Dutch could use the arguments that had been used in the French discussions as stepping stones to solidify their own case.

It has become unquestionable that pedagogical language manuals were just as important for the debates on the form of French and Dutch as treatises on language designed for study. Moreover, the exchanges on language have been attached too narrowly to academically trained communities. Middle-class teenagers in their formative years, boys as well as girls, came into

[327] See: Chapter 3.4.

contact with the discussions on language through their schoolbooks and received the ideal training to reflect on and take part in the discussions themselves.

The contributions of French schoolmasters to the debates on French and Dutch were marked by their professional use of both languages, showing that context is key when studying language discussions. Their manifest interest in the quarrels on the spelling of French and Dutch are surely related to their daily encounters with the topic in the classroom, as is supported by the fact that learnability was their go-to argument. It would be a mistake to interpret the fact that schoolmasters in the Low Countries continued to reflect on French orthography long after the *querelle* in France had come to a standstill as them simply lagging behind. The issue itself had not been resolved, and therefore the discussions lost none of their topicality.

The defences of language learning are indissolubly linked to the fact that this constituted the income source of the schoolmasters, as well as to the growing interest in civic virtue. Especially in the context of the Low Countries, where bilinguals could bridge the gap between the Dutch-speaking and French-speaking parts of the population, language teaching was a form of serving the *patria*. Teaching both languages in a good and sound manner is what earned Heyns the title of 'double soldier' in a time when the local population had witnessed all too many real soldiers fighting for what they deemed right for the fatherland.[328]

The issue of loanwords is put into perspective when considered in light of the French schools. Schoolmasters apparently did not face anxieties that bilingualism would lead to language contamination, as they did not defend themselves against such fears, nor did they promote themselves as opponents of borrowing. In rare cases where the purity of language was discussed, it concerned French at least as often as Dutch, which has been overlooked thus far. For these language instructors, eloquence, not purity, was the primary selling point. They tackled concerns that the vernaculars might not possess the lexical richness to act as scientific, religious, or literary languages, and branded themselves as 'Prefect[s] of the treasury of [their] language', to repeat the words of Vives quoted at the beginning of this chapter.[329] By training the language users and debaters of tomorrow, schoolmasters claimed their role as defenders of the fatherland.

[328] 'dubbel Soudenier'. Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. A3r
[329] Translated by F. Watson: Vives, *Vives on Education*, 103.

## 8. Conclusions

'Who only speaks one language, speaks none well'.[330] These words, written by Hendrik Laurensz. Spiegel in honour of Peeter Heyns, could have been the motto of the fascination with language in the Low Countries. The multilingual situation that marked the area and its literary culture imbued and shaped thinking about its two local languages, Dutch and French. Both Spiegel and Heyns were key representatives of this multilingual character of the reflections and discussions on the Dutch vernacular: Spiegel as the likely author of the *Twe-spraack*, of which the revolutionary and monolingual reputation has been put into perspective and contextualized, and Heyns as a bilingual schoolmaster-rhetorician who, being a critical go-between, determined which French elements were suitable for adaptation in the Dutch language.

The ascertainment that the sixteenth-century discussions on language were shaped by the multilingual character of daily life in the Low Countries has strong implications. Studies on the history of the Dutch and French languages and their respective literatures fail to do justice to the multilingual contemporary reality when an attempt is made to catch them within a monolingual framework or within the geographical boundaries imposed by modern-day state borders. Narrow overviews of the history of the French language risk overlooking, for instance, the role played by Christophe Plantin and foreign schoolmasters in the history of French spelling, or the extent to which the writings of Ronsard influenced orthographical discussions in the Low Countries. The prince of poets has revealed himself to be the primary ambassador of French spelling. Just as striking is the case of Leeuwarden schoolmaster Eduard Mellema, who glorified and promoted neither Frisian nor Dutch, but French. Mellema shows that language defence was not confined to one's native vernacular—even in Friesland.

The fact that the multilingual language debates touch the core of the literary histories of both languages is made apparent by Heyns's innovative opinion on versification. It evolved through the experimentation and comparison of French and Dutch poetic forms. Moreover, comparative analysis of Philips of Marnix of Sainte-Aldegonde's *Biënkorf* and *Tableav* has shown how crucial aspects of these texts have systematically escaped the attention of modern scholars who were focused either on Marnix's oeuvre in Dutch or on in his works in French. This study of the early modern language debates has thus shown that, because of the multilingualism and openness of the Low Countries, a historical literary overview of this region that comprises only literature in Dutch will always fall short. Moreover, the choice for a

[330] 'Die maar een taal wel kan, kan gheen taal wel vertolken'. Heyns, *Cort ondervvijs* (1605), sig. A3r.

particular language and for a specific language form in a literary text—including loanwords or not, adopting a certain spelling or not, and so on—can hold much information for literary historians, as the various texts studied here have demonstrated. Taking the chosen language for granted means disregarding a wealth of information.

Attention to other languages and literatures was stimulated by the growing competition between countries and languages. As demonstrated by remarks by the likes of Cornelis van Ghistele and Willem Silvius, a sense of rivalry was particularly felt towards the other language of the Low Countries, French. These texts also mention the native tongue of their contested sovereign, Spanish, as well as Italian and the neighbouring (High) German. Because of its close genealogical relation to Dutch, some language debaters, such as printer Hans de Laet, proposed German as a potential donor of loanwords. Both De Laet and Dirck Volkertsz. Coornhert saw German as being superior to and more developed than Dutch. These statements strongly suggest that by the second half of the sixteenth century, Dutch and German had grown into two separate languages in the minds of their speakers. The anxiety of deficit with regard to German is remarkable in light of later remarks by members of the *Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft*. They held quite the opposite view, namely that Dutch literature surpassed that of German. Feelings of competition were thus not necessarily unidirectional.

Competition and comparison of different languages allowed insight into what was special and unique about the mother tongue and its literature. In the case of Dutch, for instance, it was the high number of monosyllabic words that stood out, as proposed by Johannes Goropius Becanus and his followers Heyns and Simon Stevin. Becanus further argued that the pronunciation of Dutch contained no extremes, making this vernacular the embodiment of the golden mean of languages. Moreover, comparison revealed positive elements in other languages that might be adopted in order to improve the native vernacular—for example, when Jacob van der Schuere proposed that Dutch follow Ronsard's advice for French spelling. The open attitude towards other languages, finally, also offered the possibility of finding inspiration in defences of other languages. Various arguments and concepts that marked the debates on French and Dutch in the Low Countries circulated throughout Europe at that time, such as the terms 'illustration', 'grace', 'energie'/'enargie', and, of course, 'scum'. In these cases, it is not always clear who scummed whose terminology, and Dutch does not seem to have been solely on the receiving end.

In light of the growing competition with other languages and the outbreak of the Dutch Revolt, the many instances where schoolmasters and printers supported their view on Dutch and French by referring to the notion of fatherland obtain added significance. References to

notions such as the greater good were not reserved excusively for cases where the Dutch language alone was used and defended. Whenever French, the other language of the region, was involved, similar claims could be made, inspiring Spiegel to praise Heyns as a soldier defending both tongues of the Low Countries. Moreover, language learning in general enjoyed a certain esteem, since it was seen as benefitting the *patria*. Feelings of patriotism, if not proto-nationalism, were expressed to an increasing degree, and they could be related to one or both languages of the Low Countries, or to the multilingual abilities of its inhabitants.

Through their connection with the common good, the discussions on language frequently extended beyond the literary domain into the political and social field, connecting language history and literary history to political and religious history. Richard Verstegan demonstrated how, by denouncing the language use of the opposing party, these debates could be used for political purposes in the context of the Dutch Revolt. A similar method was applied on a larger scale by Marnix in the religious domain. By falsely accusing his Catholic opponents of having a defective grasp of and view on language, he made the discussions on language religiously relevant. Contrary to what Marnix suggested, religious preference had no defining effect on one's opinion on language, one's ability to speak multiple languages, or one's ability to participate in the language debates: Spiegel was a Catholic, while Heyns became a Calvinist.

As Marnix's wide language interests amply show, the discussions were more multifaceted than the sole topics of purification and uniformization to which they have been often reduced since Lode Van den Branden's monograph on the topic. The general fascination with language also dealt with, for instance, the histories of various languages and their genealogical relations, which were studied by Marnix, and the sound structures of different tongues examined by the rhetoricians.

Furthermore, the focus on standardization and the wish to paint the language debates in black-and-white terms do injustice to the variety of opinions on the improvement of Dutch and French that were expressed by members of all the *lieux* studied here. Everyone was trying to find a golden mean, but there was no consensus about what these perfect middle forms of Dutch and of French, respectively, were. The defence and rejection of loanwords were supported with equally valid arguments; as a result, the topic continued to be discussed up to the present day. This period was marked by an appreciation of or at least neutral stance towards variety, an appreciation that shaped opinions on dialectal and orthographic diversity. A few exceptional individuals proposed regularization of spelling, but none of their proposals were widely adopted. These early modern source texts support the pertinence of the work of historical linguists who have looked beyond standardization alone. The concept of standardization is, just

like Van den Branden's triad of illustration, purification, and construction, insufficient to describe the sixteenth-century language debates: these notions do not do justice to the diversity of the attempts to improve and defend the Dutch language, let alone French.

The broad scope of the discussions on language is reflected in the source texts used for this book. They cover a diverse set of genres, including schoolbooks, dictionaries, psalters, satirical writings, poetry, and scholarly treatises on language as well as on seemingly unrelated topics, like anatomy and weight measurement.[331] The people behind them are equally diverse and certainly not restricted to academic environments either. The Persian-Germanic thesis, designed by humanists such as Justus Lipsius and Joseph Justus Scaliger, became known to Marnix as well as to rhetorician Govert van der Eembd. The ideas of Johannes Goropius Becanus gained a wide reception in Dutch- and French-speaking environments, leaving traces in the works of Heyns and *Den Nederduytschen Helicon*.

Studying the classical languages was not reserved for academic scholars either. Both Matthijs de Castelein and the authors of the *Twe-spraack* were interested in the sound structure of Latin in comparison to Dutch. This example further illustrates the continuum existing between rhetoricians like De Castelein and those responsible for the *Twe-spraack*, where earlier scholars supposed a breach. Both were interested in classical and foreign examples. Both, furthermore, actively reflected on the question of which of those models could be followed to forge the Dutch language into a perfect shape while respecting the form and structure of that vernacular.

This study has further altered the general chronology of the discussions as perceived since Lode van den Branden's monograph on the topic. The starting point of the intensification of language reflection in the Low Countries has been advanced to the 1540s. According to Van den Branden, Jan Gymnick's Livy translation of 1541 was an early anomaly.[332] However, several other important texts reflecting on language were created in this decade: Haschaert's work on French spelling of 1544; Lambrecht's 1546 *Naembouck*; and De Castelein's *De const van rhetoriken*, which was written in 1548. Van den Branden overlooked Haschaert as a supporter of French, and De Castelein as a rhetorician, but their cases prove that there was a continuity in the language reflections in the Low Countries from Gymnick onwards. The first, 1546 edition of Lambrecht's *Naembouck*, currently preserved at Museum Catharijneconvent in Utrecht, was only rediscovered after Van den Branden's monograph was published. He knew

[331] On anatomy, see: Valverda de Hamusco, *Anatomie*. On weight measurement, see: Stevin, *De beghinselen der weeghconst*.
[332] Van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking*, 16.

the 1562 text on which he based his research was the second edition, but he assumed its predecessor had been printed between 1550 and 1553, as had been suggested by Lambrecht's modern editor René Verdeyen.[333]

While the first printed contributions to the language debates date from the 1540s, the topic was by then probably discussed widely. Oral discussions must have played a much greater part in the distribution of concepts and arguments than can now be determined. In addition, there are clues that suggest that some treatises on language circulated in manuscript form before being printed, both within and outside the region in which the language they targeted was spoken. This might explain the connections between Lambrecht and Jacques Peletier du Mans's work, between Heyns and Becanus's, and between Van der Eembd and Grotius's, before any of the latter texts were printed.

The printed texts in question in all likelihood only reveal the tip of the iceberg that constitutes the discussions on the vernaculars in the sixteenth-century Low Countries, especially since various texts encouraged their readers to join their community of knowledge and debate. The dictionaries published by Plantin's *officina* are good illustrations of this principle. These texts fostered the early modern culture of knowledge production in vernacular environments. More extensive analysis of surviving copies of texts like these is necessary in order to be able to determine to what extent readers actually obeyed these calls and engaged in studies of language by adding to dictionaries, grammars, orthographical treatises, and so on.

The main conclusions of this book are not only relevant in case of Dutch, but also with regard to studies on the early modern debates on language in other European regions. The discussions on French, English, German, and so on have been studied largely from a monolingual perspective. The observation that the debates in the Low Countries involved both French and Dutch and were mainly played out by plurilinguals in texts with a multilingual background gives reason to revaluate the monolingual approach that has been applied to other regions. The debates on the form of the English language, for instance, need to be reconsidered in relation to French as well as Dutch. Ultimately, it would take the challenging task of writing an overview work with a truly pluridirectional, multilingual scope to reveal the full interconnectedness of the discussions on all these languages.

To avoid the pitfalls of monolingual research, this book adopted a spatial approach. Four *lieux* form its pillars: French schools, Calvinist churches, printing houses, and chambers of rhetoric. While this spatial approach allowed the transcendence of linguistic confines, it also

[333] Verdeyen, *Het* Naembouck, xvii; Van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking*, 17; E. Cockx-Indestege, 'The first edition of the *Naembouck* by Joos Lambrecht (1546)'. *Quærendo*, *1*, 1 (1971).

enabled a certain level of perceptivity towards the ways in which a particular professional, social, cultural, and even material context shaped the early modern reflections on language. Indeed, it has become apparent that each of the four *lieux* was marked by a focus on particular elements.

Masters of French schools supported, from a professional standpoint, the traditional French spelling that allowed them to attract pupils to their schools. Nevertheless, they had much more innovative views on Dutch orthography, such as in the case of Jacob van der Schuere, who wanted to rid this vernacular of all superfluous letters. This insight is relevant for historians of education, who tend to describe schoolmasters as implementing rather than creating new ideas on language. Individuals like Van der Schuere and Heyns played an important intermediary role between discussions in France and those in the Low Countries by including the ideas of French debaters in their French and Dutch publications. Whereas spelling was thus an important issue in educational circles, loanwords were not. Schoolmasters responded to the language interests of their clientele by using eloquence rather than purity as a selling point for their teaching activities.

In the newly forming Calvinist communities, the confrontations between different dialects and vernacular languages that intensified because of large-scale refugee movements stimulated attention to the ability of language to foster or hinder internal cohesion. The safe haven in London, where Marnix oversaw the creation of a bilingual community, provides an example of this growing awareness. Within the Calvinist community, juggling its different languages, translation strategies were an important topic. The Calvinist psalm translations by Jan Utenhove, Petrus Datheen, and Marnix himself exposed and attempted to offer solutions to the religious consequences of language diversity. Language was thus used to foster internal unity, but also to attack outsiders: in his *Biënkorf* and *Tableav*, Marnix falsely accused Catholics of having a faulty attitude towards language, helping to create a distorted image of the clergy that would have long-lasting effects.

Printing houses were crucial nodes in the network of distribution on which the language debates depended. Plantin offered the public not only theoretical contributions to the discussions, but also tools that allowed them to take an active, inquisitive stance themselves, such as polyglot dictionaries that could be used for comparative studies of the lexicon. It is remarkable that, with the exception of Plantin, so few calls were made in these environments for orthographical uniformization. This is a topic with which this *lieu* has traditionally been connected by book historians and historians of language, but it seems to have been taken up by schoolmasters to a much greater extent. To sell their works, printers responded to the increasing

competition with other languages instead. In contrast with schoolmasters, they did use the discussions on borrowing to their advantage, using promises of a loanword-free text in order to sell their works.

Having passed from the classroom to the church and the corrector's room, the final visit to the chamber of rhetoric allowed this book to come full circle. In the chambers, individuals connected to the three previous *lieux* came together to practice rhetoric—people such as the schoolmasters Heyns, Van der Schuere, and Jan Boomgart, and the religious men Matthijs de Castelein and Jan van Mussem. They demonstrate how strongly all these environments were connected. As places where individuals with an interest in the liberal arts convened to practise the art of rhetoric in Dutch, it is not surprising that virtually all topics of the language debates were on the agenda. In the domain of spelling, their extant calls to follow certain rules are more numerous than those by printers. Rhetoricians were not interested uniquely in Dutch. From their earliest onsets onwards, the chambers were marked by an open mindset towards other languages and literatures, particularly French.

Approaching the sixteenth-century literary culture of the Low Countries through the spatial parameters of *lieux* has proven to be a successful way to avoid the pitfalls imposed by modern national languages and borders. Nevertheless, it has its downsides; it forces other individuals to the margins. Even though the focus of this book is led by its four central *lieux*, it has therefore allowed space for short excursions to visit relevant individuals in the nearby surroundings. Without mentioning Tielman Susato and Johan Radermacher, for instance, this book on the sixteenth-century language debates would have been incomplete.

An element that connects all four *lieux* is their geographical distribution. In each case, the balance of the geographical placement of the actors involved tilts towards the southern Low Countries, with Antwerp being the radiant centre of most language-related activity. While historians of Dutch language and literature have had a primarily hollandocentric focus on, for instance, the *Twe-spraack* and *Den Nederduytschen Helicon*, they neglected people such as Heyns. This focus on Holland and the so-called 'Renaissance' poets who allegedly arose around the time of publication of *De Eglentier*'s *trivium* is not supported by the extant sources. Antwerp rhetorician Heyns and Amsterdam *Eglentier* member Spiegel personify, through their personal relationship, the continuity that existed between the southern and northern regions of what essentially constitutes the cultural heartland of the Low Countries. In this central area, all the ingredients were present to set the language debates in motion, most importantly an intense interplay between French and Dutch.

The observation that multilingualism and an open mindset towards other languages and cultures marked the ways in which the inhabitants of this region perceived their languages and community has consequences for modern considerations of Dutch and Flemish culture. It is impossible to approach either as monolingual entities at any point in time. These strongly related cultures have both been shaped by a willingness to learn other languages, to interact and compete with other cultures, and to build on their example. To extrapolate Spiegel's statement: he who only speaks Dutch, does not speak it well. Multilingualism was and is a cornerstone of Dutch and Flemish culture.