PROOF!

For the final version - with numbered sections and deviating page numbers
- see:

Language, Literature and the Construction of a Dutch National Identity (1780-1830)

Edited by Rick Honings, Gijsbert Rutten and Ton van Kalmthout

Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press

pp. 97-117

4 Johannes Kinker

A Kantian Philosopher Teaching Dutch Language,
Literature, and Eloquence

Marijke van der Wal

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

DOI: 10.5117/9789089648273/CH04

Abstract

The cosmopolitan citizen and Kantian philosopher Johannes Kinker, who had played a leading role in many institutions and societies of the northern Netherlands, held the newly founded Dutch chair in Liège for more than a decade. The present chapter addresses the questions why he accepted this post, what his experiences were, and how he actually shaped the Dutch chair. Could he share his scholarly expertise on general language theory, philosophy, prosody and eloquence with his audience of students? By examining Kinker's correspondence and his, so far barely explored, lecture notes, I am able to present a clear view of his daily teaching practice in a French-speaking university town.

Keywords: Kantian philosophy, general language theory, language acquisition, codification, Dutch literature

Johannes Kinker: Lawyer, Literary Author, and Society Man

Who was Johannes Kinker (1764-1845) and why should we consider him one of the agents in the field of Dutch studies who deserves a chapter in the present volume? Arguing that he was the first professor to hold the chair in Dutch language and literature at the University of Liège seems a convincing, formal argument. In Kinker's case, however, I would like to add that his importance is not restricted to academic life and Dutch studies. Kinker was a multi-faceted and versatile spirit who participated intensively in social and cultural life and adopted an active stance in times of political

turmoil. A revealing example of the latter is his poem *Stille bemoediging na de inlijving van Holland in het Fransche keizerrijk* ('Quiet Encouragement after the Annexation of Holland into the French Empire'), which he wrote in response to Holland's occupation by the French. He starts this poem, which consists of twelve five-line stanzas, by stressing the relationship between fatherland or nation and language:

The fatherland exists, whatever fate may befall us!
As long as its beautiful language does not become lost;
As long as we still hear its sound and full linguistic power;¹

This evidently sounds like a strong voice of nationalism. At the same time, Kinker has been characterized as the foremost representative of the international Enlightenment around 1800 and as an advocate of universal cosmopolitanism.² Another apparent contradiction is that initially he did not have strong Orangist feelings, but later welcomed Willem I's policy of creating a United Kingdom of the Netherlands and greatly appreciated the sovereign as a Monarch of the Enlightenment. Furthermore, Kinker was fully embedded in the social and cultural life of the northern Netherlands and played a leading role in many institutions and societies there. Yet, surprisingly, he accepted the newly founded chair in Liège in 1817 and moved to a francophone region, giving up what had to date been his main activities. One may wonder about these, at first sight, conflicting facts. Various questions arise such as *why* he accepted this post, *what* his experiences were, and *how* he actually shaped the Dutch chair and dealt with his audience of students. This chapter will address these and other questions in sections 4, 5, and 6 after presenting an overview of Kinker's networks and scholarly activities and subsequently focusing on his linguistic work in sections 2 and 3. In conclusion, section 7 evaluates Kinker's contribution to nation building and nationalism in language and literature.

Kinker's Networks and Scholarly Activities

Johannes or Jan Kinker was born on 1 January 1764 in the village of Nieuwer-Amstel, present-day Amstelveen (a suburb of Amsterdam). After graduating

¹ Jensen, 2013, p. 20: 'Het Vaderland bestaat, wat lot ons zij beschoren! [...] / Zoo lang zijn schoone spraak voor 't oor niet gaat verloren; / Zoo lang wij nog haar' klank en volle taalkracht hooren'.

² Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 63; Hanou 1988, volume 2, pp. 39-42, footnote 83.

in law he became a lawyer, but his professional activities left him with enough free time to write a wide range of literary works and to devote himself to philosophy. Various inheritances gave him independence from financial concerns.³ His marriage to Maria Eva Theodora Bain in 1793 ended in separation in 1802 (although there was no divorce), after which Kinker shared a happy life with Geertruy Margaretha de Clercq, his companion for four decades. Hanou gives a more detailed description of Kinker's life while Vis focuses on his literary work.⁴

Kinker had access to an elaborate political and literary network, complemented by extensive contacts in the order of freemasons, of which he became a member in 1805. Hanou convincingly demonstrates Kinker's interest in and commitment to social issues by referring to his active membership of at least twenty societies.⁵ In 1800, he was one of the initiators of the Bataafsche maatschappij van taal- en dichtkunde ('the Dutch/ Batavian Society for Linguistics and Poetry'), which was renamed in 1806 the Hollandsche maatschappij van fraaije kunsten en wetenschappen ('the Holland Society of Arts and Sciences') and by this time also included history and philosophy.⁶ This society aimed to promote excellence in literary theoretical, scholarly and societal thinking and endorsed prescriptive studies such as Siegenbeek's orthography and Weiland's grammar, which were initiated and published on behalf of the government.⁷ Kinker's prosody study was also awarded an honorary gold medal by the Holland Society. For Kinker and the Amsterdam department of the society, the Enlightenment and critical philosophy should be the foundation of the new era.⁸ As president of the society, Kinker stressed the task of educating *het volk* ('the general public') and during the period of his office the society also welcomed women into the audience when papers were presented.

Apart from these activities, Kinker had delivered an impressive number of literary, polemic and scholarly publications before he became a professor at the University of Liège. As a philosopher, he favoured Kant's philosophy, which he was assiduous in promoting, defending, and applying. His *Proeve eener opheldering' van de Critiek der zuivere rede* ('Essay to Clarify the

3 Hanou, 1988, pp. 19-20.

4 Hanou, 1988; Vis, 1967.

5 Hanou, 1988.

6 Hanou, 1988, p. 38.

7 Siegenbeek, 1804; Weiland, 1805. The society supported Minister of Education van der Palm in his plan for spelling reform. Siegenbeek's spelling was endorsed by the Batavian Society and subsequently in 1804 by the authorities (Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp.17-18).

8 Hanou, 1988, p. 39.

Critique of Pure Reason'), published in 1799, introduced Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* into the Netherlands. Its French translation (*Essai d'une exposition succincte de la Critique de la raison pure; traduit du Hollandais par J. le Fèvre*, Amsterdam, 1801) was a source for Kantian study in France.⁹ Together with Paulus van Hemert (1756-1825), a steadfast advocate of critical philosophy, Kinker took his stance in the face of the controversy that was prevailing in the Netherlands at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The two men defended Kant's philosophy against opponents such as Willem Bilderdijk (1756-1831), Rhijnvis Feith (1753-1824), Hieronymus van Alphen (1746-1803), and Samuel Johannes van de Wijnpersse (1759-1842), for whom Kantianism was irreconcilable with their dogmatic theological view of life.¹⁰

We will see below (section 3) that Kinker also applied Kant's ideas to his own elaborate language theory. At the end of his life, he even tried to improve Kant's philosophy in *Le dualisme de la raison humaine*, published posthumously in 1850-1852.¹¹ Kant was clearly in Kinker's blood, not only in his scholarly work, but also in his daily life as a citizen: Kinker's cosmopolitanism and his patriotism have been linked to Kant's view that every cosmopolitan also has a patriotic duty in his own country.¹²

In sum, Kinker has been characterised as a representative of Kantian Enlightenment and his endeavours and ultimate aim have been described as follows:¹³

Kinker's aim was to achieve his humanitarian and Kantian ideals mostly through particular societies. His overriding ambition was to create a tolerant society of global citizens, ultimately united in one global nation, in which the individual could develop all his talents.¹⁴

9 Van der Wal, 1977, p. 51; Wielema, 1988, pp. 456-457. The *Proeve eener opheldering' van de Critiek der zuivere Rede* appeared in *Magazyn voor de critische wijsgeerte* II, 1799, pp. 43-238. The translator Jean Lambert Joseph Lefèvre was a member of the Amsterdam freemason's lodge La Charité, as was Kinker (Hanou & Vis 1992, p. 226, footnote 18).

10 Wielema, 1988, pp. 460-461.

11 *Le dualisme de la raison humaine; ou le criticisme de Em. Kant, amélioré sous le rapport de la raison pure, et rendu complet sous celui de la raison pratique*, publié par les soins et sous les auspices, et avec des notes de J.D. Cocheret de la Morinière, Amsterdam: Weytingh & van der Haart, 1850/52, 2 vols. See also Wielema (1988, p. 465).

12 Jensen, 2013, pp. 180-181.

13 Hanou, 1988, p. 61; Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 22-28.

14 Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 17: 'Kinkers streven was om vooral via bepaalde genootschappen zijn humanitaire en Kantiaanse ideaal dichterbij te brengen: het scheppen van een tolerante samenleving van wereldburgers, uiteindelijk in één wereldstaat verenigd, waarin het individu al zijn talenten tot ontplooiing kon brengen'.

Was this cosmopolitan citizen well equipped and eager to play a role in the field of Dutch studies? Before discussing the period of Kinker's activities as a professor of Dutch language, literature, and eloquence, I will elaborate on his language theory and his other linguistic publications.

Kinker's Language Theory and his Other Linguistic Publications

Kinker presented his *Inleiding eener wijsgeerige algemeene theorie der talen* ('Introduction to a Philosophical General Language Theory') at meetings of the KNI, the Koninklijk-Nederlandsche Instituut van wetenschappen, letterkunde, en schoone kunsten ('the Royal Dutch Institute of Sciences, Literature, and Arts'). This institution, which was founded in 1808 by King Louis Napoleon, was the precursor of the present-day Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen ('Royal Dutch Academy of Sciences').¹⁵ His language theory was debated at meetings held from 1810 to 1812, and ultimately published in the *Gedenkschriften* ('Memoirs') of the KNI in 1817. The starting point of Kinker's theory is that *een algemene theorie der talen* ('general linguistics') implies focusing on *thought language*, the interpreter of thoughts which, subject to the laws of thinking, arise in the human mind. This *thought language* is assumed to be present in all spoken languages, but it is in fact independent of all existing languages. Even if all languages were to become obsolete, *thought language* would still exist as long as thinking human beings exist. Kinker assumes that the *thinking mechanism* is identical and works in the same way in every human being. Consequently, *thought language* must be universal to all languages, and the goal of a general language theory must be to discover and describe the characteristics of this *thought language*. In order to achieve this aim, he rejects the method of comparing spoken languages, which would yield only the similarities between languages, not the reasons behind these similarities, and would thus not lead to knowledge of *thought language*. The only legitimate and appropriate method to reveal *thought language* is through an analysis of the *thinking mechanism*.

It is a broad and highly philosophical analysis of the *thinking mechanism* that Kinker offers in his treatise. His analysis ultimately results in a table of basic meanings, i.e. a survey of meanings shared by everyone, which must therefore also be the basic meanings in *thought language*. Kinker uses this table in his approach to the two linguistic aspects of concept and mechanism; in modern terms these are the semantic and syntactic aspects

¹⁵ Van der Wal, 1977, p. 3; Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 18-20.

of language. He distinguishes the internal and external meanings of words, which meanings belong either to the concept or to the mechanism part of language. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to detail Kinker's complex theory in which he, for instance, criticizes the traditional divisions of parts of speech, while providing an extensive discussion of the characteristics of each of these parts of speech.¹⁶ What is important for us here is that Kinker stresses the central function of the verb, which he characterizes with the term *agere* 'acting'. In relation to the verb, nouns, and pronouns can function either as subjects or as objects, in Kinker's terminology either as *agens* 'the worker or person' or as *actum* 'that which is acted upon, the matter'. This analysis leads to the discovery of the *language mechanism*, the syntactic aspect, which appears to be based on the tripartition *agens-agereactum*. This tripartition functions not only in single sentences, but also on different levels in compound and complex sentences and even between sentences. Ultimately, Kinker's ideal *thought language*, as presented in his language theory, should make it possible to assess the merits of every spoken language: the more a language resembles *thought language*, the better it will be. Kinker optimistically believes that all languages develop towards the ideal *thought language*. Assessing particular spoken languages, is, however, beyond the scope of his treatise, in which he only occasionally brings to light the defects of a particular language.

Kinker's at first sight idiosyncratic language theory fits into the rational language approach that had been gaining ground in Western Europe at least from the publication of the Port Royal Grammar in 1660 onwards.¹⁷ His theory can be considered as a new and fascinating example of the idea that language is determined by the *ratio*. Unlike many authors of so-called general or philosophical grammars, Kinker, does not fall back on logical terms or logical analysis.¹⁸ Making use of Kantian ideas and terminology, he independently developed his own original language theory.¹⁹ Kinker's language theory thus appears to be a late representative of the old rational

¹⁶ For more detailed information I refer to van der Wal, 1977, pp. 4-41.

¹⁷ Harris & Taylor, 1989, pp. 94-107.

¹⁸ Juliard 1940, p. 14; van der Wal 1977, pp. 43-48; Maat 2013, pp. 404-407, 410-416.

¹⁹ As demonstrated in van der Wal 1977, 1985. There is, as far as I know, only one book before 1817 in which Kant is referred to for linguistic purposes: *Philosophische Principien einer allgemeinen Sprachlehre nach Kant und Sacy*, published anonymously in 1805 by Friedrich Nicolovius in Königsberg. The author identified, Stephan Wannowski (1749-1812), theologian and rector of the German Reformed Burghschule in Königsberg, concerns himself mainly with Sacy and merely applies Kant's categories in his treatment of the verb and of the compound sentence. Further details of Kinker's Kantian language theory, and of similarities and differences between Kinker and Kant, are to be found in van der Wal, 1977, pp. 51-55.

approach. It was published at a time when the new trend of historical comparative linguistics, focusing on actual differences between languages, had already begun to manifest itself.²⁰

Kinker, who was a gifted and often invited speaker, also published on eloquence or rhetoric and on prosody. In his *Over de hoorbare voordracht van den redenaar* (1813; 'On the audible declamation of the orator'), adopting the well-known Ciceronian rhetorical division of *inventio*, *dispositio*, *elocutio*, *memoria*, *pronunciatio*, he elaborates in particular on the *pronunciatio*, using his earlier publication on prosody, the *Proeve eener Hollandsche prosodia* (1808; 'Specimen of a Dutch prosody'). Kinker argues that the orator should restore the neglected bond with musicians and actors. Pitch, tempo, and rest or interval in speaking can be indicated by staff notation, as in music; on a more visual note, gestures are important for actors and speakers alike.²¹ He also extensively reviewed and evaluated Willem Bilderdijk's *Nederlandsche spraakleer* ('Dutch Grammar') in various articles, which were collected in the volume entitled *Beoordeeling van Mr. W. Bilderdijks Nederlandsche spraakleer* (Amsterdam 1829; 'Review of W. Bilderdijk's Dutch grammar'). Following the structure of Bilderdijk's grammar, Kinker had the opportunity to present his own views on orthography (pp.1-28), morphology (pp.29-123), syntax (pp.124-244), and prosody (pp.245-339).²²

Bilderdijk and Kinker were old acquaintances, since Kinker started his career as a lawyer at Bilderdijk's law office (probably 1787-1792) and acted as his business representative when Bilderdijk left the country in 1795. In their correspondence, Bilderdijk also discusses his plans for linguistic publications, for instance on the gender of nouns.²³ However, in terms of their philosophy, Bilderdijk, as the representative of conservatism, and Kinker, as the representative of Kantian enlightenment, were worlds apart. In the end, this gap and Kinker's appointment as a professor at the University of Liège, while Bilderdijk was not appointed to a similar chair at the University of Amsterdam, caused the two men to drift apart.²⁴

20 In 1830, Kinker once more concentrates on general language in his treatise *De Proeve eener beantwoording van de vraag: wat nut kan de empirische algemeene taalkennis aan de hoogere wijsbegeerte toebrengen?* (Specimen of an answer to the question: What benefit can the empirical general knowledge of language present to higher philosophy?), which was also published in the *Gedenkschriften* of the Koninklijk-Nederlandsche Instituut.

21 Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 15-16.

22 See De Vooys, 1947, for a general impression and Schultink, 2007, for a positive evaluation of Kinker as a morphologist.

23 Van der Wal, 1993, p. 152.

24 Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 21-22.

Kinker's Appointment as a Professor at the University of Liège

Kinker was a prominent figure in the social and cultural life of the northern Netherlands; he was a well-known poet and had published on philosophy, eloquence or rhetoric, and language. It was therefore not surprising that he was offered one of the newly founded chairs in Dutch language and literature; what was surprising, however, is that he accepted the post. At the time, contemporaries, among whom Anton Reinhard Falck (1777-1813), wondered why Kinker left for Liège.²⁵ Hanou, discussing Kinker's appointment, also wonders why he opted for this French-speaking university town full of conservative Catholics.²⁶ Did he enjoy teaching Dutch and did he consider a chair to be a reward for his previous work? Apart from these suppositions, Hanou considers two other possibilities, one related to philosophy and the other to freemasonry.²⁷ In Liège Kinker became a member of the Faculty of Philosophy and Arts. Both disciplines were mentioned in his letter of appointment, and Kinker repeatedly referred to himself as a professor of philosophy, for instance in a letter dated 25 May 1818.²⁸ In the edition of his *Gedichten* ('Poems', 3 volumes, 1819-1821, published by Johannes van der Hey in Amsterdam), he is also referred to as 'Mr. J. Kinker *Hoogleraar in de Wijsbegeerte, enz. Aan de Hooge School te Luik, Lid van het Koninklijk Instituut*' ('J. Kinker, Professor of Philosophy, etc. at the University of Liège, member of the Royal Institute'). Could the task of spreading Kantian philosophy have attracted Kinker to Liège? In that case, the reality of academic life in Liège may have been disappointing. In his correspondence, Kinker often complained that he did not have as much opportunity to teach philosophy as he wished. His manuscript *Aperçu détaillé de la philosophie critique* is an example of a course he was able to teach only occasionally.²⁹ Or could it be that the reason was not academic, but rather that it was a future task in the order of freemasons that lured him to the southern Netherlands? Kinker was heavily engaged in freemasonry and promoted his ideal of a

25 Hanou, 1988, p. 364. A.R. Falck, Minister of Education from March 1818, was interested in Kantian philosophy. He was a member of the third class of the Koninklijk-Nederlandsche Instituut (KNI) and was also a freemason (Hanou & Vis, 1993, p. 16). See Falck's remark in a letter, dated 14 July 1817, addressed to Fabius: 'Wat ziet Kinker toch voor heil in dat professoraat in Luik? Enfin, als hij maar te vreden is, mij is het wel' ('What benefit does Kinker see in that chair in Liège? Well, if he is content, it's all the same to me.') (Hanou, 1988, p. 364).

26 Hanou, 1988, pp. 362-365.

27 Hanou, 1988, pp. 364-365.

28 Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 366.

29 Hanou, 1988, pp. 364-365.

joint enlightened freemasonry in the northern and southern Low Countries. He may have regarded his presence in Liège as an opportunity to play an active role in achieving this ideal.³⁰

Whatever his motivation, after some delay Kinker travelled to Liège where he remained until 1830, when political developments forced him to leave.³¹ The revolt against the rule of Willem I, which led to the splitting up of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands into the Netherlands and Belgium, meant a farewell for Kinker. Returning from his academic summer recess in Holland, Kinker was surprised by the rapid revolutionary developments in Liège. He was even taken hostage at the beginning of October 1830, but was exchanged for a hostage taken by the Dutch. He returned to Liège, but, after refusing to sign a document pledging loyalty to the Brussels preliminary government, he left for Amsterdam on 18 October 1830 and never saw Liège again.³² It was more than a decade since he started his lectures and seminars in the autumn of 1818. I will focus on his experiences during that period of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands and will refer to different types of sources. Apart from secondary literature such as that of Hanou and Janssens & Steyaert,³³ I will rely on Kinker's own correspondence, edited in three volumes,³⁴ and his lecture notes which are preserved among his papers in the University library of Leiden and the Royal library in The Hague.³⁵ These lecture notes have been mentioned repeatedly, by Rutten and Vis, but have barely been explored.³⁶ Janssens compared part of the lecture notes on Dutch pronunciation with the notes made by one of Kinker's students.³⁷

Kinker's Students, Lectures and Seminars

In a letter dated 4 November 1818 addressed to Gerrit van Lennep, a lawyer, poet, and translator and the author of a Dutch grammar in French, Kinker phrases his new experiences: 'I might be able to accommodate to my new

³⁰ Hanou, 1988: pp. 25, 365.

³¹ On 5 July 1817 Kinker received the confirmation of his appointment, dated 24 June 1817. His task was described as teaching 'Nederduitsche letterkunde en welsprekendheid' (Dutch literature and eloquence) (Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 34).

³² Janssens & Steyaert, 2008, pp. 194-195.

³³ Hanou, 1988, Janssens & Steyaert, 2008, pp. 181-195.

³⁴ Hanou & Vis, 1992, 1993, 1994.

³⁵ I did not consult his notes held in the library of the University of Amsterdam.

³⁶ Rutten, 1962, p. 107; Vis, 1967, pp. 288-289, 291.

³⁷ Janssens, 2012.

career, but Liège and a Dutch wife mean a tough job and misery'.³⁸ A few years later, in his letter dated 7 March 1821 addressed to the publisher J. Immerzeel Jr., Kinker conjures up the moment of being sent to pagan Liège to preach the Dutch gospel: 'Almost a year passed before I somewhat got in the way of what was needed in order not to preach as a voice in the wilderness'.³⁹ In the early days of his time in Liège, daily life was probably not easy; neither was teaching. In the letter to van Lennep, Kinker refers to his disparate audience consisting of 36 students, of whom eight or nine were fluent in Dutch, four or five understood half of what was said, and the remaining majority did not understand a single word of Dutch. He solved this problem by delivering his lectures one-third in Latin, one-third in French, and one-third in Dutch. All his preparatory work could be torn up and, much to his disappointment, not a single student enrolled for his lectures in 'philosophical linguistics'.⁴⁰ This last point shows that Kinker intended to present his language theory, as discussed in section 3, to his audience of students. However, given the lack of interest in the topic, he had to shift to the level of language acquisition and adapt his lecture topics accordingly. To support the students who did not understand Dutch or did not understand it well enough, Cicero and Tacitus were translated into Dutch and during the translation process Kinker also explained the syntactic part of van Lennep's *Grammaire hollandaise à l'usage des collèges et des institutions* (Bruxelles 1816, second print 1818), a grammar that he recommended to his students.⁴¹

A year later, according to the *series lectionum*, Kinker was teaching an introduction to Dutch grammar, Dutch literature and eloquence.⁴² In his letter dated 29 October 1819 addressed to M. Stuart (1765-1826), secretary of the third class of the Koninklijk-Nederlandsche Instituut, Kinker mentions the unexpectedly high level of interest in his lectures, both his introduction to Dutch grammar, where the lectures were given in French, and his Dutch lectures on eloquence and literature.⁴³ The latter course was offered on the condition that at least six participants committed to attend the course on a

38 Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 372: 'Ik zou mij misschien in myne nieuwe loopbaan wel kunnen schikken; maar *Luik* en eene Hollandsche *vrouw*: hoc opus, hic labor'.

39 Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 416.

40 Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 372-373: 'in de wysgeerige taalkunde'.

41 Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 373.

42 For the detailed *series lectionum*, see Rutten, 1962, pp.104-106, in particular the elaborate footnote 12.

43 Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 383-388. The same courses were given by Kinker in the first half of 1819 (see his remark in the letter).

regular basis, a number that was even exceeded. Happily, Kinker mentions that it seemed likely that he would be able to give philosophy lessons in Dutch the following year. In passing, he admits the effort it costs him to teach in French: as part of the preparation, he has to write his lectures out in full.⁴⁴

During his stay in Liège, Kinker regularly wrote to the politicians A.R. Falck, Minister of Education, and Justice Minister C.F. van Maanen (1769-1849) to keep them informed about the situation in the southern Netherlands and about such issues as the fluctuating number of students, the topics of his lectures and the opposition that he encountered.⁴⁵ From 1820 to 1823 he complained regularly about the anti-Dutch attitude in Liège. This opposition was aimed at the Dutch language and at King Willem's policy and ideas, which Kinker both defended and symbolized as holder of the chair in Dutch language and literature.⁴⁶ At the request of King Willem I, Kinker also gave advice on methods of second language learning and teaching, which were important issues for education in the non-Dutch speaking areas of Wallonia and Luxembourg. In his *Verslag aangaande de leerwijze van den heer Jacotot* ('Report on Mr Jacotot's Method', 1826), he evaluated Jacotot's universal method of memorising foreign language texts, carefully considering its advantages and disadvantages in daily practice.⁴⁷ A few years later, in 1829, Kinker was again consulted on educational matters, on this occasion on educational policy and the issue of whether the government should maintain its educational monopoly or allow private schools and colleges to be established.⁴⁸

In the meantime, Kinker came to realize that his achievements in Liège might fall short of expectations. He argued repeatedly that the elementary tasks for which he was responsible could better be carried out by someone else.⁴⁹ Kinker nevertheless assured his friend notary Jan Fabius (1776-1850) that he was doing all he could to defend the national honour, although this was quite a burden.⁵⁰ However, we do not find only complaints; there are

44 Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 386-387.

45 See Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 406 for the letter dated 2 September 1820 to Falck. Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 408-409 for the letter dated 12 November 1820. Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 444-447 for the letter dated 1 July 1922. For the numbers of students, see Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 424, the letter to his friend, notary Fabius.

46 Janssens & Steyaert, 2008, pp. 184-185, 187.

47 Janssens & Steyaert, 2008, pp. 235-238, 241-243.

48 Janssens & Steyaert, 2008, pp. 109-110.

49 See Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 438, 424, 428 for his letters to Falck and Fabius.

50 Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 402-403.

also more optimistic messages in his correspondence. In a letter to Falck, dated 1 July 1822, Kinker mentions the start of a successful course on Dutch synonyms and etymology in Dutch attended by more than thirty students.⁵¹ His evening lessons also attracted an increasing number of students. This *privatissimum* or tutorial, which Kinker started in 1820, developed into a kind of literary society that came to be known as Tandem.⁵² It was Tandem that gave Kinker the opportunity to teach and coach his best and most motivated students. The maximum number of members allowed was ten and after graduation participants became honorary members.⁵³ During a weekly meeting at Kinker's home, selected advanced students had to give a speech of at least ten minutes in Dutch on a chosen literary, philosophical, linguistic, political, or other topic, which would be followed by a discussion. Speaking French was prohibited.⁵⁴ Every member had to prepare a speech on which another member, who had received the text a week earlier, was required to comment. Finally, Kinker added his own comments and returned the corrected texts a week later. If the student corrector had overlooked mistakes, he had to pay a fine. The end-of-year dinner, organized by a master of ceremonies, was paid for with these fines and additional funds from Kinker himself.⁵⁵ The Tandem meetings were highly nationalistic occasions. Based on the triad of sovereign, fatherland, and Dutch language, attention was paid to the political present and past of the Netherlands and to such political topics as slavery and Willem I's education law.⁵⁶ French, Latin, and German authors were translated and Dutch authors such as Bilderdijk, Vondel (1587-1679), Helmers (1767-1813), Feith, Tollens (1780-1856), van der Palm (1763-1840), and Kinker were read.⁵⁷ Tandem was also the birthplace of a manual for a history of Dutch literature: J.F.X. Würth's *Cours préparatoire à l'étude de la littérature hollandaise* (1823).⁵⁸ As Tandem's minutes have been partly preserved (for the period May 1823 to July 1826), we are familiar with the proceedings of about one hundred meetings.⁵⁹

51 Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 444.

52 Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 444-445. The name *Tandem* originated from the Latin phrase *Tandem fit surculus arbor* 'One day the cutting becomes a tree' (Janssen & Steyaert 2008, p.190).

53 Janssens & Steyaert, 2008, pp. 190-195.

54 Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 34-35.

55 Rutten, 1962, pp. 121-122.

56 Hanou & Vis, 1993, p. 23; Janssens & Steyaert, 2008, p. 192.

57 Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 35. For van der Palm, see Krol, this volume.

58 See Steyaert, 2012, pp. 160-164 for a critical review of Würth's *Cours* which was interpreted as anti-Catholic in its selection of texts.

59 See Steyaert, 2012. For a detailed view of the Tandem practice, see Rutten, 1962, pp. 118-130.

Hanou & Vis conclude that Kinker's teaching during the decade from 1820 to 1830 comprised mainly language acquisition and stylistics.⁶⁰ In more detail, they mention the addition of the course on the etymology of Dutch (1821-1822).⁶¹ Altogether, from 1823 Kinker taught three courses: Dutch literature combined with language acquisition and stylistics, etymology, and Dutch grammar.⁶² In their view, this meant that Kinker's preferred topics, general theory of literature and art and general linguistics, disappeared from his lecture schedule and Dutch literature was combined with grammar and stylistics as supporting disciplines. In daily practice, however, these supporting disciplines predominated, and Dutch language acquisition became the main substance of his teaching. In these circumstances, Kinker needed assistance for his elementary courses, which were compulsory for candidates in the arts and for future lawyers.⁶³ He discussed this issue repeatedly in his correspondence and suggested that his most gifted pupil Jean François Xavier Würth should replace him part-time if he himself were to acquire a part-time job at the court of justice.⁶⁴ This exchange of duties did not materialize and Kinker continued to teach his full range of courses. Close scrutiny of Kinker's lecture notes reveals the precise content of his lectures and courses.

A View of Kinker's Daily Lecture Practice

It does not appear to have been Kinker's practice to carefully keep lecture notebooks with details of dates and audiences, at least that is not the impression we glean from the notes that have survived in the collections of the Leiden University Library and the Royal Library The Hague. Rather we have to reconstruct the function and context of his lectures from a mishmash of densely written papers. Only rarely is additional information available, such as the notes taken by student Jean-François Tielemans during the

60 Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 34. After the course on Dutch literature, eloquence and the theory of poetry in the first year (1817-1818), two new courses were added in the second year: general linguistics and Dutch linguistics (partly applied to literary texts). However, the former course disappeared in 1820 and Dutch grammar was exchanged for language acquisition.

61 Hanou & Vis, 1993, p. 19.

62 See also Rutten, 1962, p. 106

63 Hanou & Vis, 1993, pp. 19-20.

64 Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 34. In later letters to Falck, Kinker attempts to promote Würth, asking whether he may promise him the position of lecturer or professor by special appointment in Dutch language and literature at the University of Liège (Hanou & Vis, 1992, pp. 406-407, 446).

pronunciation part of Kinker's introduction to Dutch grammar.⁶⁵ To give an example of the problems of reconstructing the context of the lecture notes, I focus on what has been catalogued as *J. Kinker, Dictaten over taalkunde in het algemeen, in het Nederlandsch en Fransch, gegeven te Luik* (J. Kinker, Lecture notes on general linguistics, in Dutch and French, presented in Liège; UB Leiden LTK 3). On the second page Kinker mentions 'an honourable invitation by our president' to read a part of his introduction to general linguistics. On the following pages Kinker sometimes translates specific Dutch examples into French. He also elaborates on Dutch synonyms, for instance on page 16 verso where he discusses the difference between *onderwyzen*, *onderrigten*, and *leeren* and also mentions French *enseigner*, *instruire*, and *apprendre*. From these French translations and examples I conclude that these notes were used in Liège, but that Kinker evidently also re-used earlier notes taken, for instance, from his presentations at KNI meetings (see section 3). It is in general difficult to determine to which academic years and which audiences Kinker is referring in his notes. In LTK 17, a collection of French notes, for example, he states that his lectures will be given partly in French and partly in Dutch and that he will use Weiland's grammar *just as he did the previous year* (LTK 17, 6 recto).⁶⁶ The latter remark shows that the notes do not reflect his first course, but it remains unclear in which year the course was given.

Kinker's detailed lecture schedule is presented in various collections of notes. According to LTK 3, 18 recto, on Tuesday and Wednesday he would continue to explain Weiland's grammar in French, on Thursday he would continue with Montesquieu's Essay on Roman politics regarding religion (which work was translated from French into Dutch) and on Friday (just as he did the previous year) he would read the *proeven van Nederduitsche Dichtkunde uit de zeventiende eeuw, met eene voorrede uitgegeven door Matthys Siegenbeek* ('Examples of Dutch Seventeenth-Century Poetry, with an Introduction by Matthijs Siegenbeek').⁶⁷ After having translated Montesquieu's Essay, each Thursday he would discuss a publication of contemporary Dutch literature. A similar schedule can be found in LTK 29, 194 *Dictaten over Nederlandsche taal en woordvoeging* ('Notes on Dutch Language and Syntax') and in LTK 17, 16 recto *Lessen over Nederlandsche*

⁶⁵ Janssens, 2012.

⁶⁶ LTK 17 *Lessen over Nederlandsche taal- en letterkunde en welsprekendheid* (Lessons on Dutch language and literature and eloquence) consists of 309 pages which seem to be arranged in a different order from the original.

⁶⁷ Elsewhere he stresses the importance of Siegenbeek's Preface (see KW 73 F15, 65 recto).

taal- en letterkunde en welsprekendheid ('Lessons on Dutch Linguistics, Literature, and Eloquence').

Kinker's opinion of the importance and function of grammar is made clear in various lecture notes. He stresses that it is not possible to acquire good style without knowledge of the grammatical rules (KW 73 F15, 64 verso, 65 recto). Discussing his course on eloquence and Dutch literature, Kinker confirms the important role of grammar and characterizes languages as instruments 'de la pensée et du sentiment' which resemble each other by the same mechanism (LTK 17, 1 recto, 1 verso). That mechanism, he explicitly states, is the object of the 'grammaire générale' (LTK 17, 5 recto). Kinker furthermore divides Dutch grammar into the familiar parts, i.e. pronunciation, orthography, etymology in the sense of morphology⁶⁸ and parts of speech. In his notes concerning the parts of speech, he frequently refers to sections in Weiland's grammar. For the benefit of his students, however, he also uses publications in French as is apparent from his intention to give an overview of the grammar rules according to Weiland, translated by G. van Lennep in his *Grammaire hollandaise*, already mentioned in section 5 (LTK 29, 68). From the subsequent pages I conclude that Kinker mainly discussed syntax, as he wrote to van Lennep (see section 5). Another French publication to which Kinker referred during his lectures on synonyms (see LTK 3, 17 verso) is the *Dictionnaire Universel des Synonymes de la Langue Francaise* (1816).⁶⁹

The contents of Kinker's notes are not spectacular: they comprise grammar according to Weiland and Kinker's own comments on linguistics, literature, and eloquence, which can be understood clearly against the background of his publications. Occasionally, a number of notes reveal Kinker's opinion on particular issues such as loans. In LTK 4, 116-120, he deals with words of foreign origin such as *kleur*, *krant*, *prediker* which have become fully integrated in the Dutch language and have adapted to Dutch pronunciation and orthography (116 recto). He adds, however, that one should never use foreign terminology for philosophy in Dutch (119 recto). Also in LTK 29, 225 – 230, a touch of the familiar phenomenon of purism is found, in particular in the section entitled 'Betoog van den Rykdom en voortreffelykheid der Nederduitsche taal, en eene opgave der middelen, om de toenemende verbastering van dezelve tegen te gaan' ('A Demonstration

68 In this part Kinker discusses, for instance, morphological patterns such as that in *prikken* – *prikkelen*.

69 According to the subtitle, the dictionary comprised synonyms of famous authors among which Beauzée, D'Alembert and Diderot.

of the Richness and Excellence of the Dutch Language, and the Means to Fight its Increasing Corruption'), which title refers to Siegenbeek's essay, published in 1810.⁷⁰ Kinker also argues that the Dutch language has an elaborate *woordgronding* ('etymology' or 'morphology'): every original Dutch word has at least one syllable that expresses the root meaning.⁷¹ Dealing with 'gelijkvloeiende en ongelijkvloeiende werkwoorden', that is regular, weak verbs, and irregular, strong verbs with vowel alternation, Kinker argues that all strong verbs are stem verbs, referring to authoritative linguists such as Ten Kate (1674-1731) and Bilderdijk.⁷² We should note that in his *Aenleiding*, Ten Kate (1723), in particular, considered the strong verbs as core elements of the language.⁷³ Furthermore, Kinker stresses that the Dutch language is remarkably regular and analogous (KW 73 F 15, 47 recto) and that even children are already aware of the principle of analogy. This is apparent from their mistakes such as 'een koopmannin' ('a tradess/female trader') and 'ik heb gevind, ik heb gekoopt. Ik spinde' ('I have finded, I have bought, I spunned (wool)'; KW 73 F 15, 50 recto).

In a series of notes Kinker presents the analysis of a sentence or a grammatical proposition, which in his view consists of at least three elements: *de dader*, *de daad*, and *het voorwerp, waarop de daad toegepast wordt* ('the agent, the action, and the object of the action'). The relationship between the action and the object of the action is either direct, i.e. without a preposition, or indirect, i.e. with a preposition, as in *die schutter/ mikt op/ het doel* ('the shooter/ aims at/ the target') (LTK 4, 60 and following). The tripartition resembles Kinker's *language mechanism* discussed in section 3, to which he appears to refer repeatedly, for instance, when discussing syntax (LTK 29, 19) and revealing 'the mystery of language and of general linguistics' (LTK 6, 16). For the topic of '*Woordgronding*', he presents his own remarks, aiming at teaching the most frequent and appropriate words and their usage. A glimpse of Kinker's educational methods is to be found in his

70 Mattheijs Siegenbeek, *Antwoord op het voorstel der Bataafsche Maatschappij van taal- en dichtkunde, vorderende een betoog van den rijkdom en de voortreffelijkheid der Nederduitsche taal, en eene opgave der middelen om de toenemende verbastering van dezelve tegen te gaan*, (Amsterdam: Allart, 1810).

71 LTK 6, 53: 'Ieder echt hollandsch woord heeft ten minste één lettergreep, die de wortel-beteekenis uitsprekt'.

72 See his comment on Ten Kate 'qui après une étude profonde du *Liber argenteus* de notre compatriote Junius nous a fait connaître le premier, cette vaste étymologie de notre langue, et qui m'a donné donné (sic) la première idée d'en composer un système complet de racines belges dont je donnerai l'esquisse dans le cours que je me propose d'ouvrir à cet effet' (LTK 17, 29 recto).

73 In KW 73 F15, 64 verso, 65 recto, Kinker also refers to Ten Kate for the character and genius of language.

notes with deliberately inserted spelling and grammar mistakes and loans such as Germanisms and Gallicisms (LTK 6, 1-4). Students were apparently required to identify the errors.

Above, at the end of section 5, when discussing the level and contents of Kinker's teaching on the basis of the information in his letters, we concluded that language acquisition inevitably predominated. Scrutinising his lecture notes, I am able to establish that indeed his teaching practice was mainly elementary. Two simple publications used in his teaching provide additional proof of this: *De Nederlandsche Zeeloods Frans Naerebaut, een Schoolboek door Lastdrager* and *Aanteekeningen gehouden gedurende mynen Marsch naar, in en uit Rusland door Wagevier*, which Kinker characterises as 'simple publications written in a more or less common manner'.⁷⁴ It is noteworthy that Lastdrager's book was also used in secondary education, that is in the 'cours inférieur' of the Collège Royal in Liège.⁷⁵ For the lessons on grammar, Kinker explicitly mentions that he sometimes uses Wagevier, not to read or to translate, but in order to apply the grammatical rules (LTK 3, 18 recto) or to practise pronunciation (LTK 17, 16 recto).

Conclusions: Nation Building or Nationalism in Language and Literature?

The opportunity to adopt a position on the various issues of standardization, the literary canon, and rhetoric or eloquence largely depends on the audiences that a professor has to address. In Kinker's case, teaching in a francophone region, he had to overcome the opposition against the idea of one nation with one Dutch language, as Janssen & Steyaert stress.⁷⁶ He had to concentrate on language acquisition and needed French as a tool

74 KW 73 F15, 65 recto: 'makkelyke werkjes in eene meer of min gemeenzame wyze geschreven'. The bibliographical details are: A[braham] J[ohannes] Lastdrager, *De Nederlandsche zeeloods Frans Naerebout. Een schoolboek*. Amsterdam: Hendrik van Munster en Zoon [1820], 78 pp. or Amsterdam: J. van der Hey, 1820 and C.J.Wagevier, *Aanteekeningen gehouden gedurende mijnen marsch naar, gevangenschap in, en terugreize uit Rusland, in den jaren 1812, 1813 en 1814*. Amsterdam: J. van der Hey, 1820. Both books are listed in the catalogue of Kinker's library (Catalogus 1846, p.143). According to the description, these copies comprised elaborate linguistic notes made by Kinker. Neither Wagevier's copy in the Leiden University Library (UBL 2338 G33) nor the copy of Lastdrager in the TU Delft Library (1902 032) can be identified as having been annotated by Kinker. I would like to thank Ester Šorm for consulting Lastdrager's copy in the TU Delft Library.

75 See Janssens & Steyaert, 2008, pp. 161-163.

76 Janssen & Steyaert, 2008, p. 330.

for communication and clarification. Apart from a single remark on loans (see section 6), he therefore does not discuss regional and social linguistic variation or linguistic change and seems to avoid giving his opinion on other languages. He does make use of the official codified Dutch grammar, Weiland's *Nederduitsche spraakkunst* (1805), which is presented as the authority in grammar. In rhetoric or eloquence, Cicero is a general model, just as he was for all professors at northern and southern universities. Discussing sentences and different means of expressing the same content, Kinker mentions exemplary authors such as Pieter Cornelisz. Hooft (1581-1647), Geeraardt Brandt (1626-1683), Martinus Stuart, J.H. van der Palm, and Jan Wagenaar (1709-1773), and above all Simon Stijl (1731-1804) who as a second Hooft again presented the strong language and style of our ancestors.⁷⁷ The study of patriotic authors was an important element in the creation of a shared United Kingdom culture. Information on Kinker's literary preferences can be inferred both from occasional remarks and from the Dutch library that he started in 1819 in Liège. Apart from publications by the Bataafsche maatschappij van taal- en dichtkunde and the Hollandsche maatschappij van fraaije kunsten en wetenschappen, books were bought that were written by the main Golden Age authors Pieter Cornelisz. Hooft and Joost van den Vondel, by his eighteenth-century contemporaries Balthasar Huydecoper (1695-1778), Arnold Hoogvliet (1687-1763), Hendrik van Wijn (1740-1831), Lucretia Wilhelmina van Merken (1721-1789), J.H. van der Palm, Jan Wagenaar, Jan Frederik Helmers, Cornelis Loots (1765-1834), Willem Bilderdijk, and Matthijs Siegenbeek (1774-1854). Linguistic publications by Lambert ten Kate, Adriaan Kluit (1735-1807), David van Hoogstraten (1658-1724), and Petrus Weiland (1754-1842) are also part of the library.⁷⁸ In this respect Kinker does not differ from the contemporary literary and linguistic national canon, nor did he write an anthology or literary handbook to present his own preferences, as his pupil Würth did.⁷⁹

Comparing Kinker's major publications on general language theory and on prosody with his teaching practice in Liège, the only conclusion to be drawn is that he was unable to fully share his scholarly expertise with his audience of students. This inability has been considered by Hanou & Vis as the tragedy of his professorship.⁸⁰ He may, however, have found

77 KW 73 F15, 57 recto: 'de gespieerde taal en styl onzer voorouderen'.

78 Rutten, 1962, p. 111-112, footnote 20. For Van Wijn, see van Kalmthout, this volume. For Siegenbeek, see Rutten, this volume. For Kluit, see van Driel & van der Sijs, this volume. For Weiland, see Noordegraaf, this volume.

79 See Würth, 1823.

80 Hanou & Vis, 1992, p. 36.

some compensation in sharing his poetic works and preferences with his advanced students in the Tandem society. At the Tandem meetings nationalism reigned, with the focus being on Dutch language, literature, and history, and on the Dutch nation and sovereign.

References

- Catalogus, *Catalogus van drie hoogst belangrijke en zeer fraaye boekverzamelingen* (...) Alles nagelaten door wijlen de wel edele heeren Mr. Johannes Kinker, Mr. Johannes Willem Willekens...en Arend Horstman (Amsterdam: Radink & Muller, 1846).
- A.J. Hanou, *Sluiers van Isis: Johannes Kinker als voorvechter van de Verlichting, in de vrijmetselarij en andere Nederlandse genootschappen, 1790-1845*, 2 vols. (Deventer: Sub Rosa, 1988).
- A.J. Hanou & G.J. Vis, *Johannes Kinker (1764-1845). Briefwisseling*, vol. 1: 1792-1822 (Amsterdam etc.: Rodopi, 1992).
- A.J. Hanou & G.J. Vis, *Johannes Kinker (1764-1845). Briefwisseling*, vol. 2: 1823-1828 (Amsterdam etc.: Rodopi, 1993).
- A.J. Hanou & G.J. Vis, *Johannes Kinker (1764-1845). Briefwisseling*, vol. 3: 1828-1843 (Amsterdam etc.: Rodopi, 1994).
- R. Harris & T.J. Taylor, *Landmarks in Linguistic Thought. The Western Tradition from Socrates to Saussure* (London etc.: Routledge, 1989).
- G. Janssens, 'De uitspraakcolleges van Johannes Kinker aan de universiteit te Luik: Een eerste verkenning', in *Taal, cultuurbeleid en natievorming onder Willem I*, ed. by R. Vosters & J. Weijermars (Brussel: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen, 2012), pp. 171-190.
- G. Janssens & K. Steyaert (with the cooperation of Bernard Pierret), *Het onderwijs van het Nederlands in de Waalse provincies en Luxemburg onder koning Willem I (1814-1830). Niets meer dan een boon in een brouwketel?* (Brussel: VUB Press, 2008).
- G. Janssens (with the cooperation of K. Steyaert), *Tweehonderd jaar neerlandistiek aan de Universiteit de Liège: Een geschiedenis van de oudste extramurale leerstoel Nederlands* (Leuven etc.: Acco, 2014).
- L. Jensen, *Verzet tegen Napoleon* (Nijmegen: Vantilt, 2013).
- P.N. Juliard, *Philosophies of Language in Eighteenth-Century France* (The Hague: Mouton, 1970).
- L. ten Kate, *Aenleiding tot de kennis van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche Sprake*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam: Rudolph & Gerard Wetstein, 1723; reprint ed. by Jan Noordegraaf and Marijke van der Wal, Alphen aan den Rijn: Canaletto/Repro Holland, 2001).

- J. Kinker, 'Proeve eener opheldering' van de Critiek der zuivere rede', *Magazyn voor de critische wijsgeerte en de geschiedenis van dezelve*, II (1799), 43-238.
- J. Kinker, *Essai d'une exposition succincte de la Critique de la Raison pure; traduit du Hollandais par J. le Fèvre* (Amsterdam: Changuion & den Hengst, 1801).
- J. Kinker, *Inleiding eener wijsgeerige algemeene theorie der talen*, in *Gedenkschriften, in de hedendaagsche talen, van de derde klasse van het Koninklijk-Nederlandsche Instituut van Wetenschappen, Letterkunde en Schoone Kunsten*, vol. 1 (Amsterdam, 1817).
- J. Kinker, *Proeve eener Hollandsche prosodia, oordeelkundig gegrond op, en door het gehoor getoetst aan de uitspraak onzer taal, door het beschaafde gedeelte onzer natie, en toegepast op het rythmus en metrum der ouden, in zoo verre beiden in onze Hollandsche dichtkunde zouden kunnen worden ingevoerd* (Amsterdam: Allart, n.d.; 1808/1810).
- J. Kinker, *Beoordeeling van Mr. W. Bilderdijks Nederlandsche spraakleer* (Amsterdam: van der Heij, 1829).
- J. Maat, 'General or Universal Grammar from Plato to Chomsky', in *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Linguistics*, ed. by Keith Allan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), pp. 397-417.
- M. Rutten, 'Neerlandica aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Luik: Johannes Kinker', *Tijdschrift voor levende talen – Revue des langues vivantes*, 28 (1962), 99-133.
- H. Schultink, 'Johannes Kinker (1764-1845) als praktiserend morfoloog', in *Leven met woorden. Opstellen aangeboden aan Piet van Sterkenburg bij zijn afscheid als directeur van het Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie en als hoogleraar Lexicologie aan de Universiteit Leiden*, ed. by F. Moerdijk, A. van Santen & R. Tempelaars (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 435-444.
- M. Siegenbeek, *Verhandeling over de Nederduitsche spelling* (Amsterdam: Allart, 1804).
- K. Steyaert, 'Het "mysterie" Tandem: Kinkers studentengenootschap te Luik', in *Taal, cultuurbeleid en natievorming onder Willem I*, ed. by R. Vosters & J. Weijermars (Brussel: Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen, 2012), pp. 153-168.
- G.J. Vis, *Johannes Kinker en zijn literaire theorie* (Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink, 1967).
- C.G.N. de Vooy, 'Kinker als taalkundige naast en tegenover Bilderdijk', in *Verzamelde Taalkundige Opstellen III* (Groningen: Wolters, 1947), pp. 63-76.
- M.J. van der Wal, *De taaltheorie van Johannes Kinker* (Leiden: Publikaties van de Vakgroep Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde, 1977).
- M.J. van der Wal, 'The Kantian Mentalism of Johannes Kinker (1764-1845)', *Topoi*, 4 (1985), 151-153.
- M.J. van der Wal, 'Recensie van Johannes Kinker (1764-1845). Briefwisseling (deel I: 1792-1822)', eds. A.J. Hanou & G.J. Vis, *Rodopi Amsterdam – Atlanta 1992*, *Forum der Letteren*, 34 (1993), 151-154.

P. Weiland, *Nederduitsche spraakkunst* (Amsterdam: Allart, 1805).

R.M. Wielema, 'Die erste niederländische Kant-Rezeption 1786-1850', *Kant-Studien*, 79 (1988), 450-466.

J.F.X. Würth, *Cours préparatoire à l'étude de la littérature hollandaise* (Liège: Collardin, 1823).

Manuscripts consulted

University Library Leiden (UBL):

UBL, LTK 3. J. Kinker, Dictaten over taalkunde in het algemeen, in het Nederlandsch en Fransch, gegeven te Luik.

UBL, LTK 4. J. Kinker, Opstellen en aantekeningen over vergelijkende taalkunde.

UBL, LTK 6. J. Kinker, Taalkundige aantekeningen. Vergelijking van de Nederlandsche met andere Indo-Germaansche talen.

UBL, LTK 17. J. Kinker, Lessen over Nederlandsche taal- en letterkunde en welsprekendheid.

UBL, LTK 29. J. Kinker, Dictaten over Nederlandsche taal en woordvoeging.

UBL, LTK 31. J. Kinker, Over verschillende soorten van werkwoorden.

UBL, LTK 409. J. Kinker, Over ongelijkvloeiende werkwoorden.

UBL, LTK 572. J. Kinker, Woorden en spreekwoorden in de taal van Luik.

Royal Libray The Hague (KB):

KB Den Haag, KW 73 F11-12

KB Den Haag, KW 73 F15

About the Author

Marijke van der Wal (1949) is Professor in the History of Dutch (chair Merweborgh Foundation) at Leiden University. Her publications cover the fields of both historical linguistics and the historiography of linguistics. Her current research focusses on egodocuments and the language history from below. She directed the 'Letters as Loot. Towards a non-standard view on the history of Dutch' research programme, which explored the extraordinary source of Dutch seventeenth- and eighteenth-century private letters, kept in the National Archives (Kew, UK). She is editor, together with Terttu Nevalainen (Helsinki), of the *Advances in Historical Sociolinguistics* book series (John Benjamins Publishing Company).