



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

**Dutch grammar in Japanese words: reception and representation of European theory of grammar in the manuscripts of Shizuki Tadao (1760 - 1806)**

Nespoli, L.

**Citation**

Nespoli, L. (2023, September 12). *Dutch grammar in Japanese words: reception and representation of European theory of grammar in the manuscripts of Shizuki Tadao (1760 - 1806)*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Amsterdam. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3640636>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3640636>

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

## **CHAPTER III**

### **Early European Studies on the Dutch Language**

*Bergen en daalen ontmoeten elkander nooit, maar menschen wel.*

Mountains and valleys never meet each other, but men do.

(Hendrik Doeff, 1814)

### 3. Early European studies on the Dutch language

#### 3.1 European tradition on grammar, from Socrates to *Twe-spraeck*

Before analyzing the studies on language and grammar that have been carried out in the Low Countries about Dutch, I should first briefly illustrate the origin of what I will henceforth simplify with the phrasing “Greek-Latin tradition”. The present section will mainly function in two directions. Firstly, it will illustrate how the theories of Ancient Greece spread throughout Europe, during the centuries. Secondly, it will evidence the fact that some of the issues and topics I will deal with in the present book, have been discussed since the very conception of the idea of grammar.

When it comes to the “Greek-Latin tradition” of grammar, it is generally believed that the first postulations of this kind have been made roughly in the 5<sup>th</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> century BC, in Greece, by philosophers such as Socrates (470 – 399 BC), Plato (428/427 or 424/423 – 348/347 BC) and Aristotle (384 – 322 BC). As claimed by ROBINS (1951, 6), a peculiarity of the beginnings of the grammatical investigations in Greece is that it was strongly motivated by the need to understand and reinterpret the language of the classics, namely Homer. Generally, ROBINS adds, the birth of a grammatical conscience arises in a specific culture when encountering a foreign language, but this was not completely true for Greece.

In Protagoras (480 – 410 BC), one can already see the detecting of two verbal moods (indicative and conjunctive) and three genders. Democritus (470 – 360 BC), instead, had already tried to justify the “correctness of language” based on the language used by the poet Homer, with the principle of *orthoepia* ὀρθοεπία. Appealing to an honorable source, specifically a poetic one, in order to justify one’s own theories on grammar will be a pattern that can be witnessed across the ages, and even in Japan. After Plato’s *Cratylus* (Κρατύλος), Aristotle is probably one of the first figures to provide a somewhat structured description of the parts of speech. In his *De Interpretatione* (Περὶ ἑρμηνείας), he divides words in three categories: *onomata* “nouns”, *rhemata* “verbs” and *sundesmoi*, literally “conjunctions”, the latter including words that only conveyed grammatical meaning (RUIJSENDAAL 1991, 12; ROBINS 1951, 17-18). Along with the distinction between “nouns” and “verbs”, another grammatical issue that was already investigated by the early Greeks, is the question of grammatical gender; how to categorize the different classes of nouns, and to what extent real-world sexual features could help with such categorization (ROBINS 1951, 14).

Subsequently, learned individuals started gathering in the city of Alexandria. For them, Homer’s language was already becoming noticeably distant and obscure. This incentivized new studies on the classics and a tendency to strive to maintain a Greek language that could be as close as possible to that of the classics themselves. The scholars of Alexandria intended to redeem Greek from decadence. It is in this context that one can see extreme tendencies, like Zenodotus who started emending Homer’s language when it did not comply with Attic Greek grammar (ROBINS 1951, 37-38). After a period of centrality of the Alexandrine school, that pondered on

whether grammar should be *techné* (art) or *empeiria* (experience), the pivotal *Techné grammatiké* is published, a brief collection of notions regarding language, written in the first century BC and attributed to Dionysius Thrax, himself from Alexandria. This work stands out as a first attempt at treating language as a single entity, based on experiential knowledge (*empeiria*) and normal language-use (*usus*) of poets and writers. A grammar serving literature (RUISENDAAL 1991, 48-49). What is most interesting for the present research, regarding Thrax's grammar, is the fact that it presents eight parts of speech: nouns, verbs, participles, articles, pronouns, prepositions, adverbs, and conjunctions. Verbs, in Thrax, were defined as "the part of speech without case-inflection, admitting inflection of tense, person and number, signifying an activity or a being acted on" (ROBINS 1951, 40). In the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD, in Alexandria, lived Apollonius Dyscolus, who created a theory of syntax while trying to find a working system behind all grammatical constructions, even irregular ones. An interesting feature of his theory is that verbs are considered secondary to nouns because they are used to specify the active or passive state of nouns themselves (RUISENDAAL 1991, 58-59). The grammar attributed to Dinoysius Thrax has created a system whereby the grammatical investigation was focused on the categorization of words, and has been maintained for centuries (LUHRMAN 1984, 13). This approach has been defined by ROBINS (1967, 25) as "word based grammar", that he believes involves three main implications, which I copy verbatim:

"the identification of the word as an isolable linguistic entity; the establishment of a set of word classes to distinguish and classify the words in the language; the working out of adequate grammatical categories to describe and analyze the morphology of words entering into paradigms of associated forms and the syntactic relations obtaining between words in the construction of sentences"

These implications are what LUHRMAN (1984, 15) asserts leading to the necessity, in most post-Thraxian grammars, of defining what a word is, what the categories of said words are and how words are inflected morphologically. In order to explain the role of such morphological modifications, the ancient grammarians came up with the concept of *accidens*, that can be traced back to Aristotle. Each variable category was to be inflected according to a number of *accidentia*, in order to express their morphosyntactic function, like tense and mood, for verbs, or case and number for nouns, etcetera. Although I will cover this concept in 3.2, one *accidens* that deserves to be anticipated is that of *genus* 'gender'. Grammatical gender was not something unique to nouns or to those parts of speech that needed to be inflected accordingly in combination to nouns but was also extended to verbs. The *accidens genus* of verbs is a particularly complicated issue to cover, since this term has been used in a plethora of senses, often conflating activeness and passiveness, that correspond today to the "voice" (*vox*) of verbs, and the concepts of transitivity and intransitivity (LUHRMAN 1984, 381). Little mention was made to the concept of *accidens genus* after the *trivium* period. However, even within the grammatical theory relevant to the present research, the common approach was to divide verbs in three types: active, passive, and neuter. Similar distinctions could be seen already in the writings of Roman

grammarians Aelius Donatus who, in the 4<sup>th</sup> century, described five genders of verbs, in Latin, as follows:

1. *Activa*: those verbs that present the ending *-o* in the first person singular present indicative form, and that can be turned passive by the ending *-or*;
2. *Passiva*: those verbs that present the ending *-or* in the first person singular present indicative form, and that can be turned active by the ending *-o*;
3. *Deponentia*: those verbs that end in *-or*, while always having an active meaning;
4. *Communia*: those verbs that end in *-or* and have either an active or neutral sense according to the context;
5. *Neutra*: those verbs that end in *-o* but cannot be turned passive by the ending *-or*. Also those verbs that do not end in either *-o* or *-or*, in their first person singular present indicative form, but rather in *-t*, *-i*, or *-um*.

As LUHRMAN (1984, 382) points out, these definitions depend fundamentally on the two “main” categories of “active” and “passive”. In fact, the other three categories are all defined depending on their possibility of expressing activeness or passiveness. The tendency of defining neuter verbs as those that cannot express either an action or a “suffering”, is very well documented, however, Priscian, who lived in the 6<sup>th</sup> century, was already criticizing this definition that stated that all verbs express actions that are *aut patitur aut agit* “either suffering or action”. What Priscian proposes instead, is to use the concept of neutrality to refer to those verbs that cannot combine with a genitive, accusative or dative, and cannot be turned passive, a definition that coincides with modern intransitive verbs. This means that neutrality was shifted from a purely morphological category to a morphosyntactic one (LUHRMAN 1984, 382-3).

The summoning of Crates of Mallus to Rome, during the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC, is considered the moment when Greek grammar entered the Latin-speaking world. The works of Crates are considered fundamental in inspiring of what is believed to be the first book of Latin grammar, authored by Marcus Terentius Varro (116 – 27 BC), by the title *De lingua latina* (RUIJSEDAAL 1991, 67-69).

When Greek grammar reached Rome, the Latins could thus base the grammar of their own language on the work that had already been done by the Greeks, whose culture the Romans tended to admire. Many Roman scholars decided to adopt and adapt Greek grammar, by including the main differences between the two languages, namely: the absence of a definite article, in Latin, and the six-case system of Latin against the five of Greek. The close relatedness of Latin and Greek made it possible for the Romans to simply adopt Greek grammar with just a few adjustments (ROBINS 1951, 48-49). After Varro, other Romans started working on grammar, also coining many of the Latin terms that are seen in 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century Dutch grammars as well, starting from the adaptation of Thrax’s term *Technè grammatikè* into *Ars grammatica*. Notable mention should be made of Latin authors such as Quintus Remmius Palaemon and his student Marcus Fabius Quintilianus, both rhetoricians. The Roman period is considered to end with Priscianus Caesariensis (5<sup>th</sup> century AD) author of *Institutio de arte grammatica*, also known as *Institutiones grammaticarum*. This book is acknowledged as the last Latin grammar book that can

be considered authored by a native speaker and has been at the basis of the grammars of the Middle Ages (RUISENDAAL 1991, 88-129). A turning point from the ancient era is Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius (480 – 524), who is known as the one who first used the term *quadrivium* to refer to the “four” liberal arts, namely: arithmetic; geometry; astrology and music (RUISENDAAL 1991, 139). It is Roman scholar Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus (485 – 580) who provided the following definition of grammar:<sup>1</sup>

<p>Grammatica vero est peritia pulchre loquendi ex poetis illustribus, oratoribusque collecta. Officium ejus est sine vitio dictionem prosaem metricamque componere.</p>	<p>Grammar really is the analysis of the collection of the beautiful speeches of distinguished poets and orators. Their job is to compose prose and metric without errors.</p>
--	--

This demonstrates the continuation of the approach to grammar with the intention of describing and prescribing the use of language of famous and respected authors.

ROBINS (1951, 70-75) divides the grammatical studies of the Middle Ages into two periods. The first period spans from the 8<sup>th</sup> century to the 12<sup>th</sup>, while the second goes until the Renaissance. The first period was considered “formative”, by ROBINS, while the second period was described as “more productive and significant”. During the Middle Ages one also sees the affirmation of the seven liberal arts, that were composed of the two groups: *trivium* and *quadrivium*, to which I will go back in 3.2.

With time, one also starts seeing grammars of Latin being produced in lands where Latin had never been native. The English Bede (672/3 – 735) and Alcuin of York (735 – 804) are particularly relevant as they reintroduced the dialogued style in their grammar books, meant for teaching (RUISENDAAL 1991, 148-153). The dialogue-form will still be used by some Dutch authors, in the eighteenth century, even among those that reached Japan, like Marin’s *Spraakwyze* (see 4.4).

The Italian Renaissance stimulated humanism that meant an interest in the Classical world and, thus, in the Latin language and literature. It is in this context that Lorenzo Valla (1407 – 1457) compiled his *Elegantium linguae latinae libri sex*, where it is claimed that there is only one type of Latin that can be considered good, and that is the type of Latin used by authors such as Virgil and Ovid and no later than Priscianus (RUISENDAAL 1991, 183-187). Humanism steadily spreads from Florence toward the northern lands of Europe, inspiring Erasmus of Rotterdam (1466 – 1536) who believed grammar to be the basis of all disciplines (*Grammaticen esse deisciplinarum omnium fundamentum*). Travelling across Europe, Erasmus is convinced that the arid learning of grammatical rules makes little sense if one is able to practice daily with actual speakers of such language. For humanists, grammar was generally concerned with four fields of investigation: orthography; etymology (that corresponded more closely to what we would today call “morphology”); prosody; and syntax (RUISENDAAL 1991, 195-205). The year 1540 is often acknowledged as a turning point for European grammatical tradition and the year in which the studies of the classics reached their peak. This is because

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from RUISENDAAL (1991, 140), my English translation.

in that year the Italian Julius Caesar Scaliger (1484 – 1558), latinized name for Giulio Cesare della Scala, published his *De causis linguae latinae*, where he proposes a return to the Aristotelian theoretical framework, and a more empirical approach to the study of language. He criticizes the other humanists for not having considered language as an abstract system that required to be analyzed scientifically. In fact, he believed language not to be a form of *ars*, but rather a form of *scientia* (RUIJSEDAAL 1991, 206-207). These authors and movements certainly did not stay confined within the borders of their homelands and spread all throughout Europe. One still needs to wait, however, until the foundation of the University of Leiden in 1575, for a more prominent role of the Low Countries, in the context of the studies of grammar. The University of Leiden attracted many important scholars of the time, among whom one should mention the philologist Justus Lipsius (1547 – 1606). Ludolffus Lithocomus of Dusseldorf (dates unknown) authored *De grammatica latina*, that spread in the Low Countries since the year 1584. This work still employed the subdivision of grammar in orthography, prosody, etymology, and syntax. Lithocomus' *De grammatica latina* has been notably used in the Low Countries for the subsequent decades, also employed as the basis for Christiaan van Heule's Dutch grammar in 1625. The hegemony of the use of *De grammatica latina* will not be superseded until the publication, in 1635, of *Aristarchus, sive De arte grammatica libri septem* by Gerardus Vossius (1577 - 1649). For Vossius, grammar was but an instrument by means of which to teach, and the specific rules of a language needed to be learned in the context of one's own daily life (RUIJSEDAAL 1991, 232-233).

The first traces of learned individuals defending the use of the so-called “vulgar language” in literary contexts can be found in Italy, particularly with the 1304 *De vulgari eloquentia* by Tuscan author Dante Alighieri (1265 – 1321). What is considered to be the first European grammar on a “vulgar language” – or, better said, “vernacular language” – is indeed Tuscan, specifically with the 1443 book *Grammatica della lingua toscana*, by Leon Battista Alberti (1404 – 1472). One still needs to wait until the year 1492 for the second such book, a grammar of Castilian Spanish by the title *Gramática castellana* by Antonio de Nebrija (1444 – 1522). Slowly, in the rest of Europe, other lands developed their own vernacular grammars, often motivated by nationalism and empire-building (RUIJSEDAAL 1991, 245-246).

In the Dutch speaking territories, the literary interest in the vernacular language developed mostly from the need to provide a readable translation of the Bible, consistent with the Lutheran Reformation. However, most attempts at providing translations into a language that could be accessible to all speakers of the Dutch varieties had little success during the 16<sup>th</sup> century. A concrete step forward was made in 1618 with the Synod of Dordrecht where many literates came together and finally agreed on how to proceed with the translation of the Bible in a form of the vernacular language that could be accessible to all speakers of Dutch. Nonetheless, there were not only religious reasons that motivated the adoption of a form of vernacular language in the Low Countries. In fact, the language of politics and institutions also needed to be more accessible to the masses, gradually abandoning the custom of communicating in Latin, French or German (RUIJSEDAAL 1991, 250-251).



In the process of de-Latinization of scholastic knowledge, of the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, one must remember the support in favor of the use of Dutch from great authors such as Dirck Volkertszoon Coornhert (1522 – 1590), Simon Stevin (1548 – 1620) and Hendrik Laurenszoon Spiegel (1549 – 1612) (RUISENDAAL 1991, 257), this last one recognized as the author of the anonymous *Twe-spraeck vande Nederduitsche letterkunst* (henceforth *Twe-spraeck*) in 1584, the first book of Dutch grammar written in Dutch. *Twe-spraeck* was a pivotal work, that started what is called the *trivium*-period in the Netherlands (3.2). This work was also structured in the form of a dialogue. This explains the division in four parts, namely: *orthographia* ‘orthography’; *maatklank* ‘prosody’; *etymologia* ‘etymology’ (closer to modern morphology); *t’samenvoeghing* ‘syntax’ (RUISENDAAL 1991, 294-302).

The present paragraph 3.1 does not have the ambition of presenting a complete and comprehensive description of all the works on grammar ever made in Europe across history. This work has been already done by many scholars, some of whom I have cited in the present paragraph, and who could devote to this topic many more pages than it is necessary for the present research. The scholars of Dutch with whom I am concerned, probably did not read most of these sources directly, and were surely not immersed in this type of cultural environment. In fact, Dutch grammarians of the 18<sup>th</sup> century generally only cited authors contemporary to them or belonging to the near past, with the exception, maybe of Hooft and Vondel, undisputed symbols of good Dutch, and the first Dutch grammar *Twe-spraeck* of 1584. However, disregarding the whole process of development of a grammatical thinking in Europe that can – and must – be traced back to the first philosophical abstractions of Greek authors and, thus, the long tradition of Latin studies should not be permitted. Although not being direct sources, many of the concepts that were created in this distant past had preserved in grammatical studies and were still being employed and were oftentimes assumed as commonly known concepts. Instead, the intent of this paragraph is to provide a loose picture of what will be pointed at when the term “Greek-Latin tradition” will be used. Certainly, I cannot claim that Dutch grammarians of the 18<sup>th</sup> century always employed such broadly defined Greek-Latin tradition consciously, but one needs to acknowledge the fact that what the Japanese got to read from sources such as Séwel, can be defined as the 18<sup>th</sup> century Dutch reception of such Greek-Latin tradition. In 3.2, I will present the so-called *trivium*-period, that concerns a series of Dutch authors preceding the 18<sup>th</sup> century, who have adopted and adapted the Greek-Latin tradition of grammar to the description of Dutch, for the first time in history.

### 3.2 The *trivium*-grammarians and the concept of *spraakunst*

The coining of the term and concept of “grammar” is attributed to the Hellenistic grammarian Dionysius Thrax (170 - 90 BC), who referred to it as *téchnē grammatiké* τέχνη γραμματική that was subsequently translated into Latin as *ars grammatica* ‘grammatical art’ evolving, during the Dutch Renaissance, into the term *letterkonst*, composed of the terms *letter* ‘letter’ and *konst/kunst* ‘art’. This term has been used profusely by many authors in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, but it was ultimately substituted by the term *spraakunst* (or variations thereof) after Christiaen

van Heule (? - 1655) first introduced it in the Dutch language, in his 1625 work by the title *De Nederduytsche Grammatica ofte Spraec-konst*, as *spraec-konst*, composed of the terms *spraec* ‘speech/language’ and *konst/kunst* ‘art’ (DIBBETS 1995, p. 10). The main reason why this newly coined term is preferred, is explained by the author in the following excerpt:<sup>2</sup>

<p>De spraeckonst wort in het latijn <i>Grammatica</i> genaemt, welk op het duitsch Letterkonst beteykent, maer om dat in dit werk de spraeke meer aengevoert wort, als wel het gene dat den letteren aengaet, so heeft ons het woort <i>Spraeckonst</i> best behaecht.</p>	<p>The <i>spraeckonst</i> is called <i>Grammatica</i> in Latin, which corresponds to the Dutch <i>letterkonst</i> but since in this work we will concentrate more on the speech, rather than letters, we believe the word <i>spraeckonst</i> to be better suited.</p>
---	---

The term *spraeckonst* used by Van Heule has been subsequently used to refer to many publications on language, like schoolbooks; treatises on spelling, pronunciation, word categories or syntax; as well as books for Dutch speakers to learn a foreign language, or speakers of a foreign language to learn Dutch (DIBBETS 1995, i). Structurally, grammar books in the *trivium*-period still generally presented the subdivision in four parts, covering orthography, etymology (i.e., morphology), prosody, and syntax, where the former two tended to occupy foremost importance (RUIJSEDAAL 1991, 245).

### 3.2.1 The parts of speech in the *trivium*-grammars

The categorization of the parts of speech can be done according to different methodologies that consider different characteristics of the words of a language. DIBBETS (1995) argues that the Dutch *trivium*-grammarians have been less prone to adopt the category of articles since it did not exist in the Latin language (see 3.2.2). In the first half of the *trivium*-period, there still was no consensus on how the concept of “word” was to be defined and where the line distinguishing between syllables and words ought to be drawn (DIBBETS 1995, 25-28). In this regard, Joos Lambrecht (1491 – 1566/7) wrote, in his *Nederlandsche Spellinghe* in 1550, the following:<sup>3</sup>

<p>D’earste silleben van dézen voorgaanden woorden, te wéten be, ghe, naar, onder, ont, ende ver, zijn ledsilleben, of <i>articuli praepositivi</i>, dats voorwoorden, of voorsilleben, diemen zomstijds voor ander woorden steld, tot staerker beteakenes.</p>	<p>The first syllables of these previous words, namely <i>be-</i>, <i>ghe-</i>, <i>naar-</i>, <i>onder-</i>, <i>ont-</i> and <i>ver-</i> are <i>ledsilleben</i>, or <i>articuli praepositivi</i>, which are <i>voorwoorden</i>, or <i>voorsilleben</i> which sometimes, when placed before other words, strengthen their meanings.</p>
---	--

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from DIBBETS (1995, 11), my translation.

<sup>3</sup> Quoted from DIBBETS (1995, 28), my translation.

Prefixes are considered here as a type of words belonging to the *voorwoorden*, literally ‘pre-words’, also *voorsillemen*, literally ‘pre-syllables’, that Lambrecht calls *ledsillemen* in Dutch, or *articuli praepositivi*, in Latin. The term *led*, often *lid*, is nowadays used in compound words referring to the category of articles (i.e., *lidwoord*, also see 3.2.2). Even Halma, in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, used to refer to the prefix *ge-* as an article (see 4.2).

The debate of whether syllables ought to be considered words and to what extent this should be done was particularly lively in the *trivium*-period, but it remained present up until the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The author Christiaan (van) Varenbraken (dates unknown), in 1530, asserts that monosyllabic words cannot be considered as “words” even when they are combined with other syllables, in which case they become simple syllables. That is to say that the syllable *brac*, in isolation, is a word, while the same syllable in the word *bracker* – where the suffix *-er* is added – is not a word anymore but a syllable, instead (DIBBETS 1995, 26).

After drawing the distinctive line between words and syllables, the Dutch *trivium*-grammarians tried to define the different types of parts of speech, or at least a system by means of which the vocabulary of the Dutch language could be categorized. The approaches in the *trivium*-period were mainly two, both considering the fundamental distinction of categories that could undergo inflection and those that could not. In this approach, one would initially divide words in “inflectable” (*buigelijk* or *veranderlijk*) and “non-inflectable” (*onbuigelijk* or *onveranderlijk*) and, subsequently, place the different types of words in either category. This is the conception of Dutch parts of speech presented, for example, by Van Heule. Amongst the *trivium*-grammarians this was adopted by the pivotal *Twe-spraeck*, published in 1584 by an unnamed author, although generally attributed to Hendrik Laurensz Spiegel (1549–1612). Alternatively, dividing words between inflectable and non-inflectable could be done after first dividing them into the eight/nine categories (DIBBETS 1995, 34-36). The idea that words must be divided according to the possibility of inflection is derived from the Aristotelian philosophy, where the term *sumbebēkós* σὺμβεβηκός indicated what was being incidentally added to a word (see 3.1). This was reworked by the Latin authors into the terms *observatio* and *accidens*, from which the Dutch term *toeval* ‘accident’ was coined and used throughout the *trivium*-period to indicate the different types of inflection (DIBBETS 1995, 41-43).

Although counting nine parts of speech was probably the most common practice, their number varied. For example, Van Heule, in his 1633 *De Nederduytsche spraec-konst ofte tael-beschrijvinghe*, claims that Dutch has six parts of speech, where all the non-inflectable words are collected in the *help-woord* ‘help-word’ category (DIBBETS 1995, 36). Another influential school of grammarians, particularly prolific in the French-speaking world, believed the parts of speech to be eight, not including articles (DIBBETS 1995, 50-51). In the following sections, I will provide a brief overview of how each part of speech was conceived of by some of the influential grammarians of the *trivium*-period, in order to understand precisely what type of background knowledge each 18<sup>th</sup> century author of Dutch grammars had. This is necessary when analyzing Halma and Marin’s dictionaries, since their grammatical content is sparse, scattered and, often, inconsistent. Without the

knowledge of the schools of thought that have preceded them, it is impossible to interpret and contextualize the definition of each grammatical term they used, also considering that most of these terms only occur once in their dictionaries.

### 3.2.2 Articles

Articles did not exist in Latin, yet they did in Ancient Greek. Consequently, the Greek philosophers had postulated the existence of such category, using the term *árthra* ἄρθρα (singular: *árthron* ἄρθρον), originally ‘limb’. This word was then translated into Latin as *articuli* (singular: *articulus*, from *artus* ‘limb’ + *-culus* diminutive suffix) and, subsequently, into Dutch in many ways. For example, *lidwoord*, *lid*, *ledeken* and *voorleeden* were terms used until the 19<sup>th</sup> century, where *lid* and *le(e)d* correspond to the idea of “limb”, thus “small part”. Among German grammarians the term *artykel* – also *artikel* – was also often used (DIBBETS 1995, 49). Since articles did not exist in Latin, this category has been re-purposed by Latin grammarians to indicate parts of speech that are nowadays categorized differently. Varro has used the term *articuli* to refer to the pronouns of Latin, which is understandable since, in Romance languages, the definite articles have developed from the demonstrative pronouns of Latin.<sup>4</sup> Because of their role in the Ancient Greek language, and their absence in Latin, articles were considered, by the *trivium*-grammarians, to be words directly connected to the gender and case of the nouns they referred to (DIBBETS 1995, 50), an idea that lived on well into the 18<sup>th</sup> century (see Chapter IV).

### 3.2.3 Nouns and adjectives

The category of noun was first postulated by Greek philosophers via the term *ónoma* ὄνομα, on the basis of which the Latin *nomen* was coined, consequently adapted by the Dutch grammarians as *naam* ‘name’. This term has been used up until the *trivium*-period, when the modern *naamwoord* was coined. The definitions given to nouns by the *trivium*-grammarians tended to specify that they referenced ‘things’ (*ding*, *iet*, *zaak*), that are both concrete as well as abstract (the latter rendered with terms such as *on-lichaamlijk* or *on-lijfflijk*) (DIBBETS 1995, 79-81). The term *naam(woord)* has been always used, and still is, to refer both to nouns as well as adjectives, an approach that was started by Greek-Latin grammarians in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC (DIBBETS 1995, 38). To distinguish nouns from adjectives, the former ones were called *zelfstandig naamwoord* ‘substantive noun’, ‘independent noun’ while the latter *bijvoegelijk naamwoord* ‘adjectival noun’, ‘adjunct-noun’, or similar phrasings. “Common” (*gemeen*) nouns were either considered a subcategory of substantives or a supercategory that included substantives as well as adjectives (DIBBETS 1995, 88). As mentioned above, gender and case were mostly seen as being informed via the use of articles, yet the terms *naamval* or *geval*, calques from Latin *casus nominis*, was not uncommon in the *trivium*-period, as well, demonstrating the conception of “case” as an *accidens* of nouns. This can be seen in

<sup>4</sup> See, for example, PATOTA (2016, 128-135) for the origin of articles in the Italian language.

the following quote from the 1628 *Taelbericht der Nederlandsche spellingé* by Samuel Ampzing (1590 – 1632):<sup>5</sup>

<p>[...] voorneemste buijginge, die in onse tale het onderscheijdt der gevallen maakt, geschied in de ledekens der selfstandige ofte rechte Naamen, ende niet so seer in de rechte Naamen selfs</p>	<p>[...] main inflection, which in our language indicates the difference between the cases, occurring in the articles of the substantive or proper nouns, and not in the substantive nouns themselves.</p>
---	--

The description of the *accidens/toeval* of the cases of nouns was generally based upon their structure in Latin, often to justify the elegance of the Dutch language. In the *Twe-spraack*, one can read the following quote:<sup>6</sup>

<p>De Latynen hebbender zes, die wy in dezen Vólgen zullen, om daar deur tót grondlyker Naspeuring der eighenschappen onses taals te komen.</p>	<p>The Latins had six of them, which we would abide by, here, in order to reach a thorough understanding of the qualities of our language.</p>
---	--

It was also not uncommon for Dutch grammarians in the 18<sup>th</sup> century to refer to the concept of the *casus obliqui* ‘oblique case’. This is a term used by Latin grammarians to distinguish the nominative case, the only *casus recti* ‘direct case’, from all the others. This distinction could be seen, for example in Van Heule (1625), where he uses the terms *rechte gevallen* and *gebogene<sup>7</sup> gevallen* for *casus recti* and *casus obliqui*, respectively (DIBBETS 1995, 162).

The correct use of each grammatical gender was already considered a fundamental skill for the educated and proper use of the language in the *trivium*-period (DIBBETS 1995, 102-107) and, as I will discuss, it was still lively in the 18<sup>th</sup> century.

### 3.2.4 Pronouns

The Dutch terms *voornaam* and *voornaamwoord* were already used to refer to pronouns since the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. This is a calque from the Latin *pronomina* that translated the Greek *antōnymía ἀντωνυμία* (DIBBETS 1995, 193). The definition of this category was anything but clear during the *trivium*-period and was surely in line with the works published in the rest of Europe (DIBBETS 1995, 228). Furthermore, French, and English grammarians tended not to go too deep into the quality of pronouns, contrarily to the German tradition (DIBBETS 1995, 208). This could explain why 18<sup>th</sup> century Halma and Marin, both very much influenced by French grammars, present rather confused explanations regarding pronouns, as will be seen in Chapter IV. In this period, one can witness the use of terms such as *aan-*

<sup>5</sup> Quoted from DIBBETS (1995), my translation.

<sup>6</sup> Quoted from DIBBETS (1995), my translation.

<sup>7</sup> From the verb *buigen* ‘to bow’, thus “oblique”.

*wijzende* for ‘demonstrative’, *betrekkelijk* for ‘relative’, *vragende* for ‘interrogative’, *we(d)erkerig* for ‘reflexive’ and *bezittende* for ‘possessive’.

One fundamental difference from the *trivium*-period and the grammarians of the 18<sup>th</sup> century is that in the 1600s the second person singular pronoun *du*, and its inflexed forms *dij* and *dijn*, were still used by many authors (DIBBETS 1995, 210). This pronoun disappears almost completely from the grammars of the following century; favoring *gij*, *u* and *uw*, that are today often replaced by *jij*, *jou* and *jouw*, in many instances, in contemporary Dutch.<sup>8</sup>

### 3.2.5 Verbs

In the first decades of the *trivium*-period the term for verb was simply *woord* ‘word’. This was a consequence of the adaptation of the Latin term *verbum*, which is still used in languages such as English and French, but which originated from the Platonic-Aristotelian *rhêma* ῥῆμα, simply indicating ‘word’, indeed. In the 16<sup>th</sup> century, it was not rare to see this part of speech being called *dadich woort* or *wervig woort*, both meaning something like ‘doing-word’. Peeter Heyns (1537 - 1598), in his *Cort onderwijs van de acht deelen der Franschoiser talen* (‘Short teaching of the eight parts of the Franch language’), uses the term *werck-woorden* ‘work-words’, first (1571) for verbs in general, and subsequently (1605) only for active verbs, where *werck* ‘work’ is, supposedly, a translation of the Latin *actio* ‘action’. Although many other words have been used throughout the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, the term *werkwoord* became the most common by the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Dutch verbs were always divided into two or three main categories: active verbs, neuter verbs and, sometimes, passive verbs. This categorization, while ultimately coming from Latin (see 3.1), was mediated by the *trivium*-grammarians by means of the definitions they provided of verbs which, they claimed, could express *doen* ‘doing’, *lijden* ‘suffering’ (i.e., ‘passivity’) or *geschieden* ‘happening’. The verbs expressing something that happens (by Van Heule also, ‘an action done by somebody else’) were for a long time conflated with the category of *onpersonelijk* ‘impersonal’ but have developed by the 18<sup>th</sup> century into the category of ‘neuter verbs’ (DIBBETS 1995, 229-233). In the definition of neuter verbs, during the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, many grammarians started substituting the concept of ‘happening’ with the concept of ‘being’, either with the term *wezen* or *zijn*. Regarding the verb *zijn* ‘to be’, it needs to be added that conceiving it as a *zelfstandig werkwoord*, as a ‘substantive’ or ‘independent verb’ started with Latin grammarians and was maintained until the 18<sup>th</sup> century, although this appears to be an adaptation of Apollonius Dyscolus’ claim describing the Latin verb *esse* ‘to be’ as the ‘verb of existence’ (DIBBETS 1995, 235; RUIJSENDAAL 1991, 360). Van Heule (1625) claims that the verb *worden* – a verb often used in the construction of passives – also needs to be considered as *zelfstandig* (DIBBETS 1995, 239). Van Heule (1625) claims that this distinction belongs to the *accidens genus*, meaning these three types of verbs

<sup>8</sup> VAN DER WAL & VAN BREE (2021, 138-141) point out that the pronoun *gij* and its declined forms, originally a second person plural, was considered a politer version of *du*, for the second person singular, already in Middle Dutch.

belong to the distinction in gender of verbs. He calls them, in fact, *het werkende geslacht* ‘the active gender’, *het lijdende geslacht* ‘the passive gender’ and *het derde geslacht* ‘the third gender’ (DIBBETS 1995, 240). An early interpretation of “neuter verbs” as coinciding with the idea of intransitivity is found in Allardus Lodewijk Kók (1616 – 1653) (DIBBETS 1995, 244-245).

The concept of *helpende werkwoord* ‘auxiliary verb’ is also found in some *trivium*-grammars. Van Heule (1625) claims that the *zelfstandig* verbs *wezen*, *zijn* and *worden* are all auxiliaries, along with the verb *hebben* ‘to have’. In the *Twe-spraak* the auxiliary verbs are *hebben*, *zijn* and *zullen*. Surely, the understanding of auxiliary verbs was particularly not reliant on the Latin-Greek traditions since neither features such category. At the same time, the French language, while having auxiliaries (and modals, a term that does not appear in any Dutch grammar here analyzed), does not have direct correspondence to the Dutch *zullen* and *worden*.<sup>9</sup> The most common *accidentia* of verbs across *trivium*-grammars are tense and mood. The *trivium*-grammarians often identified the present, past, future tenses, along with the perfect, imperfect, and pluperfect. DIBBETS (1995, 260) claims that this derives from a French re-working of Donatus’ (4<sup>th</sup> century AD) idea of verbs as being divided into three main tenses – *praesens*, *praeteritum* and *futurum* – with the *praeteritum* featuring three subcategorizations in *imperfectum*, *perfectum* and *plusquamperfectum*.

### 3.2.6 Participles

Participles have been considered a category on their own quite unanimously by *trivium*-grammarians, and by 18<sup>th</sup> century authors as well. Initially, the term *deelneming* was rather common, coined as a calque of the Latin *participium*, although since Van Heule used the term *deelwoort* (a probable calque) in 1625, grammarians have been adopting this term, up until today. Even though some authors have categorized them differently, their approach did not gain much traction. The issue with categorizing participles lies in the fact that, although they originate from verbs, they behave much similarly to “nouns”, specifically, “adjectival nouns”. In fact, *trivium*-grammarians recognized four *accidentia* in the use of participles, namely: *genus* ‘gender’; *comparatio* ‘comparison’; *casus* ‘case’, that are typical of nouns and adjectives; and *tempus* ‘time’ (‘tense’), typical of verbs (DIBBETS 1995, 281-290).

### 3.2.7 Adverbs

The Dutch term for “adverb” is *bijwoord*, that was coined as a calque of the Latin term *adverbum*. As such, the *woord* part of this term should be understood as a translation of the Latin *verbum* and corresponding to the concept of “verb”, instead

---

<sup>9</sup> Passives in French are constructed via the verb *être* ‘to be’, while the future tense is rendered through inflection. The acknowledgement of the use of the verb *aller* ‘to go’, in the construction of the future tense, in pre-modern prescriptive sources should not be taken for granted.

of referring to the idea of “word”. In general, adverbs were understood as being in a tight connection to verbs, specifying them in the same fashion “adjectives” (*bijvoegelijke naamwoorden*) modify the meaning of a “noun” (*zelfstandig naamwoord*). That is the reason why some Dutch grammarians used to refer to adverbs with the wording *bijvoegelijk woord* (with *woord* still referring to verbs). Among the *trivium*-grammarians the term *helpwoord* – that many have used for auxiliary verbs – was not uncommon to refer to adverbs (DIBBETS 1995, 291). There is a tendency in Van Heule (1633) and Leupenius (1653) to use the term *bywoord* for all those parts of speech they defined as *onveranderlyk* ‘unchangeable’, meaning “non-inflectable” (DIBBETS 1995, 300). At the same time, in France, some authors started to define each adverb according to the meanings they conveyed from which many *trivium*-grammarians have drawn inspiration (DIBBETS 1995, 303).

### 3.2.8 Prepositions

The first use of the term *voorzetsel* for “preposition” can be found in the *Twe-spraeck* (1584) and subsequently in Heyns (1605). Prepositions were considered by *trivium*-grammarians as an *onveranderlyk* ‘unchangeable’ word, and some authors, like Van Heule (1633), included them in the broader category of “non-inflectable” words (*helpwoord*, in Van Heule), while others recognized them as a category on their own. The Greek-Latin tradition, using the terms *próthesis* πρόθεσις, in Greek, and *praepositione* in Latin, divided this part of speech in three sub-categories, according to the possibility of finding each preposition independent from another word. Those “prepositions” that could only be used in combination with another word are what we would call prefixes today; like *ge-* or *be-*, in Dutch (DIBBETS 1995, 306-309).

### 3.2.9 Conjunctions

There were many terms that 18<sup>th</sup> century grammarians of Dutch used for the category of conjunctions. Such diversity is a direct consequence of the different wordings that the *trivium*-grammarians employed to translate the Latin term *coniunctio*, that can be interpreted as conveying both the meaning of “jointing” and “binding”. In order to render that, Dutch grammarians have used terms derived from verbs like *binden* ‘to bind’, *voegen* ‘to joint’ or *koppelen* ‘to couple’. The last two had become particularly common in words such as *koppelwoord* and *voegwoord*. Although *voegwoord* is the term still used today, *koppelwoord* has been used well into the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and eventually decreased in popularity (DIBBETS 1995, 317-318).

### 3.2.10 Interjections

The category of interjections has been present for a long time in the European grammatical tradition. While the Greeks did not consider interjections any different from adverbs, the Latins thought that in their language their use was quite distinct and, thus, deserved to be treated as a different category. Many Dutch terms have been coined for this category, particularly variations of *tusschen worpinghe* ‘thrown



in-between' have been used since the Middle Ages, while in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, variations of *inwerpsel* (also from the verb *werpen* 'to throw') have seen an increase in popularity. Today one generally uses the term *tussenwerpsel*. The precise labels specifying the use and meaning of each interjection were already adopted, with some variation, by the *trivium*-grammarians (DIBBETS 1995, 329).

### 3.3 Authors and publications of the late 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries

In the second half of the 1600s, the *trivium*-period can be considered mostly concluded. In this paragraph, I will present the context in which Halma, Marin and Séwel were active while working on their grammatical publications. Here, I will present the contemporaries, colleagues, adversaries, and sources of the main individuals whose works I will cover in Chapter IV, in order provide a context in which to understand their theories and their ideas. As I will make clear, the early 18<sup>th</sup> century was a period of vital exchange of grammatical ideas, with many books being published by authors who often knew and collaborated with each other and not rarely also fought publicly with their adversaries. However, until recent times it has been believed that the period including the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century and most of the 18<sup>th</sup> century was characterized by a decreased interest in grammatical studies in the Low Countries. So much so that RUIJSEDAAL (1991, 340) calls the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century a "transitory time" (*overgangstijd*). The scarcity of publications on Dutch grammar in the second half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, was an issue about which grammarian Jacobus Nyloë (1670 – 1714) himself was complaining (DIBBETS 2003, p. 11). In the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, KNOL (1977, 65) took the duty of writing a chapter on the grammatical tradition of Dutch in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The very first words of the introduction to that chapter, which I will quote and translate in English below, demonstrate his uncertainty and lack of confidence regarding this specific field of study, consequent to the fact that he could not find much literature about it:

De Nederlandse taalkunde in de achttiende eeuw is tot nog toe zeer onvoldoende bestudeerd. Er is geen overzicht waarin het tijdvak in zijn geheel uitputtend wordt behandeld. Monografieën zijn slechts gewijd aan de twee grootsten uit deze eeuw, Lambert ten Kate en Balthazar Huydecoper

[...]

Bij deze stand van zaken kan in het onderstaande slechts een gebrekkig overzicht gegeven worden van wat de achttiende eeuw op taalkundig gebied te bieden heeft. Het is het resultaat van een beperkt onderzoek, gericht op de belangrijkste werken.

The studies on Dutch in the eighteenth century have not been, until now, sufficiently studies. There is no overview where this period is treated exhaustively, in its entirety. Monographies are merely dedicated to the two greatest [scholars] of this century, Lambert ten Kate and Balthazar Huydecoper

[...]

In this state of affairs, one can only give an imprecise overview of what the eighteenth century has to offer, in the context of studies on the language. This is the result of a limited research, focused on the most important works. Works of secondary

Geschriften van secundair belang konden we in dit onderzoek nauwelijks of in het geheel niet betrekken. Ook moest de vergelijking met buitenlandse bronnen, waaraan alleen voor Ten Kate iets gedaan is, blijven liggen. Onze schets is dus zowel in de breedte als in de diepte onvolledig en verdient daarom niet meer dan de naam van een ‘voorlopige schets’.

importance could mostly not be covered in the present research. We also had to pass over the comparison with foreign sources, which we only did limitedly with Ten Kate. Our sketch is, thus, incomplete both in broadness and in depth, and deserves as such nothing more than the name ‘provisional sketch’.

Fortunately, however, things have changed substantially since then. Publications such as SCHAARS & TE WILT (1989), DE BONTH (1998), VAN DER WAL (2000, 2002, 2009), DIBBETS (2003), RUTTEN (2006), VAN DE BILT (2009), NOORDEGRAAF & VAN DER WAL (2001) among others, have provided a better understanding of this otherwise neglected period.

Impactful in the tradition of Dutch grammar, in this period, have been the *Waarnemingen op de Hollandsche tael* ‘Observations on the Dutch language’ (henceforth simply *Observations*) by the poet Pieter Corneliszoon Hooft (1581 – 1647), a series of notes on pocketbooks or loose papers, dating from 1635 to 1641, that, apparently, had subsequently come into the hands of preacher and predicant Geeraert Brandt (1626 – 1685) and ultimately reached scholar Lambert ten Kate (1674 – 1731), who authored many works on the Dutch language (DIBBETS 2003, p. 6). Hooft’s *Observations* have been extremely influential in the publications on the Dutch language that followed him, and his theories have been embraced by many of the most relevant authors of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, including Séwel himself. The language of poetry has been the reference for the correct and proper use of language for most of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, as I discuss below, with only few exceptions. Along with the frequently cited poet Hooft, all scholars of the 18<sup>th</sup> century could not but pay their respect toward the cherished poet Joost van den Vondel (1587 – 1679). The language of Vondel was quite unanimously regarded as the undisputed quintessence of proper Dutch and any unorthodoxy could be justified by finding parallel uses of the language in one of the works by Vondel. Another poetic contribution to Dutch grammatical tradition was afforded by the author Johannes Vollenhove (1631 – 1708). According to DIBBETS (2003), Vollenhove had contacts with many of the important authors of his century, like Nyloë and Moonen, and even Halma recognized him as fundamentally influential in the works of other authors, such as Lukas Rotgans (1653 – 1710). Among his works, the most relevant has probably been the poem titled *Aan de Nederduitsche schryvers* ‘To Dutch writers’, included in the 1686 *Poëzy* ‘Poetry’, where he rhymes about what he considered to be the correct and refined use of the Dutch language (DIBBETS 2003, 42). This approach, although overwhelmingly supported in the Dutch scholarship of the time, was certainly not without detractors, such as the 1705 work by Johannes Hilarides (1649 – 1726), titled *Nieuwe Taalgronden der Nederduytsche Taal* (DE BONTH & DIBBETS 1995, 1).

In the grammatical investigations of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, KNOL (1977, 73-77) identified three main approaches, often in striking and active contrast with each other. The one

that was, likely, the most widespread, was the idea that the rules of language had to be deduced by studying the use of language employed by the cherished authors of the past, mostly Hooft and Vondel. This is what KNOL (1977, 74) calls *het achtbare gebruik* ‘the honorable use’ and is most exemplarily adopted by scholars such as Moonen and Van Hoogstraten. The other competing methodology was still fundamentally reliant on the Greek-Latin concept of “common language” (*lingua comunis*), distinct from the “special languages”, that the Romans called *dialecti* ‘dialects’, among which the *dialectus poetica* ‘dialect of poetic’. This position is epitomized by author Adriaen Verwer (1655 – 1717) whose fierce critique of Moonen, that he initially wrote in his 1707 *Linguae Belgicae Idea, grammatica, poetica, rhetorica; deprompta ex adversariis Anonymi Batavi: in usum proximi amici*, addressed exactly this point, drawing clear lines between the two concepts of language and grammar, and influencing other publications such as the works of Ten Kate and Huydecoper. Verwer has also put forth strong opinions against the inclusion of the study of the spoken language in grammatical publications of his contemporaries, including Séwel’s *Spraakkonst*. The third idea, that was also embraced by Séwel, argued that spoken language could also be used to notice and deduce linguistic patterns to be included in one’s grammatical publications (KNOL 1997, 77).

While in Chapter IV, I will provide an overview of the grammatical contents one could find in Halma and Marin’s dictionaries, in the present section I will introduce the most relevant approaches to the description of Dutch grammar, as displayed by other authors of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The books on grammar of this period generally used the term *spraakkunst* (also *spraakkonst*) as a translation of the Greek *grammatica* ‘grammar’. As a similar yet different approach from that of the preceding centuries, authors in this period tended to recognize, within the discipline of grammar, different fields of investigations. These subjects, of clear Greek-Latin influence, could be considered as different steps of focus-broadening in the way a language can be observed. In general, the first chapter would be devoted to the teaching of spelling, that the Dutch called *spelkonst* ‘art of spelling’ or *orthographie* ‘orthography’, within which basic phonological issues were also tackled. Since a Dutch standard language was still lacking, in any functional sense, different authors preferred different pronunciations, according to their background, and that was mirrored in their spelling choices. For this reason, the chapter on spelling often also included indications on diction. A second chapter was generally titled *woordoorsprongkonst* (as in *Korte schets der Nederduitse spraakkonst*, a 1755 publication of Jan van Belle), *woordgronding* (as in Moonen) or *oorsprongkunde* (in Séwel), that corresponded to the Greek *etymologia*. Regardless of its name, nonetheless, “etymology”, in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, was not dealing with the reconstruction of the historical evolution of words, rather, it was much more similar to what one would call today “morphology”, as it researched the different classes words could be categorized in and morphological issues such as inflection and word formation. The contemporary use of the word “etymology” will not become the norm until the last two decades of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (KNOL 1977, 80). The chapter on *woordschikking(konst)* ‘syntaxis’ was also often present in many works, including Van Belle, Moonen (who called it *woordvoeging*), but also Marin (in *Spraakwyze*)

and Séwel, as I will demonstrate below and, not rarely, one could also find a chapter on prosody, by the name of *maatklank(kunst)*.

From the point of view of grammatical rule-finding, the topic that undisputedly attracted the most attention was that of gender. One could easily explain the specific attention given to this topic by the fact that, for centuries the use of gender and cases had already been decreasing in consistency, especially in freer contexts of language-use. Gender and cases were often covered together, as it was generally believed that their specification was provided by the appropriate use of the articles, that were, indeed, defined as those parts of speech that made the gender of words explicit, a definition also adopted by Moonen and Séwel. In the categorization of the parts of speech, it was normal to identify nine of them, within which adjectives and nouns were both under the broad category of *naamwoord*, and “participles” (*deelwoorden*) were a distinct category from either verbs and adjectives, except in Verwer who does include them among verbs.<sup>10</sup> These categories were initially collected into two bigger classes according to their ability to inflect, as is also seen in Séwel (KNOL 1977, 87-88). The distinction of verbs into the classes of “personal” and “impersonal” is also very common, as well as the “active-passive” dichotomy, to which the concept of neutrality is also added, defined as the category of those verbs that are neither active, nor passive. An approach that can be seen as early as Moonen (KNOL 1977, 94).

In the following sections, I will provide a brief introduction and contextualization of the main authors of grammars who were active in this period. These individuals certainly entertained relationships with each other, often influencing and citing their colleagues, within their works. The intent of these paragraphs is to, thus, frame the context of grammatical studies within which Marin, Halma and Séwel worked, and understand their interconnections and possible inspirations.

### 3.3.1 Joannes Vollenhove (1631 – 1708), *Aan de Nederduitsche schryvers* (1686)

Poet and pastor Vollenhove did not publish any actual handbook of Dutch grammar, yet he has been a fundamental figure in the Dutch-speaking literate world. In his collection of poems published in 1686, with the title *Poesy*, there is one poem titled *Aan de Nederduitsche schryvers* “To Dutch writers” where Vollenhove illustrated what he believed to be the proper use of Dutch, particularly, yet not exclusively, focusing on the correct use of genders and cases. Vollenhove’s ideas on Dutch are to be deduced, thus, from that poem or from other private documents (DIBBETS 1991, 63). It is known that Vollenhove entertained epistolary relations with many of the main individuals concerned with the Dutch language and poetry, in his time. DIBBETS (1991) does a splendid job collecting the most notable of these connections, finding relevant information regarding what Vollenhove thought about the correct use of Dutch. Among others, Vollenhove knew the poets Willem Sluiter

---

<sup>10</sup> To some extent this could also be claimed regarding Séwel and Marin (*Spraakwyze*) who, although naming “participles” as one of the nine parts of speech, still provided them within the conjugation of table of verbs, along with their respective tenses.

(1627 – 1673) and Geeraert Brandt (1626 – 1685). He had a personal friendship also with the author Lukas Rotgans (1653 – 1710), whom Halma claims he had to thank for his relationship with Vollenhove and Moonen, allowing him to maintain a purer language, in his works. Vollenhove’s poems were particularly appreciated by Vondel, himself. Furthermore, as I will cover in 3.3.3, Nylöe’s *Aanleiding* cites often Vollenhove’s poem *Aan de Nederduitsche schryvers*, showing obvious influence in the grammatical environment of his time (DIBBETS 1991, 19-32). Although not specifically publishing works on grammar, Vollenhove’s ideas spread greatly across the literate élite of the late 17<sup>th</sup> century, thanks to his tight epistolary connections and friendships with individuals who were curating works on language.

### 3.3.2 David van Hoogstraten (1658 – 1724), *Aenmerkingen over de geslachten der zelfstandige naemwoorden* (1700)

David van Hoogstraten, whose father François was an editor, translator and poet, published in 1700 his *Aenmerkingen over de geslachten der zelfstandige naemwoorden* (‘Remarks on the genders of substantive nouns’, henceforth simply *Aenmerkingen*). This book is a list of nouns with a precise specification of the gender they belong to, since Van Hoogstraten believed that many Dutch authors of the time were not using them correctly. The rules are mostly based on the use of language witnessed in Vondel and Hooft, yet with an evident preference for the former (RUTTEN 2006, 46). Van Hoogstraten’s *Aenmerkingen* has been generally praised by his contemporaries, such as Moonen, Ten Kate and Elzevier. Willem Séwel called it a “praiseworthy auxiliary tool” (*pryslyk hulpmiddel*) in a review he published in 1702. As I will argue in 3.3.3, this work has also been at the basis of Nyloë’s *Aanleiding tot de Nederduitsche taal*. Van Hoogstraten’s *Aenmerkingen* has been republished in 1710, 1711 and in 1723, in a revised edition with the title *Lyst der gebruykelykste zelfstandige naemwoorden, betekent door hunne geslachten* ‘List of the most useful substantive nouns, according to their genders’ (RUTTEN 2006, 19). The motivations for Van Hoogstraten’s publication were most notably two. The first one, that I have already mentioned, is what RUTTEN (2006, 122) defines a “complaint” (*klacht*) over the limitedness of the grammatical works of his contemporaries. Secondly, the pedagogical intent was also very lively. In the first edition, one can read *voor u, ô edelmoedige Jeugt, heb ik deze proeve enkel opgesteld* “For you only, oh magnanimous youth, have I compiled this essay”. The pedagogical goal was not very common across Dutch grammatical works until the 1750s (RUTTEN 2006, 137-140). Despite the positive review Séwel published in favor of *Aenmerkingen*, Van Hoogstraten has not been as favorable toward him. Verwer and Van Hoogstraten, who were friends since their youth, started teaming up against Séwel. Their disdain toward him was so great that they also started avoiding naming him, preferring periphrastic wordings (RUTTEN 2006, 372-375).

### 3.3.3 Jacobus Nyloë (1670 – 1714), *Aanleiding tot de Nederduitsche taal* (1703)

Nyloë was a Protestant preacher who published anonymously *Aanleiding tot de Nederduitsche taal* (1703), as a collection of notes on grammar. It is the second such work from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, after Van Hoogstraten's *Aenmerkingen*. Originally, it was probably intended for personal use, as a collection of remarks for the interpretation of the language used in the holy scriptures. Nyloë publishes a second edition in 1707, this time making his authorship public. This edition has been reworked after commentary added by Vollenhove. There are six further editions: one in 1711, two in 1723, and others in 1746, 1751 and 1778. The work analyzes language starting from the smallest units (letters), then continuing incrementally with syllables, words and then conglomerate of words. The influence from Van Hoogstraten's *Aenmerkingen* is evident, particularly in the third chapter titled *Van de zelfstandige en byvoegelijke Naamwoorden, hunne geslachten en buigingen* ('About substantive and adjectival nouns, their genders and declension'). Regarding Van Hoogstraten, Nyloë wrote the following:<sup>11</sup>

De Hr. D. van Hoogstraten, een geleert en deftig Taalkundige, heeft de moeite genomen, om uit Hooft, Vondel, en andere opbouwers onzer tale, een register van de voornaamste en gebruiklijkste woorden te verzamelen, met aanwijzinge in wat geslachte elk zelfstandig naamwoort by die grote mannen gebruikt wort: het is een klein boekje, maar van veel nuttigheit.

Mr. D. van Hoogstraten, a learned and stylish Linguist, has made the effort of collecting, from Hooft, Vondel and others who have built our language, a record of the main and most useful words, with indications regarding the gender in which each substantive noun was used by those great men: it is a small book, yet very useful.

Influence from Vollenhove's *Aan de Nederduitsche schrijver* is also evident. Minor citations from the *Twe-spraack* and Van Heule are also present (SCHAARS & TE WILT 1989, 267-294).

### 3.3.4 Arnold Moonen (1644 – 1711), *Nederduitsche Spraekkunst* (1706)

Arnold Moonen was a preacher in Deventer since 1676. He was born in Zwolle, where he attended a Latin school, where Allardus Lodewijk Kók was rector, a figure Moonen himself will define as "my beloved master" *myn geliefden meester*. Moonen carried out research in many fields, with his main interest being theology, yet he was also a productive scholar of history and poetry (SCHAARS 1988, 2-7). Moonen's theories on grammar have been first published in his 1700 *Poësy*, in the introduction of which he also mentioned the fact that he was working on a new Dutch grammar. However, a previous mention of the compilation of such grammar could already be read in Van Hoogstraten's *Aenmerkingen*, that also came out in 1700, just a few months earlier than Moonen's *Poësy* (DIBBETS 1992, 259; SCHAARS 1988, 7). By

<sup>11</sup> From page 22 of Nyloë's *Aanleiding* (1703), as quoted in RUTTEN (2006, 19).

reading private letters between Moonen, Vollenhove and Halma, the latter being Moonen's publisher, it appears that *Nederduitsche Spraekkunst* was initially supposed to come out before *Poësy* and that its compilation, that was already started in 1699, had been strongly incentivized by Halma, himself (DIBBETS 1992, 260). In his letters to Vollenhove, Moonen mentions having consulted Petrus Francius and some advisor in Amsterdam, in order to compile his grammar (DIBBETS 1992, 262). However, in the introduction, Moonen names directly his sources, amongst whom one should mention Ampzing, Brandt, Nyloë, Francius, Van Heuele, Van Hoogstraten, Kók, Leupenius, Vollehove, and *Twe-spraeck*, along with Hooft and Vondel (SCHAARS 1988, 52-59). A few pre-print manuscripts have preserved until our times, which can be used to understand the process of compilation and evolution of Moonen's theories according to the sources he got to read. The oldest manuscript, that is probably to be dated no later than 1700, is notably shorter and less similar to the final product. The main differences are to be found in the way Moonen covers the topic of the gender of nouns. In the oldest manuscript, this topic was mostly based on Van Heule and Kók, while already since the second manuscript, the influence from Van Hoogstraten's *Aenmekringen* is undisputed (SCHAARS 1988, 44-45). An interesting choice of Moonen is that of dividing his grammar into two parts: *woordgronding* 'etymology' and *woordvoeging* 'syntaxis'. This is in striking contrast with the general approach of dividing grammar in four, including *maatklank* 'prosody' and *spelling* 'spelling'. Moonen did cover these topics, as well, though under the first part on etymology. A similar division could be found in the German book *Ausführliche Arbeit Von der Teutschen HauptSprache* (1663) by Justus Georg Schottel (1612 – 1676) (SCHAARS 1988, 74-77). Moonen divides words into nine parts of speech. The difference between "variable" (*veranderlyk*) and "invariable" (*onveranderlyk*) was secondary (SCHAARS 1988, 135). Concerning verbs, Moonen defines them as follows:<sup>12</sup>

DE <i>werkwoorden</i> [...] zyn zulke Veranderlyke woorden, die eenigh werk van <i>Doen</i> , <i>Lyden</i> of <i>Weezen</i> beteekenen met de omstandigheden van den <i>Tegenwoordigen</i> , den <i>Voorgaenden</i> en den <i>Toekomenden</i> Tyt	Verbs [...] are those variable words which mean some action of <i>Doing</i> , <i>Suffering</i> or <i>Being</i> with the circumstance of <i>Present</i> , <i>Past</i> and <i>Future Time</i> [Tense]
---	---

Moonen's grammar has been widely cited and used as a source in the following years, particularly by Séwel. He has been very active in the literate environment of the early 18<sup>th</sup> century, working with Halma and supporting the works by Verwer and Van Hoogstraten, also playing a role in the quarrel with Séwel.

### 3.3.5 Adriaen Verwer (1655 – 1717), *Linguae Belgicae idea grammatica, poetica, rhetorica* (1707)

Adriaen Verwer, born in Rotterdam, is believed to have received his education in a Latin school, growing up in a familial and social context where any type of *scientia*

<sup>12</sup> Quoted from SCHAARS (1988, 253), my English translation.

was cultivated, immersed in studies on theology, history, philosophy, literature, and Latin. His family has been for generations in good relations with the Van Hoogstraten family, where the linguist David was born, who shared a friendly relationship with Verwer since their youth. Verwer moved to Amsterdam in 1680, working as a merchant and it is there that he started interacting with groups of learned individuals, and ultimately developed his fascination for the works of the Dutch philosopher Baruch Spinoza (1632 – 1677). It is within the context of these biographical circumstances that Verwer published his work on Dutch grammar, in 1707, by the title *Linguae Belgicae idea grammatica, poetica, rhetorica; deprompta ex Adversariis Anonymi Batavi: In Usum Proximi Amici* (henceforth *Idea*), published by Halma. *Idea* was published anonymously, with the author mentioned as an “anonymous Dutch” a choice Verwer humbly made “because I am not a member of the renowned Writers” (*om dat ik geen lidt der Schryveren van name en ben*). Verwer claims that the book was the collection of many notes he had been taking down regarding language since the 1670s. It was Van Hoogstraten who published *Idea* and who dedicated the work to Moonen who, in turn, had just published his *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst* one year before, in 1706 (VAN DE BILT 2009, 29-36).

The reason why *Idea* was written in Latin was because Verwer believed that his theories on grammar were meant for a cultivated target audience anyway. Verwer’s theories on language have not only been written down inside *Idea* but can also be read in three letters he published in two journals. In 1708, Verwer published on *De Boekzaal der geleerde Weeraeldt*, two open letters to Van Hoogstraten, signing himself as “the anonymous author of the *Idea*”. In the May-June 1708 issue, Verwer published the letter titled *Brief, door den ongenoemden Schryver der Idea, of Schetse der Nederduitsche Spraakkunst, aen den Heere David van Hoogstraten*, and in the September-October issue he came out with the letter titled *Brief, door den ongenoemden Schryvere der Idea Grammatica &c. ofte Schetse der Nederduitsche Taelkunst aen den Heere David van Hoogstraten over de echte Nederduitsche Vocaelspellinge*. Both letters contained a postscript where Willem Séwel’s newly published *Nederduitsche Spraakkunst* was criticized and which Séwel will address in the Foreword to his second edition (see 3.4.1). A third letter containing Verwer’s thoughts on language was published by the bookseller of Utrecht Willem Broedelet, with the title *Brief aen den Heere Adriaen Reland, Professor in de Oostersche Talen in de Academie tot Utrecht, vanden Schryver der Linguae Belgicae Idea Grammatica: &c. tot rekenschap vande Aenmerkingen vanden Heer Arnold Moonen op dezelve Idea; en van ’t richtig Nederduitsche, zoo als door onze Hooge Overheit gebruikt is in Hare nieuwe overzetting des Bybels* (VAN DE BILT 2009, 49).

It is furthermore believed that Verwer might have had Lambert ten Kate as one of his students. What is out of doubt is the impact Verwer had on Ten Kate’s production, specifically in his first famous publication *Geméenschap tussen de Gotische spraeke en de Nederduitsche* (1710). Theoretically, the similarities between Verwer and Ten Kate are very evident, both believing language to be something that grows along with a specific society and whose irregularities derived from a process of transformation of an originally simple and regular language. Both also believed in the fundamental connection of one language with one people and,



thus, one country and that language has a “binding characteristic” in bringing together individuals belonging to the same civilization. Each language had, thus, their own *genus loquendae*, term that Verwer used to describe the specific characteristics of a language, regarding its syntax, phonetics, and morphology. One important difference between Verwer and Ten Kate is the fact that the former believed nouns to be the first category of speech developed by humans, while Ten Kate believed it to be verbs (VAN DE BILT 2009, 63-74).

After Verwer’s death, his *Idea* has been noticed by a scholar of classical languages, literature and history and a productive translator Adriaan Kluit (1735 – 1807), who worked on the fifth edition of Van Hoogstraten’s *Lyst*, published in 1759. He translated Verwer’s *Idea* into Dutch and has been a fundamental figure in the spreading of Verwer’s linguistic works in the rest of the eighteenth century (VAN DE BILT 2009, 100). Kluit’s editions also influenced Pieter Weiland (VAN DE BILT 2009, 203).

### 3.3.6 Lambert ten Kate (1674 – 1731), *Aenleiding tot de kennis van het verheven deel der Nederduitsche sprake* (1723)

Lambert ten Kate is an interesting and innovative figure in Dutch grammatical studies. He has published anonymously, in 1710, a work by the title *Geméenschap tussen de Gotische spraek en de Nederduitsche* (‘The Affinities and Similarities between the Gothic and Dutch Languages’) where he analyzed linguistic phenomena of variation across Germanic languages. This work introduced many topics that will be expanded later with the foundation of comparative historical linguistics. This is an extremely relevant book, that was also suggested to Jacob Grimm (1785 – 1863), when he was pursuing his famous studies on the Germanic languages. The main work of Ten Kate is, however, his 1723 book *Aenleiding tot de kennis van het verheven deel der Nederduitsche sprake* (‘Introduction to the knowledge of the most important part of the Dutch language’). His *Aenleiding* was praised by his contemporaries, and spread also abroad, with notable appreciation recorded by the Scot James Boswell (1740 – 1795) and the Italian Giuseppe Gaspare Mezzofanti (1767 – 1854) (VAN DER WAL 2002). Ten Kate believed that grammatical rules were to be deduced from the actual use of the language, rather than made up *a priori*. However, this did not distance him from basing his theories on the “honorable use of the language” (*achtbare taalgebruik*) of Hooft and Vondel (DE BONTH 1998, 13-14). Because Ten Kate’s *Aenleiding* was published in 1723 and the authors he inspired worked some decades later,<sup>13</sup> his figure is less relevant for the present work. Valuable research has been carried out, on this figure, by VAN DER WAL (2000; 2002; 2009), and via the commented edition of the *Aenleiding* of NOORDEGRAAF & VAN DER WAL (2001). It is known that Ten Kate had come to possess Hooft’s *Waernemingen*, that he studied and helped spread and preserve (DIBBETS 1991, 3-4). The figure of Lambert ten Kate is also an evident

---

<sup>13</sup> Amongst the direct influences of Ten Kate, we should mention Jan van Belle, Josua van Ieperen, Matthias Kramer, Frans Burman, Korn Elzevier, Frans de Haes, Kornelis van der Palm, Derk Mestingh and Klaas Stijl (VAN DER WAL 2002, 53).

demonstration of the intention to “elevate” (hence *verheven deel* in the title, literally “elevated part”) the Dutch language, particularly when compared to the prominence of French. Such an approach was rather common amongst the grammarians and *literati* of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (DE BONTH 1991, 11). In this regard, Ten Kate wrote the following about Dutch:<sup>14</sup>

*ten uiterste Rijk en Kragtig van Woorden, Edel in 't Onderscheiden, beminnde Klaerheid van Schikking, Vloeyendheid en Zuiverheid van Klanken, zonder vrugtlooze By-geluiden, bequaem tot allerhande Stijl, zo Deftig en Hoogdravend, als Nederig en Gemeenzaem; Behoevende in dit alles niet te zwigten nogte voor 't vermaerde Grieksch, nogte veel min voor 't Latijn; en bezittende daerenboven niet alleen die gemakkelijckheit van Woord-koppeling, die aen de Grieksche Tael haren groten luister toegebracht, maer ook [...] die gewigte en nooit genoeg te prijzene eigenschap, dat ze altoos het Waerdigste en Zakelijcke deel van een Woord ons allernadrukkelijckst doet uitspreken.*

*extremely rich and powerful of words, noble in the differentiation, lovable clarity of composition, fluidity and purity of sounds, without purposeless sounds, complete of all styles, solemn and pompous, as well as lowly and colloquial; Needing not to yield before the illustrious Greek, let alone Latin; and owning furthermore not only the ease in word-composition, which afforded the Greek Language its greater splendor, but also [...] its weight and never enough praised qualities, that it always makes us pronounce the worthiest and pragmatic part of a word in the most expressive way possible.*

### 3.3.7 Balthazar Huydecoper (1695 – 1778), *Proeve van Taal- en Dichtkunde* (1730)

Huydecoper published his *Proeve van Taal- en Dichtkunde* in 1730, immediately praised by many of his contemporaries, like Pieter la Ruë (1695 – 1770), and still appreciated decades later by literates such as Herman Tollius (1742 – 1822) who claims that, along with Ten Kate’s *Aenleiding*, there is “no other more useful or judicious work” (*geen nutter noch ordeelkundiger arbeid*) (DE BONTH 1998, 6-8). Huydecoper’s main inspirations are certainly Moonen and Séwel’s grammars, although the importance of Ten Kate’s *Aenleiding* should not be underestimated, either (DE BONTH 1998, 117). Huydecoper was also a productive playwright, authoring three plays, namely: *De triompheerende standvastigheid of verydele wraakzucht* (1717); *Achilles* (1719, of which another version was published in 1728); *Atzases of 't edelmoedig verraad* (1722). He additionally translated *Ædipe* by Pierre Corneille (1606 – 1684), that came out in 1720 with the title *Edipus*, and the same year he also wrote a pamphlet in defense of his own translation, titled *Corneille Verdedigd*. In 1726 he translates Horace with his *Hekeldichten en brieven van Q. Horatius Flaccus* (1726) (DE BONTH 1998, 60-72). Huydecoper cites Verwer in his *Proeve*, evidencing he drew inspiration from him in believing that after the Middle Ages, Dutch knew a period of decadence. An opinion also shared by Ten Kate (VAN DE BILT 2009, 89).

<sup>14</sup> In his *Aenleiding* (1723), on page 11. Cited from DE BONTH (1998, 11).

### 3.3.8 Lexicography of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries

While the tradition of grammar can be traced back to the first Greek philosophical works, lexicography was not as common in the ancient world. The Greeks and the Romans did not compile full-fledged dictionaries. The closest things to a dictionary, from the Classical world, are glossaries of difficult terms, that could be defined as jargon from specific subjects, like philosophy for example. The first known lexicon of Europe is attributed to Papias, who lived in the Italian peninsula, in the 11<sup>th</sup> century. Any lexicographical work concerned Latin until the 17<sup>th</sup> century, when the first monolingual dictionaries started being compiled on the vernacular language. The first European publication on a vernacular language is the Italian *Vocabolario degli Accademici della Crusca*, printed in Venice in 1612, that was followed in 1694 by the first French dictionary published by the Académie Française that eventually served as an example for the other European countries to compile one of their own national languages (VAN STERKENBURG 1984, 6-9).

As far as the Dutch language is concerned, in 1562, Christoffel Plantijn (1520 – 1589) from Antwerp published his Latin dictionary with each entry translated into Greek, French and Dutch, with the title *Dictionarium Tetraglotton seu voces Latinae omnes et Graecae eis respondens cum Gallica et Teutonica, (quam passim Flandricam vocant) earum interpretation.* His specific goal was to provide the youth of Gallic Belgium with a dictionary in their own “dialect” (*ut toties Galliae Belgicae pubes commune habeat vernaculo idiomate Dictionarium*). In 1573, Plantijn publishes another dictionary, by the title *Thesaurus Theutonica Linguae*, with the express goal of providing to Dutch the same type of tool that Robert Estienne (1503 – 1559) provided to French with his *Dictionarium Latinogallicum* (1552) (SCHAARS 1988, 30-31).

Although Latin was still undoubtedly considered a core reference for issues regarding language, in the 17<sup>th</sup> century, its hegemony underwent sensible reduction, amid the emergence in importance of other European languages, particularly French. This is specifically visible in the context of lexicography, as evidenced by DE TOLLENAERE (1977, 219-221). Bilingual dictionaries of many languages saw the light, starting from Séwel’s English-Dutch, Dutch-English dictionary, but also including works on Spanish and Italian, with French still being the undisputed leader in Dutch lexicography of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The most active lexicographers of the time were probably François Halma and Pieter (Pierre) Marin, whose works have been massively used in Japan for the learning of Dutch. These two, as I will discuss below, have had some conflicts during their respective careers, although, at some point, Marin was working for Halma (see 3.4.2), who also was a productive publisher, as mentioned above.

One point that needs to be made clear here is the role of lexicography, in the context of Dutch studies in Japan and, thus, within the present research. In Chapter IV, I will analyze the content of two Dutch-French dictionaries, namely those of Halma and Marin. Although it is undeniable that they have been used as basis for the compilation of the first Dutch-Japanese dictionaries, it does not mean that the Japanese received them solely as lexicographical works. As I will demonstrate in

Chapter VII, for example, the introduction of Marin's dictionary has most likely inspired Shizuki's understanding of the genders of words and the ways by which one can turn one part of speech into another, in Dutch, by means of suffixes. The reason why I cover the topic of lexicography is, thus, not because I intend to also cover the reception of Dutch lexicographical works in Pre-Modern Japan as such, but rather because the Japanese, specifically Shizuki, used dictionaries as sources on grammar. In the rest of this Chapter III, I will introduce the authors and their books that have reached Japan, concentrating onto the most influential among those Shizuki has read. The analysis of the content of these books, that is the result of my personal investigations, will be presented in Chapter IV. In 3.4, I have relied mostly on HULL (1933), for Séwel's biography, and on VAN DEN GRAFT (1965), LOONEN (1997) and VAN EEGHEN (1965) for what concerns Marin and Halma. But first, a few words are in order regarding the Dutch tradition of abecedaries.

### 3.3.9 Primers, abecedaries, and *haneboeken*

Another type of source that has reportedly been used by the Japanese to learn the basics of the Dutch language are so-called *A B C Boeken* 'A B C Books', that the Japanese often called *a be būku* アベブック or *a be se būku* アベセブック. These are not only attested directly by Japanese sources, but there are also examples of Dutchmen reporting the Japanese interpreters learning by heart and repeating religiously their content, as it is read in the diary of Captain Dirck de Haas, in its entry in 1677. There is also a copy of an *A B Boek* that appears to have belonged to the Kyōto scholar of Dutch Koishi Genzui 小石元瑞 (1784 – 1849) (KATAGIRI 2016, 38). Within the context of the research on Dutch studies in Japan, many have tried to understand which specific abecedaries the Japanese have made use of, like ŌSHIMA (2018) or KATAGIRI (2016), however identifying the specific edition will probably remain an impossible task. This is a consequence of two main issues: most *A B C Boek* ever made have gone lost and, secondly, their content did not vary too much, to begin with.

The tradition of *A B C Boeken*, in Northern Europe can be traced back to the so-called hornbooks, very popular in England, America and the Netherlands. These were rectangular wooden boards upon which a piece of paper containing the alphabet was fastened, and covered with a plate of horn, hence the name. Unfortunately, not many original hornbooks have preserved to our days, thus a specific dating of the beginning of the adoption of such tool is not clear. However, one can deduce when they were used, by secondary sources, like books and painting. This allows to know that hornbooks have started appearing in Western Europe sometime in the 15<sup>th</sup> or 16<sup>th</sup> century (TER LINDEN 1995, 9-10).

An *A B C Boek* is, instead, a small booklet made from one single piece of paper folded three times as to make sixteen pages. It generally contains one page with the alphabet in different fonts, the twelve Apostles' Creeds, the Ten Commandments, the prayer Jesus taught to his disciples, and some additional prayers meant to be read before and after sleeping and eating (STELLINGWERFF 1979, 8). The content of such books was, thus, very much religiously oriented. It was supposed to provide the very basic education to Dutch children, teaching them how to read and how to be good

Christians. The origin of this type of educational material can be traced back to the German *Fibel*, that where books inspired by the writings of Martin Luther, who believed that it was a good Christian's mission to write books that provided literacy and religious teachings to the young. Indeed, what is considered to be the first *A B C Boek* of history, is probably the German *Teütsche Kinder Tafel, Anfang des Christenlichen Glaubens und Teütscher sprach, wie sie die jungen kinder in den teütschen schulen lernen sollen*, published in 1534 in Nuremberg by Jobst Gutknecht (STELLINGWERFF 1979, 20). The religious motive has always been a fundamental component of the *A B C Boeken*, also visible in the publications made by the Dutch in their colonies, particularly in Formosa (Taiwan), where the *A B C Boeken* have been one component of a series of attempts at Christianizing the island (STELLINGWERFF 1979, 45).

For the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries, only one copy of *A B C Boeken* per century has remained until today (STELLINGWERFF 1979, 7-8). The 18<sup>th</sup> century brought with it a renewal that would change the look of *A B C Boeken* for the rest of their history. The first page of 18<sup>th</sup> century *A B C Boeken* featured the illustration of a rooster, called *haan* in Dutch, hence these books became famous with the name of *haneboeken* 'roosterbooks' (STELLINGWERFF 1979, 9). Characteristic of these *haneboeken* were the two rhymed verses which made analogies between the rooster as a symbol of waking up early, and the children, who also needed to wake up early, read their prayers and go to school (TER LINDEN 1995, 11-12).

It is generally believed that these *A B C Boeken* were used both at school and at home. Inside the class, the teacher would have a board with the alphabet and the children were commanded to repeat its content (TER LINDEN 1995, 14). The fundamental pedagogical idea of *A B C Boeken* is the combination of memorizing the letters and prayers, by repeating them with the learning of letters by calling them each by their names. This is called *spelmethode* 'spelling-method' and is based on the idea that children were to learn how to write by spelling the words out. To make an example, if the child was learning how to spell the word *god*, homographic with its English translation 'god', then the child would have to say out loud *ge-o-de*.<sup>15</sup> This method slowly became outdated, and was replaced, by the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, by the *klankmethode* 'sound-method', that taught children how to spell by associating sounds, images, and letters. There was no spelling out of each letter of words anymore. Words were accompanied by an illustration, they were pronounced in their entirety, and then shown the spelling. This change occurred in the Netherlands with the 1790 book by the Leiden-based Swede J. J. Schneither, titled *Nieuwe leerwijze, om kinderen, binnen zeer korten tijd te leeren leezen en denken* (DE VRIES 1995, 19-21).

Because of the fact that only a very limited number of copies of all the different editions ever made of such *A B C Boeken* have preserved until today, and because their contents were often extremely similar, understanding which specific edition the Japanese used is an almost impossible goal. As I have mentioned in 2.4.4, even though Shizuki cites one whole sentence from one *A B C Boek*, since that sentence

---

<sup>15</sup> As I have mentioned in 1.5, a similar method can also be seen in some of the early Japanese manuscripts on Dutch.

corresponds to the First Commandment, there is no way to trace that back to one single source. Furthermore, as STELLINGWERFF (1979, 50) points out, 18<sup>th</sup>-century *A B C Boeken* generally contained the so-called *statenvertaling* of the Bible, meaning the 1618 translation by the Synod of Dordrecht, implying a homogeneity in the form of the religious content, as well.

### 3.4 Books on the Dutch Language that Reached Japan

At present, a complete list of the books that have reached Japan during the Edo period might not be available. The way these books have been preserved, of course, along with calamities, might have completely deleted from history any trace of the circulation of a specific text or a specific edition of a book during the over two hundred years of Tokugawa rule. In particular, one should not forget the consequences of the fact that, at least until 1720, when the ban on books was repealed by eighth shogun Tokugawa Yoshimune 徳川吉宗 (1716 – 1745) (IANNELLO 2012, p. 105), foreign books might have been smuggled inside the archipelago, leaving no direct trace of entrance behind them as their owners held their presence secret.

Tracing back the original Dutch sources that were used by each single scholar of Dutch is no simple task either. Clear and unambiguous citations of the source books are rare. One could see the example of Maeno Ryōtaku's *Oranda yakusen*, where the author copies over the entirety of the title pages of Hakvoort's *Opregt Onderwys*, as well as *De Cijfferinghe* (first edition in 1604) by Willem Bartjens (1569 – c.1638). In the latter case, this is done down to the year of publication, as well as the editor. Unfortunately, this is far from being the rule. In fact, if one is lucky, one can at most find the quotation of a part of the Dutch original title in *katakana*, accompanied by the name of the author, also in *katakana*. In most cases, nonetheless, one is only left with a generic title, transliterating Dutch words like *spraakunst* 'grammar', or *samenspraken* 'dialogues'<sup>16</sup> that, of course, were quite common choices among authors as titles for their books on the Dutch language, or of specific chapters. When only parts of the original title were cited, it was also not uncommon for the Japanese to nickname them with different phrasings. This is the case of the famous *tāheru anatomia* ターヘルアナトミア (probably from Dutch *tafel* 'table' and Latin *anatomia* 'anatomy') cited by the famous Sugita Genpaku in *Rangaku kotohajime* as the Dutch source for his *Kaitai shinsho* 解体新書 'New Book of Anatomy'; the actual title, in Dutch, was *Ontleedkundige Tafelen* 'Anatomic Tables'. In some other instances, the Japanese scholars used to refer to sources simply by naming their author. This is the case, for example, of Shizuki,

<sup>16</sup> Famously, Sugita Genpaku, in his pivotal *Rangaku Kotohajime* has been found claiming: "Furthermore, learning the [Dutch] letters has been possible since Nishi Zenzaburō's team had received from some Dutchman a book titled *Konstwoord* ['spelling'] and has managed to copy it up to 3 times.", original quote: 「これによりて文字習ひ覚ゆること出来、西善三郎等先づコンストウワールドといふ辞の書を和蘭人より借り得しを、三通りまで写しよし」 (SUGITA 2015, 17). This *Konstwoord*, probably an abbreviation of *Konstwoordenboek* or *Kunstwoodenboek*, is still an unknown source (SUGITA 2015, 80).

who writes about a “third edition of Marin” (*mārin sanban* マーリン三板) and a “first edition of Halma” (*haruma shohan* ハルマ初板), that can be deduced to correspond to, respectively, Pieter Marin’s third edition of his *Compleet Nederuitsch en Fransch woordenboek* (1752) and François Halma’s first edition of his *Nieuw woordenboek der Nederduitsche en Fransche taalen* (1710). In other instances, a combination of the above is adopted as citation method. This is the case of Laurens Heister’s *Heelkundige Onderwyzingen* (‘Surgical Teachings’), that Sugita refers to as *heisuteru no shuruzein* ヘイステルのシュルゼイン; *heisteru* stands for the author’s surname Heister, and *shuruzein*<sup>17</sup> approximates the Dutch word *chirurgijn* ‘surgeon’ (SUGITA 2015, 90). The names of the authors, be they of French origin, like Marin, or German, like Heister, were all adapted into *katakana* as if they were to be read according to Dutch spelling conventions, making the recognition of the names much harder.

While citations are thus not always particularly useful, fortunately the scholars of Dutch have also shown a strong tendency of copying – more or less systematically – whole sentences and paragraphs from the sources they had direct access to. This proves extremely useful for the philological reconstruction of the original source, down to the smaller details, such as the precise edition. This is the case for the edition of Marin’s *Spraakwyze* whose section of syntax is found as an appendix to Waseda’s copy of Shizuki’s *Rangaku Seizenfu* (although hardly written by Shizuki himself, see Appendix 1). However, it was not rare for a Japanese scholar to copy Dutch sentences from other Japanese-made manuscripts. The sample sentences in Maeno Ryōtaku’s *Oranda yakusen*, for example, originally taken from older editions of Marin’s *Spraakwyze*, his dictionary and, probably, other sources, can be seen in quite the same order in different manuscripts. This suggests that copying from other Japanese material was a quite common practice in the compilation of such manuscripts (I will go back to this in 4.4).

In sections 3.4.1 and 3.4.2, I will present some biographical and bibliographical information regarding the three authors who most inspired Shizuki, namely: Willem Séwel, François Halma and Pieter Marin. The purpose of these sections is to make the reader aware of the context in which the books Shizuki read were compiled, to identify the influences and relations between each grammarian and his theories. The three authors knew and collaborated with each other, yet they also engaged in disputes that can explain not only their different persuasions, but also the reason why, for example, Halma’s dictionary happens to have a rather divergent and inconsistent content. This paragraph is fundamental for a good understanding of the analysis of their books as presented in Chapter IV.

---

<sup>17</sup> The Japanese approximation in *katakana* testifies that the pronunciation of the word *chirurgijn* in Dutch, back then, used to be much more influenced by French phonology, as compared to today, where the letter <g> is now pronounced as a voiced velar fricative [ɣ] (or variations thereof), always represented with the *ga-gyō* by the Japanese *rangakusha*, while here it is represented as the *za-gyō* (e.g. *shuruzein* instead of *shurugein*), suggesting that <g> to be pronounced by Dutch native speakers as a sound closer to the French voiced post-alveolar fricative [ʒ] (see NESPOLI 2019, for further information on the Japanese phonological adaptations of Dutch).

### 3.4.1 Dutch grammarian Willem Séwel and the struggle of a Quaker of English descent

Willem Séwel (1653 – 1720) was a Dutch Quaker of English background who, in 1708, published the first edition of *Nederduytsche Spraakkonst, Waarin de Gronden der Hollandsche Taale Naauwkeuriglyk opgedólven, en zelfs voor geringe Verstanden, zo ten aanzien der Spellinge als bewoordinge, duydelyk aangewezen zyn* ('Dutch Grammar, wherein the foundations of the Dutch language are accurately dug out and clearly indicated even for lesser minds, to demonstrate the spelling, as well as the phrasings', henceforth *Spraakkonst*), that became one of the most renowned and read manuals of Dutch in the Republic, Great Britain and Japan. In contrast with the French-oriented Halma and Marin, Séwel was more productive in the context of the English language and market, also authoring *A New dictionary English and Dutch* (1691), subsequently edited for the United Provinces as *Groot Woordenboek der Engelsche en Nederduytsche Taalen, A Large Dictionary English and Dutch* (first edition in 1708), that is also referenced often in his *Spraakkonst* as *myn Engelsch en Nederduytsch Woordenboek* 'my English and Dutch Dictionary'. HULL (1933) managed to gather much information regarding his bibliography. HULL (1933) particularly focuses on the figure of Séwel as a Quaker and on his work on Quaker historiography. Indeed, most of Séwel's biography has been handed down via his own publication on Quakerism, first published in Dutch, in 1717, titled *Histori van de Opkompste, Aanwas en Voortgang der Christenen bekend by den naam van Quakers*, thus translated into English, in 1722, with the title *The History of the Rise, Increase, and Progress of the Christian People called Quakers*. As HULL (1933, 1-2) reports that the information contained in these two works is often dissimilar, with each version focusing on specific issues, according to the target readers, considering their nationality. According to *History*, Willem's father, James Williamson Sewel,<sup>18</sup> was an Englishman who decided to exile himself in the Republic for religious reasons, where he got married with Willem's mother, Judith Zinspenning, of mixed Dutch, Flemish and Walloon descent. They are reported as being amongst the first "genuine Quaker believers" (*rechtzinnige Quakersgezinden*) of Amsterdam. Séwel's literary skills were undoubtedly exceptional, besides knowing numerous languages (Latin, French, German and Greek, beyond English and Dutch, which can be assumed to have been his mother tongues), he also authored many translations, and has worked with some of the most active intellectuals of his period (HULL 1933, 31-32). For example, in this regard, it is known he has helped François Halma in the compilation of his first Dutch-French dictionary, implicating himself in one of the longest intellectual fights in the history of Dutch grammar, lasting centuries after both had died (of which more in 3.4.2). The book that made Séwel first gain popularity was his 1691 English-Dutch dictionary that made him initially famous as an Anglicist, and as a Dutch lexicographer in Great Britain. His was not simply a dictionary, as it also presented an introduction covering grammatical issues that he always claimed to be his own invention (HULL 1933, 34), regardless of having drawn inspiration from Nyloë, Van

<sup>18</sup> The spelling Séwel was adopted by Willem for it to be more easily read by Dutch speakers.



Hoogstraten and Moonen, but also Van Heule, for his second edition. Nonetheless, he was probably accused of plagiarism, on account of some noticeable and striking similarity with an earlier dictionary by Henry Hexham (c. 1585 – c. 1650), who published an earlier work with the title *Het groot woordenboeck: gestalt in 't Nederduytsch ende in 't Engelsch*, in 1648. Séwel addressed and refuted openly having drawn any inspiration from this author. In turn, Séwel has been an inspiration for Halma in his Dutch-French dictionary where the classification of words as *boertig* ‘comedic’, *plomp* ‘coarse’ and *straattalig* ‘language of the street’ was also used (DE TOLLENAERE 1977, 227). Similar terminology was also used by Marin, and is also found in Shizuki’s *Joshi-kō*, although the Japanese copyist simply took over these terms without ever really employing them, nor defining them (see 2.4.2). Séwel addressed some of the accusations that were made against him in the two versions – one for the first edition, the other for all the subsequent editions – of the *Voorreede aan den Lezer* “Foreword to the reader” he wrote for his *Spraakkonst*. In the first introduction he also states quite directly which sources on Dutch he had consulted and what specifically he took from them.

In this valuable excerpt, which can be read in its entirety with my English translation in Appendix 4, Séwel lists all the sources he was inspired by, when coming up with his theories on language. Firstly, it must be remembered that many of his theories had already appeared in his English-Dutch dictionary, some sixteen years before. He claims that he cited all the works on grammar that he read, not overlooking any, for a total of six works:

- Arnold Moonen’s *Nederduytsche spraakkonst* (1706);
- Adriaen Verwer’s *Linguae belgicae idea grammatica, poetica rhetorica* (1707), Séwel refers to as “Drafts of Dutch Grammar in Latin”;
- *Twe-spraeck* (1584), anonymous, yet attributed to Hendrik Laurenszoon Spiegel;
- Jacobus Nyloë’s *Aanleyding tot de Nederduytsche taal* (1703);
- *Aanmerkingen omtrent de geslachten* (Remarks on Genders) by Geeraart Brandt;
- Van Hoogstraten’s *Aenmerkingen over de Geslachten* (1700).

While swearing that these were his only sources, he also adds that he found literary reference in the language used by Hooft and Vondel. He further adds that he knew that the Society of arts (*konstgenootschap*) named *Nil Volentibus Arduum*, was working on a publication on Dutch grammar. However, since he preferred not to be influenced from works not already published, he decided not to look at its drafts. This work was never concluded, although part of it has been published in 1728 with the title *Verhandeling van der letteren affinitas of verwantschap: van het gebruik der accentus of toonen in de Nederduytsche vaerzen: en van de metaplasmus of woordvervorming* (DE BONTH & DIBBETS 1995, 53). The critique Séwel is strongly defending himself against is a claim according to which his theories on gender were copied from Halma. Séwel responds to this by stating that although they had been working together (see 3.4.2), his ideas on gender were his own. One explanation he provides for the similarities in the theory of gender between the two sources is the fact that both authors have read the same sources, namely Brandt, *Twe-spraeck* and

Van Hoogstraten. This is an interesting claim as it clarifies in which specific topics Séwel was inspired by those sources. However, it must be added that Van Hoogstraten and Verwer, who were friends from their youth, engaged in a fierce public critique of Séwel, publishing open letters and remarks on his work containing negative opinions, specifically concerning the spelling adopted by Séwel. Although the critiques seemed to be more often motivated on personal attacks, Van Hoogstraten has also criticized the way Séwel described impersonal verbs, claiming that one cannot say “I thunder” or “I rain”, although in certain metaphorical contexts one could indeed utter those words (RUTTEN 2006, 372-378). This critique will be addressed by Séwel in the Foreword to the second edition, as can be read in Appendix 5.

There is one section of this Foreword where Séwel mentions emblem literature, a genre of underestimated importance in the Dutch studies of Japan (see 2.4.3 and 2.4.7), citing the Latin quote *Aliis inserviando consumer*, that can be translated as “One gets consumed by serving others”. Séwel claims that this has been used in combination with the illustration (*zinnenbeeld*) of a burning candle. DE BONTH & DIBBETS (1995, 57) claim that variations of this saying, and its association with a burning candle is rather old and can be found in many sources.<sup>19</sup> However, emblem 31 found in volume two of *Gabrielis Rollenhagii Selectorum emblematum centuria secunda* (1613), by Gabriel Rollenhagen (1583 – 1619), that can be seen in Figure 3, seems to fit the description quite accurately.

Since the second edition of Séwel’s *Spraakkonst* onwards, the contents of the book have been thoroughly revised and expanded. For this reason, its introduction has been reworked as well. It appears that some have noticed commonalities between Séwel’s first edition and Christiaan van Heule’s *De Nederduytsche spraec-konst ofte Tael-beschrijvinghe* (1633). Séwel claims that he only got to know Van Heule’s works while his first edition of *Spraakkonst* was already being printed. Reportedly, he decided not to read it until he would work on a second edition, in order not to make it appear as if he consulted it without acknowledging it. Séwel adds that he had also been accused of not being of proper Dutch descent, thus not being entitled of publishing Dutch grammars. He deflects these attacks by both affirming his “Dutchness” and insinuating that he was not being criticized because of the contents of his works, but because of the religion he professed. The entire “Foreword to the reader” present from the second edition onward of Séwel’s *Spraakkonst* can be read in Appendix 5, with my English translation.

---

<sup>19</sup> In this regard DE BONTH & DIBBETS (1995, 57) reference GRAF, F., *Aliis inserviando consumer. Zur Entwicklung einer lateinischer Sentenz* in *Arcadia. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft* 4, 1969, p. 199-201.



Figure 3 Example of candle emblem by Gabriel Rollenhagen.

### 3.4.2 François Halma and Immortal Sea-Monster Pieter Marin

While little research has been carried out on the grammatical contents of Marin and Halma's works, much of their public personas can be deduced from the introductions to their respective publications. DE TOLLENAERE (1977, 221) understood that they must have, at some point, worked together. They are nowadays recognized as the main authors of Dutch-French lexicography in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and as the main sources used by the Japanese scholars of Dutch. However, they are often also known because of their long-lasting quarrel.

François Halma was born in 1653 in Langerak, a small town in the region of Southern Holland. His father died when he was only 7 years old. In 1660, his mother decided to live with a group of beguines in Utrecht, where he and his five siblings could be fed and educated. Halma himself attended the St. Hieronymusschool and he eventually decided to find a job as bookseller in order not to be a burden on his mother's economy, although initially his life seemed to lead him toward religion. He probably worked in Pieter Elsevier's bookshop in Pausdam, in Utrecht, from whom he received training in bookselling and in the French language. This allowed him to start working as a translator and earn enough money to be able to open his own shop in 1675. During his life, he managed to get good connections with many from the higher classes of society, including aristocrats, politicians, and foreign rulers. He

was also an active poet, who dedicated rhymes to king William III. His poetic works were mostly requested for wedding ceremonies. He was also a proficient publisher and became renowned for his works on the French language, the first being the co-publication of *Dictionnaire nouveau, français et flamand* in 1686, together with Claude Rouxel. He moved from Utrecht to Amsterdam in 1699, then further to Leeuwarden, in 1710, where he was awarded with the title of *landschapdrukker* 'land printer', by the states of Friesland. He died in Leeuwarden in 1722 (VAN DE GRAFT 1965).

Pierre Marin was born in France in the town of La Ferté-sous-Jouarre, in the Île-de-France region, not far from Paris, in either 1667 or 1668. He moved to the Dutch city of Delft in 1685, where he lived for three years before moving to Amsterdam in 1688, where he lived until his death in 1718. In the Republic of the United Provinces, where he was known with his "Dutchified" name of Pieter, he worked as a teacher of French and Dutch in French schools. While teaching, he also authored a considerable number of books and dictionaries, mostly intended for his students, or students at French schools, in general, for them to learn French.<sup>20</sup> Notably, in Marin's bibliography one's attention cannot but be caught by the fact that his works have been reprinted all the way until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, so much so that in an 1854 edition of the magazine *Navorscher*, a reader asked the question of whether this Pieter Marin was *onsterfelijk* 'immortal' when he found a copy of an older 1775 edition of Marin's *Nouvelle Méthode* (or *Spraakwyze*), that included an introductory poem, from the hands of the author, dated 1697, and new editions of his works were still being published with speedy tempo (LOONEN, 1997).

Another specific feature of Marin's publication is that many of his books seemed to be self-published. This can be explained by the fact that Marin tended not to have good relations with many publishers. In particular, it is worth mentioning the long-lasting altercation with Halma. After publishing *Le Grand dictionnaire* in 1686, with Rouxel, Halma started working on its new edition, together with Johannes La Gruë. When in 1694 Halma included Marin in the project, they wrote a contract wherein Halma was taking the responsibility of the publication of the dictionary, establishing the pay and the role of each collaborator, specifically requesting the two to check the French translations of the definitions of each entry. After having assigned the revision of the letter M to La Gruë, and letter N to Marin, Halma seemed not to be able to proceed in the compilation, and the two were left with little work to do. In the meantime, Marin decided to publish other works for the use of his disciples, asking Halma for permission, which he granted on the promise that it would not be too big of an endeavor. In the meantime, probably to make the work proceed faster, Halma assigned the compilation of letters S to Z to Séwel, breaching the contract. This did not seem to have worked out too well for Halma, either, since Séwel, also overloaded with translations, did not work at a good pace and his inclusion in the project caused complaints from La Gruë and Marin. Inside Leiden University's

---

<sup>20</sup> For a list of Marin's publications and their innumerable editions, refer to LOONEN (1997).

library I have found a letter,<sup>21</sup> sent by Séwel to Halma, in 1696, where the Quaker is asking the printer elucidations concerning the compilation of the dictionary.

Gunstige Vrind François Halma,

Alzo ik UE in lang mondeling niet heb gesproken, als hebbende t' elkens van Uw aanwezen in deeze stad niet geweeten, dan naa Uw vertrek, zo zal UE by deezen eens vraagen, of in het voorige gedeelte van 't Woordenboek, waaraan ik arbeide, onder de letter IJ die woorden gebragt zyn, welke men meerderdeels, en ook van ouds onder de letter Y plagt te brengen; op dat ik mag weeten hoe my in 't vervolg daarin te gedraagen, wanneer ik zo verre zal gekomen zyn: Ik heb La Grue daarna gevraagd, doch hy zeyde zulks niet te weeten, maar oordeelde 't echt noodig dat men 't by UE eens onderstond, om gene dubbeld werk te doen: ik hoop als Gy eens weder in de stad komt, dat my gelegenheyd zal gegeeuen worden om daar over mondeling eens met UE te spreken.

Graceful friend François Halma,

Since I have not spoken to you in a long time, as I have not known of you having been present in this city, until after you left, with the present I shall ask you, whether, in the preceding parts of the dictionary, which I am working on, under the letters IJ those words are put which one generally, also in the past, uses to put under the letter Y; so that I could know how to behave as a consequence, when I will have come thus far. I have asked La Grue, yet he said not to know about it, but he judged it to be necessary to consult you on this, as not to do any double work: I hope that if you ever come back in this city, that I will be given the possibility to have a spoken conversation with you.

Séwel is confused regarding the way the digraph < ij ><sup>22</sup> was to be treated in their dictionary, whenever he would get to work on that letter, and his doubts were also

<sup>21</sup> The document is recorded as *Brief van Willem Séwel (1654-1720) aan François Halma (1653-1722)* within PAP 15, it is dated 21 October, in Amsterdam, signed by W<sup>m</sup>. Séwel, and destined to François Halma, *Boekverkoper en drukker den Academia ten Utrecht*, "Bookseller and printer at the Academia in Utrecht". The full text of the letter, with my full English translation is found in Appendix 3, at the end of the present dissertation.

<sup>22</sup> The issue is caused by the fact that the digraph < ij >, in Dutch, was and had been often interchangeably written with the letter < y >. Since the four authors were taking care of the compilation of different parts of the dictionary Séwel was wondering regarding who had to take on the job of covering the entries starting with that letter (or digraph), since if one treated those words as starting with < ij >, or < i > and < j >, then they would have needed to be covered between the letters < h > and < k >, while < y > would find the same place it has in the English alphabet. The adoption of either would have meant a change in responsibility for the covering of that letter, possibly between Séwel and La Gruë, himself. Ultimately, in the first edition of Halma's dictionary, the letters < i >, < j > and < y > are all treated as the same letter, and the following text is added, on page 265: "J. I. The ninth letter of the A b c. Which also includes the letter Y, which is also used as a sixth vowel by the Dutch" (*J. I. De negende letter van 't A b c. Waar onder wy ook betrekken de Y, die voor een zesde klinker by de Nederlanders gebruikt wordt*). Marin, in his dictionary, considered the three letters as distinguished, and in the first page of the entries for Y he writes, on page 1023: "The Y, is a letter that some are trying to ban out of the Dutch alphabet, but which is used in the following words by most based on reason" (*De Y, is een Letter die zommige uit het Nederduits Alphabets zoeken te bannen, maar die in de volgende woorden van de meesten met grond van reden gebruikt wordt*). The inconsistent categorization of these three letters can also be seen in

not clear to La Gruë, whom he had also consulted with little success in the solving of this doubt. This is a testimony that the project was still lagging, well into the year 1697.<sup>23</sup>

The complaints about Séwel's introduction in the project convinced Halma to reconsider his decision and take back the role of compiling the dictionary, that he subsequently asked Marin to revise. Marin declined because he was too busy and because he feared reproaches for borrowing from their project for his own dictionary. With Marin's project having grown disproportionately in largeness, and after his claims of underpayment, the two came to a breaking point in their relationship and started working each on their own dictionaries. After this, Marin felt justified in printing the first part, from the letters A to O, of his *Nieuw Frans en Nederduits woordenboek*, in 1701. Subsequently, the altercation between Halma and Marin became public, with Halma trying to sabotage Marin's work who, nonetheless managed, through his acquaintances, to obtain a privilege for the publication of his *Compleet Fransch en Nederduitsch Woorden-boek* in 1710. Meanwhile, between 1706 and 1707, Halma, who was approaching the conclusion of his French-Dutch dictionary, was boasting about the fact that he had obtained a privilege for his publication, while Marin (still) had not. In a 1707 issue of the journal *De Boekzaal*, edited by Halma, his work was announced and, with Marin's indignation, a review of it was commissioned to Séwel, who eulogized it overtly (VAN EEGHEN 1965).

In 1710, together with Marin's French-Dutch dictionary, Halma also released the first edition of his own Dutch-French dictionary, known as *Woordenboek der Nederduitsche en Fransche Taalen*. This was a luscious opportunity for Halma to reassess his position in the market of French lexicography in the Republic, by slandering his competitor Marin in a preface spanning eight pages, an insulting

---

what the Japanese wrote regarding the Dutch alphabet. Sugita Genpaku is particularly known for writing that the Dutch alphabet contained 25 letters, with some contemporary commentators deeming this a mistake of Sugita. This is claimed, for example, in a 1969 English translation of *Rangaku kotohajime*, translated by Matsumoto Ryōzō, by the titled *Dawn of Western Science in Japan: Rangaku Kotohajime* (Hokuseidō Press, Tokyo).

<sup>23</sup> As VAN DEN ELSEN & FOX (2005) correctly point out, Séwel's letter was not sent with the main purpose of asking Halma to solve this issue. By reading the complete text of the letter (Appendix 3), it is clear that the main reason why Séwel sent the letter to Halma, was to ask the "friend", who happened to be a publisher, to fund the publication of a Dutch version of a Christian book, originally published, in German, in Frankfurt, the year before, that he intended to translate. The book in question is Gottfried Arnold's (1666-1714) *Die erste Liebe der Gemeinen Jesu Christi, das ist, wahre Abbildung der ersten Christen nach ihern lebendigen Glauben und heiligen Leben: worinnen zugleich des William Cave Erstes Christenthum nach Nothdurfft erläutert wird*. Halma would never accept this offer, for reasons one can read in VAN DEN ELSEN & FOX (2005), although Séwel would, eventually, manage to publish his translation, in 1700, with the publishers of Amsterdam Jacobus van Hardenberg, Barent Visscher and Jacobus van Nieuweveen, with the title *Waare afbeelding der eerste Christenen. Volgens hun leevendig geloof, en heylig leeven. Uyt de getuygenissen, voorbeelde en redenen der oudste en achtbaarste kerkelyke schryveren, volgens de waarheid der eerste en eenigste Christelyke godsdienst, allen liefhebberden der geschiedenissen, en voornaamelyk der aaloudheyd, als een nutte kerkelyke historie, getrouwelyk en onzydiglyk voogesteld, door Godfreid Arnold, laatst professor der historiën te Giessen*.

poem, and a degrading illustration. To get an idea of the dishonorable epithets spewed against Marin in Halma's dictionary, one can read some of the critiques written in the "preface to the reader", below, alongside my English translation:

Dat wy dit Woordenboek voor een *volkomen* werk de wereldt zouden poogen op te dringen, gelyk de verwaande Taalbrabbelaar *Marin* onlangs de schaamteloosheit heeft gehad, om dit van zyn Franfch en Duitfch Woordenboek te bevestigen, terwyl het van leemten en gebreken, (waar van in 't vervolg nader) grimmelt, hebbe niemant van ons te wachten; naardien alle menfchen, waarin de reden door eenen gezwollen waan, gelyk in deezen Franfchman, niet t'eenemaal gedooft is, overreedt zyn, dat geen Woordenboeken *volkomen* (*compleet* fchryft hy) konnen geheeten worden, vooral van dubbele taalen, die de een de andere moet verklaaren; en dat hy zulks voorgeeft, zoowel de verachtige als befpottinge over zyne verwaantheit verdient; gelyk hy die ook zekerlyk van alle verftandigen reeds heeft en verder ter wachten hebbe

[...]

Echter durven wy u wel, zonder eenige opfnyderye, verzekeren, dat 'er tot noch toe geen Nederduitfch Woordenboek, met eenige Uitheemfche taale gepaart, is gezien, zoo rykelyk geftoffeert, en met zoo veel deugden ter onderwyzinge voorzien, als dit tegenwoordige, waar omtrent wy geerne de proeve van den allerlafterzugtigften Momus willen uitftaan; als wel verzekert, dat, wat galle de Boosheit verder tegen ons moge uitbraaken, Grooten en kleenen hier over hunne neuze (als flechts eenen vergiftigen ftank van een nieu Zeegedrocht, *un nouveau Monstre Marin*) zullen toehouden; terwyl de rechte Wetenfchap door de Waarheit altoos zal opgebeurt, en met den lauwer gekroont worden; niet onaardig door onzen fchranderen Tekenaar op onze Tytelprent verbeeldt.

No one should expect from us that we would ever try to impose this dictionary in the world as a 'complete' [*volkomen*] work, just like the presumptuous babbling *Marin* has shamelessly done with his French-Dutch dictionary, regardless of the swarm of shortcomings and faults (which we will see below). As all people agree, those whose reason has not been at once quenched through a swollen delusion, just like this Frenchman, no dictionary can be called *volkomen* (*compleet*, he writes). Especially for the bilingual ones, which must clarify one language through the other; and that he purports, having earned both the contempt and derision because of his presumption; which he certainly acknowledges and is still awaiting for more.

[...]

We do, indeed, dare to reassure you, without boasting, that no one has ever seen since now a Dutch dictionary paired with such an alien language, so richly upholstered, and provided with so many virtues for the instruction, as the present, in this regard we are ready to face the challenge of this Momus, the worst slanderer of all; as reassured, that regardless of the bile which anger might spew against us, we should all, young and old, hold our noses (comparable only to the poisonous stank of a new sea monster, *un nouveau Monstre Marin*); whereas the righteous Science shall always be supported by the Truth and crowned with laurel; as not unkindly depicted by our slim-witted artist on our frontispiece.

The preface continues with a series of examples of mistakes purportedly found in Marin's dictionary. The unpleasant image described by Halma, representing Marin as a sea monster, playing a pun on his name and the French word for "maritime",

has been indeed drawn into an illustration, found as frontispiece to the first edition of this dictionary. The scene described in the text above can be observed in all its details, down to the meek expression in Marin's face, who appears in the form of a repulsive amphibious creature, stepped on by those whom the "truth of science" favors, as can be seen in Figure 4.



**Figure 4** Illustration in Halma's dictionary, depicting Pieter Marin in the form of a repugnant sea monster.

In the first part of the quote above, there is another of the main critiques moved against Marin, namely the fact that, according to Halma, not only is the word *compleet* unrequested, as no dictionary can claim perfection, let alone Marin's "mistake-ridden" work, but also that the word *compleet*, used as *onduits* ('non-Dutch') translation of *volkomen*, cannot be used in Dutch, to refer to the completeness of a work, unless one is pointing at the conditions of the physical book they are talking about. This is argued further in the preface, in the text below:

<p>Twyfelzinnig konde hier het Fransch woordt Compleet, en het onduitsch Compleet zyn, dat deeze verwaande Taalmeeſter in zyn opſchrift gebruikt; overmids het woordt <i>compleet</i> by de</p>	<p>Doubtfully can one use the French word <i>Compleet</i>, and the non-Germanic <i>Compleet</i>, as does this arrogant language teacher in his heading; while with the word <i>compleet</i>,</p>
---	--



<p>Nederlanders en Franfchen, ten aanzien der boeken, in het eerfte opzigt betekent, het geen volkomen omtrent de bladen is, of waaraan niets van de bladen ontbreekt; maar de fnorkende Schryver geeft ‘er zelf, op dat men zich niet vergiffe, de verklaringe over, op zyne 202 bladtzyde daar hy dit woordt dezer voegen uitlegd.</p>	<p>both the Dutch and French, as far as books are concerned, they mainly mean that it is complete with regard to the pages, or that none of the pages is missing; but the grunting writer provides himself the clarification, so that nobody can be mistaken, on page 202, where he explains this word this way.</p>
--	--

While Halma further proceeds by smearing Marin’s name, calling him a “smug” (*windtbuil*) in his preface-closing poem, and criticizing his use of the term *Hollandois*, to refer to the entirety of the Republic of the Seven Provinces, this semantical issue he raises can be seen in an interesting parallelism with the treatment of the so-called *Edo no rangakusha*, the ‘Dutch scholars of Edo’, toward their semi-colleagues the interpreters of Nagasaki.<sup>24</sup>

Stabs at Marin and his “complete” dictionary can be found all the way into the third edition of Halma’s, dictionary, published in 1758, 40 years after Marin’s death and 36 after Halma’s. Particularly, the second edition, dated 1729 (when both authors had already died), begins with a preface listing all the major mistakes found in his competitor’s dictionary, demonstrating the fact that their feud had also been played through by the editors, probably to convince the readers that the other most famous Dutch-French dictionary was not to be considered comparable in correctness. Regardless of the critiques that Marin received from his former collaborator in a battle that he certainly engaged in himself as well, had he known the future of their publications after their respective deaths, he would have probably rested more contently. In fact, while Halma’s publications have mostly been impactful in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, as noticed above, Marin’s works have been re-edited until the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter II, while it is true that Halma’s dictionary has been used as the basis of the first Dutch-Japanese dictionaries, since Shizuki Tadao had access to the first edition of Halma (the Dutch-French version of that which had a troubled compilation), and Marin’s third edition, the Japanese scholar found mistakes in Halma that made him rely more on Marin, when compiling *Rangaku seizenfu*, and *Joshi-kō* for example. However, traces of subsequent editions of Halma’s dictionary can be found in other manuscripts by Shizuki.

### 3.5 Conclusion

In this Chapter, I have provided context to the Dutch authors whose works I will analyze in Chapter IV. Starting from ancient Greece, I have briefly illustrated the history of the studies on grammar that occurred and spread in Europe during the

---

<sup>24</sup> The famous Sugita Genpaku mocked the interpreters of Nagasaki, whom he called ‘people of tongue’ (*setsujin* 舌人), by claiming that their knowledge of the language was so underdeveloped that they could not even properly use the appropriate term for “cold”, not being able to distinguish between “cold food” and “cold weather”, as proper Japanese would require (see 1.7).

centuries. This served two main purposes: defining what I will refer to as the “Greek-Latin tradition”; and illustrating how the Greek-Latin tradition developed through the centuries, and was received by grammarians of Dutch in the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. Having a broad picture of how these grammatical theories were born, spread, and adapted is essential in understanding the context and historical background of the Dutch authors I will cover in Chapter IV.

Even though European grammatical studies were already very ancient, Dutch grammarians of the 17<sup>th</sup> century could only rely on a short tradition as the first Dutch grammar had only been published in 1584. In Europe, when the first grammars of vernacular languages were compiled, the only grammars their authors could take as an example were, indeed, those on the classical languages, particularly Latin. It is no wonder, thus, that the grammars of the early *trivium*-period, in the Low Countries, were still fundamentally influenced by and based on the structure and categories of the past.

By the 18<sup>th</sup> century, Dutch grammarians began to distance themselves from those conventions, and came up with new ones. It is in this context that one must place the authors of Shizuki’s sources, namely: Séwel, Halma and Marin. These three authors worked in a period when Dutch grammatical studies were trying to find new ways to approach language, slowly gaining independence from the previous *trivium*-period. All these elements point toward a grammatical landscape that cannot be considered unified or settled. On the contrary, each author provided his personal interpretation of the rules of grammar, participating in the creation of a varied scholarship.

It is in this environment that Séwel, Halma and Marin operated. Furthermore, the three knew each other and collaborated in the composition of each other’s works on Dutch. In this sense, Shizuki was exposed to a very specific subsection of the studies on Dutch. In addition, the biographic notions of the three authors demonstrate how they interacted with the other works and authors and how their mutual acquaintance certainly played a role in the formation of their own grammatical theories. In particular, as I will argue in Chapter IV, there is evidence to believe that the troubled compilation of the first edition of Halma’s Dutch-French dictionary has impacted the correctness and cohesiveness of its contents, ultimately having repercussions on Shizuki’s works.

In Chapter IV, I will investigate, explain, and contextualize the grammatical contents of the Dutch publications that directly interest the present research. This process will allow me to compare the information therein contained with Shizuki’s claims about Dutch (and Japanese) grammar in order to establish to what extent these Dutch sources have been absorbed by the Japanese scholar. I will do this in Chapters VII and VIII. It will also allow me to understand whether and to what extent these grammatical notions on Dutch have been embraced by Shizuki who eventually extended them to the grammar of Japanese.

