

LINGUISTICS AND THE DUTCH

By

R. SALVERDA

*Professor of Dutch Language and Literature
in the University of London*

An Inaugural Lecture
Delivered at University College London
26 November 1990

© UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON 1990

LINGUISTICS AND THE DUTCH

There is a common myth that the Dutch are born linguists in the sense that they easily pick up foreign languages and that they have a natural and unrivalled multilingual proficiency. And of course, they all speak English too. A living example of this myth is the Dutch prime minister Lubbers, who, according to reports in the press, speaks five or six languages and addresses all his major European colleagues in their own native tongue.

This Dutch myth is nicely counterbalanced by a common belief among the English that they do not have this knack for learning foreign languages, for which they greatly envy the Dutch, especially in view of 1992. Some even seem to believe that the English lack the genetic predisposition for learning foreign languages. How fortunate then that English is the major international language today.

My lecture today is not on comparative national mythology, so I will not further discuss these beliefs here, except to say that in reality things are rather different. It is not that the Dutch are genetically better equipped than the English when it comes to foreign language learning. It is rather, I submit, that our national interests have been different so far, and, as a consequence, the respective educational policies and school systems have developed differently too. Moreover, in language learning, a lot depends on exposure and experience, training and habit formation - and in these respects, Dutch schoolchildren have more, and more varied, linguistic experiences during their years in secondary school, when they do the hard work that is necessary in order to acquire foreign languages. English schoolchildren, on the other hand, do not have this invaluable experience; they have a much more limited exposure to foreign languages while they are at school. This lack of exposure and experience tends to breed ignorance about the learning of foreign languages, which in turn may help to explain why, in this country, one can get away with advertisements claiming that Spanish or German can easily be learnt in seven days. The underlying assumption seems to be that learning a foreign language is just another skill, with nothing much to it, something that anybody can easily do in a language laboratory. The reality is very often quite different. And this, to my mind, clearly illustrates the need for fundamental research into the actual processes and factors involved in successful foreign language learning.

Now, what I have been saying so far concerns the actual learning of languages, and though I consider this to be of great academic and social importance, it is not my main topic today. I will not be concerned here with language learning, but with linguistics as an academic pursuit.

Linguistics is usually defined as the scientific study of language,¹ and in the sense that we are engaged in the systematic, empirical and theoretical

investigation of language and languages this is fine as far as it goes. However, we would do well to remember that the two key terms in this definition, 'language' and 'scientific', have been construed very differently at different times. This is brought home to us when we ask for the birthdate of this discipline and receive an astonishing range of answers.

To some, linguistics began in Mesopotamia in the third millennium before Christ, with the invention of writing. Clay tablets survive with school exercises, grammatical paradigms and word lists in cuneiform writing. On account of this material, Sarton, in his *History of Science*, says that philology is one of the earliest sciences.² The opposite extreme is to say that linguistics is a very young discipline that only really started in this century - either in 1916, with De Saussure's *Cours de Linguistique Générale*, or in 1933, with Bloomfield's *Language*, or finally in 1957, with Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*.³

The easiest way to deal with these conflicting opinions is, perhaps, to say that linguists make bad historians. Another trivial explanation would be to see De Saussure, Bloomfield and Chomsky as representatives of successive paradigms in the sense of Thomas Kuhn; if this were true, however, linguistics would have gone through no less than three Copernican revolutions in only forty years. So, in between these two views, I should like to draw your attention to a peculiar feature of linguistics, namely its inbuilt programmatic character. As De Saussure put it, the object we investigate is created by our underlying point of view.⁴ In linguistics, the empirical descriptions and the theoretical explanations we deal with are embedded in a larger perspective of leading conceptions,⁵ like e.g. Chomsky's mentalist programme. This is not to say that linguistics now is a non-empirical, ideological kind of discipline where everything is in the eye of the beholder. No. To all intents and purposes, it is an empirical discipline, but in the evaluation and testing of descriptions and explanations we also have to take into account the underlying programmatic viewpoint that has inspired them and from which they derive. Thus, linguistics is a discipline that keeps reinventing and redefining itself, and has been doing so ever since it first began in ancient times. In the history of linguistics, therefore, time and again we will see new viewpoints arise and develop into a research programme for the empirical study of language.

When we now come to our main question of today and ask what the Dutch have contributed to the development of this discipline - taking the Dutch to mean the Dutch-speaking peoples of the Low Countries across the North Sea⁶ - it is not immediately clear that this is a topic for serious discussion.

4

Indeed, one could easily get the impression, for example from Geoffrey Sampson's *Schools of Linguistics*, published in 1980, that the Dutch have made no contribution at all. Worse still, in Robins's authoritative *Short History of Linguistics*, a Dutch linguist is mentioned, the 'notorious' Johannes Goropius Becanus⁷ (1518-1573) of Antwerp, who has given Dutch linguistics rather a bad name. In 1569 he put forward the claim that his native language really was the oldest language in the world and had actually been used by Adam and Eve in Paradise. In support of this claim he adduced the most hilarious etymologies. His argument was that in general the simplest is the oldest, so short words must be older than long words, and as Dutch has more short words than Latin, Greek and Hebrew, Dutch is obviously the older language. If we thus come to see Dutch as the original language from which all other languages are derived, it is suddenly very easy to understand why the Dutch have no difficulty at all with foreign languages. You will also understand, though, that on account of these views, Goropius Becanus has been buried under centuries of ridicule. The term 'goropism' was especially coined by Leibniz to mean 'absurd etymology'.⁸ Today, Becanus is chiefly remembered as a stock example of linguistic chauvinism.

The only other Dutch linguist mentioned by Robins, earlier in the sixteenth century, is Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536) of Rotterdam. For him, as a classical scholar and theologian, Latin was the venerated language of the Church and of Classical Rome. But it was also the living instrument of humanist culture, as he masterfully demonstrated in his literary works. Though he is not commonly seen as a linguist, he published a dialogue on the correct pronunciation of Greek and Latin in 1528, with interesting phonetic observations on these languages, and his system of Greek pronunciation was subsequently adopted all over northern Europe.⁹ Erasmus thus represents the more cosmopolitan side of Dutch linguistics. Had he lived he would probably have given Becanus a place of honour among the pedantic schoolmasters and grammarians in his *Praise of Folly*.

Together, Becanus and Erasmus stand as the two patron saints of Dutch linguistics, representing the opposite tendencies of nationalism and internationalism that are characteristic of the early period of Dutch linguistics.

Taking a closer look at this period, roughly from about 1560 till 1730, we note a variety of interesting developments, of which I will highlight the following four aspects.

First of all, in the field of classical scholarship, the universities of Leuven and Leyden came to play a leading international role from about the second half of the sixteenth century. Men of great learning, like Lipsius (1547-1606)

5

and Scaliger (1540-1609), came to these universities, soon to be followed by many other eminent scholars, all inspired by the humanist ideal of studying and disseminating classical culture which they admired so highly. Famous throughout Europe for their excellent editions of the classics, as well as for their Latin grammars and polylog dictionaries, they had a deep and long lasting influence. In the seventeenth century, if one wanted to study Greek, one had to go to Leyden. Classical philology in Europe was dominated by the Dutch School until well into the eighteenth century.¹⁰ Of particular importance are the Latin grammars of Despauterius (ca.1480-1520) and Vossius (1577-1649), published at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, not only because they lasted until far into the nineteenth century, but especially because they were used as a model for the description of vernacular Dutch and its grammar.¹¹

Early in the seventeenth century, the university of Leyden also laid the foundations for its lasting fame in the field of Oriental languages, especially Hebrew and Arabic. A scholarly tradition of by now almost four centuries began with Erpenius's *Grammatica Arabica* of 1611, an outstanding work, which retained its undisputed value until the early part of the nineteenth century. Arabic was studied in connection with the increasing trade with the Middle East, but also for the purpose of gaining access to Arabic scholarship in mathematics and astronomy. The study of Hebrew was motivated by theological and biblical purposes, especially in connection with the great Dutch Bible Translation of 1637. For all their scholarship, Erpenius (1584-1624) and his successor at Leyden, Golius (1596-1667), were also very enterprising, travelling widely to study these languages, to collect manuscripts and to carry out diplomatic missions. They also seized upon the opportunities offered by the new printing technology, setting up an Arabic press at Leyden, which until nearly 1650 was the only source of Arabic type in Europe.¹²

Secondly, in the field of Dutch language studies, a respectable tradition of lexicography culminated in the latter part of the sixteenth century in the publication of the dictionaries of Cornelis Kiliaan (c.1530-1607).¹³ His famous etymological dictionary, published by Plantijn of Antwerp, third edition in 1599, stands out because of its careful explanations and its comparative etymologies, and shows that even at that time, Becanus' fantasies were already outdated.

Another important event is the publication, in 1584, of the first comprehensive grammar of Dutch,¹⁴ soon followed by a Rhetoric and a Logic, also in Dutch. While their descriptive model was still that of Latin, these works demonstrated that one could study the three liberal arts

6

(grammar, logic and rhetoric) of the basic school curriculum in Dutch. In fact, their publication was motivated by a conscious desire to see education change to Dutch as its medium of instruction, instead of Latin, in order to widen access to the fields of science, learning and higher education. To this end, new Dutch terms were coined for disciplines like mathematics, chemistry and geography. Until the middle of the seventeenth century, the grammar of 1584 was followed by a series of other works on Dutch grammar. Interestingly enough, these works were written not by academics working in the universities, but by merchants, church ministers, schoolmasters and mathematicians, sheep shearers and musicians. But now Becanus appears in a new light because, as it turns out, he was leading a serious movement for educational reform. In the event, this movement did not succeed, and there is no evidence that these Dutch grammar books were ever used in the education system. The extravagant claims and the fantastic etymologies of Becanus seem to have backfired as they provided an easy target for the academic defenders of classical culture. At any rate, Latin and not Dutch remained the language of instruction at universities in the Netherlands until well into the second quarter of the nineteenth century.¹⁵

In addition to these lexicographic and grammatical works we also note, from as early as 1550, the publication of a series of works on the problem of Dutch orthography, which contain interesting phonetic observations on the language. These provide us with some fascinating glimpses of how Dutch was spoken and how it actually sounded at the time; the descriptive realism of these works reminds one of the comedies and the paintings of the same period. The series culminates in 1635 with the publication of the *Spreekkonst*, by Petrus Montanus (1594/5-1638) of Delft.¹⁶ This book is extraordinary in its precise phonetic observations and its unfettered attention to the empirical details of pronunciation, for which Montanus developed a completely new Dutch terminology. In his *Spreekkonst* we find the same Renaissance curiosity and the same spirit of empirical enquiry which is characteristic also of the works of an engineer like Stevin, an astronomer like Snellius and biologists like Swammerdam, Leeuwenhoek and Rumphius. However, to take this kind of scientific approach to the study of the real world around us is one thing, but to apply it to the study of human speech was quite another, and something that did not go well with contemporary cultural preconceptions about language. For this reason, and also because of its terminological idiosyncracies, Montanus's work was largely ignored at the time and has only been rediscovered in this century as the work of genius it really is.

7

And then, thirdly, there is the field of foreign language learning. With respect to European languages, we note the publication, from the early part of the sixteenth century, of polyglot dictionaries and conversation books for learning Latin and French. Later on, we find that Spanish and German are also added. The first books for learning English began to appear also from the early part of the sixteenth century, and a strong tradition in teaching English and in Anglo-Dutch linguistic scholarship developed in the seventeenth century, culminating in William Sewel's (1653-1720) great dictionary and grammar of 1691.¹⁷ Today, therefore, we are looking at a long tradition of nearly four centuries, during which almost any idea has been tried and tested, generating a vast body of experience and common sense with respect to foreign language learning. The motives for learning foreign language appear to have been purely practical throughout, and for most of these four centuries the field remained in the hands of schoolmasters, translators and publishers, working outside the universities. As an academic subject it is relatively young: the first foreign language department in a Dutch university was the French department at the University of Groningen, established in 1884. At the beginning of the twentieth century a man like Kruisinga (1875-1944) still had to go abroad in order to obtain his doctorate in English studies, since this was not yet possible at a Dutch university. This predominantly practical orientation may help to explain why the Dutch have not, so far, made any significant theoretical and methodological contributions in the field of foreign language learning.¹⁸

Outside the European sphere, there is the long tradition of studies in the field of Indonesian languages, a tradition that also began early in the seventeenth century. In 1603 the merchant Frederik de Houtman (1571-1627), after two years as a prisoner in Atjeh in the north of Sumatra, came back to the Netherlands and published his Malay dictionary and conversation book, to which he added the first descriptions of the stellar configurations of the Southern hemisphere.¹⁹ This book inaugurates a distinguished tradition, still continuing at Leyden today, of studies on the indigenous languages of the Indonesian archipelago. The driving force behind these studies, at least during the seventeenth century, appears to have been a peculiar Dutch mix of religious and commercial motives: the desire to spread the Word of God and the Protestant faith in the Spice Islands, just as much as the acceptance of Malay, the *lingua franca* of the Archipelago, for trading purposes. In this field too, the first contributions were made by merchants, missionaries and translators working in the field. Although De Houtman's dictionary was made available to the international community through Latin, Italian, French and English translations that remained in use for a few centuries, the majority of these studies were published in Dutch,

8

with the result that even today a knowledge of Dutch is indispensable if one wants to come to a serious understanding of Indonesian history, culture and languages.²⁰

The fourth and final point I want to make about early Dutch linguistics, concerns the contributions by a number of Dutch linguists to what would eventually become, in the nineteenth century and in Germany, the discipline of comparative linguistics.

Of great theoretical significance was the treatise²¹ published in 1610 by Scaliger, in which he reduced all known European languages to 11 basic roots, concluding that there was no common ancestor language for these roots. The importance of this treatise lies in the systematic comparative approach on which he based his conclusions. Of wider significance is that he in fact refuted the various claims that had been made for either Latin or Hebrew or Dutch as the original language, thus freeing the investigation of linguistic history from the cultural, biblical and nationalistic views which had for such a long time prejudged the issue. Then, in 1665, came the invaluable publication of the *Codex Argenteus* by Franciscus Junius (1589-1677), which made available the text of the fourth century translation of the Bible into Gothic, the oldest known Germanic language. On the basis of this material, a Dutch schoolmaster, Lambert ten Kate (1674-1731) of Amsterdam, succeeded in 1710 in establishing the family relations among the Germanic languages, on the solid foundation of systematic comparison. Thus, he in fact inaugurated the scientific study of comparative Germanic grammar a full century before Jacob Grimm's *Deutsche Grammatik*.²²

At this point I should like to note that while I am highlighting the most significant contributions by Dutch linguists in the period from about 1560 to about 1730, I am not arguing that all this was done by the Dutch on their own. On the contrary, there have always been close international contacts and cooperation. For example, a scholar like Scaliger was not a Dutchman, but he did his most important work while he was professor at Leyden. The book by Junius I just mentioned was published with a Latin translation made by an English colleague. Ten Kate's work was also dependent on the work of the Englishman George Hickes. In France, in 1660, the influential *Grammaire Générale et Raisonnée* of Port Royal was published. And so on. My point is, rather, that at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries, in the four fields I have reviewed - classical and oriental philology, Dutch grammar, vocabulary and phonetics, foreign languages and comparative linguistics - we see an explosion of scholarly activity in the Low Countries, a rich variety of linguistic exploration and the publication of what really are monuments of discovery and learning. It is

Columel
Houtman
Hickes
Wierzbicki

9

important to see that the linguistic investigations of these men were inspired by a variety of motives, and undertaken with a view to important wider issues. Indeed, we should not think of these men as ivory tower academics, but rather, perhaps, as inquisitive and erudite investigators, sifting - like George Smiley - through all kinds of information, of strongly variable reliability and relevance, in order to get at the truth (or at least to eliminate the fantasies), on matters as diverse as the true text of the Bible, the correct chronology of world history, the original language, the exact position of the stars and the continents, or even the ideal language with which to capture the essence of reality. It is in the search for truth in these matters, at the frontiers of knowledge, that philological evidence was used and could be of decisive importance. Thus, for example, in 1653, when Golius, who was professor of Arabic and mathematics at Leyden and also the founder of its observatory, established that the Cathay he knew from Arabic manuscripts was actually the same as the China he was told of by the Jesuits, the deciding factor was the available philological evidence, and the discovery itself so important that it was published right away in Martini's great Atlas of China, published by Blaeu in 1655.²³

Concluding this survey, I think it is fair to say that the activities and admirable achievements of Dutch linguists in this early period demonstrate that in linguistics too, just as in so many other fields,²⁴ the Dutch have had a Golden Age during which they dominated the European scene by the sheer accumulation of linguistic materials, the concentration of high quality scholarship and the availability of a well-organized, international publishing trade.

However, for all its quality and rich variety, one could argue that all this does not really count as linguistics, since language at the time was not studied in itself and for itself, but for some other purpose, and the study of language was really governed by some other agenda, a theological, humanist or nationalist programme. As we have seen, this happens to be true. However, this line of criticism is self-defeating: or at least, it would follow that Chomsky's mentalist and rationalist perspective should now also be regarded as a programme alien to the study of language. One could conceivably take this view, but in line with what I said earlier about the programmatic nature of linguistics, I think it is more appropriate to see both the Renaissance search for the original language and Chomsky's quest for our innate mental linguistic capacity as programmatic viewpoints, each of which is crucially adopted in order to construct a coherent object for empirical investigation.

Even so, we might still argue that the grammarians and philologists of the period we have just reviewed studied languages, but not language; that they

uncritically adopted the logico-Latin mould of traditional grammar for the description of other languages; that they were quite normative in their approach; that is, that they lacked a proper theoretical concept of language and an acceptable method for describing and explaining the properties of this object; in short, that they were not doing pure, scientific linguistics. In reply to this, I should say that, however true this criticism may be, it derives from a twentieth century conception of linguistics as a 'pure' academic discipline. And if we apply the scientific standards of our own time to works published in the sixteenth century, we are not only trapped in an anachronism but also run the risk of seriously misjudging works that perfectly satisfied the standards of their own time.

Instead, I think it is more interesting to pursue this modern view of pure linguistics and take a closer look at the present century, in which this view has, after all, played its leading-role. So, taking up our central question of today, we ask again: What did the Dutch contribute to the further development of linguistics?

The first thing I should like to note in this respect is that, while it is generally true that linguistics has become a different discipline from what it was in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in some respects at least there is also a considerable measure of continuity. In the twentieth century Dutch linguists have continued to produce dictionaries and to write grammars. And, although this involves the use of new methods and techniques, covering wider ranges of data in far deeper detail, the descriptive work involved is not fundamentally different from what it was then.²⁵

As in the early period, the Dutch have also continued to be concerned with the problem of spelling. In the course of the present century, there has been a series of four official spelling reforms. These reforms have generated a lot of debate and the resulting spelling is clearly a compromise between on the one hand, modern, scientific and phonological considerations and, on the other hand, more traditional social and cultural values.²⁶ Nevertheless, the reforms have given the Dutch a spelling for their language which gives a far more adequate representation of the current spoken language than those of their French, English and German neighbours.

The Dutch have also continued to study foreign languages. They have remained strong in Oriental and Asiatic languages, and, just as in the seventeenth century, the study of English has remained an important concern. In fact, for the first three quarters of the present century, the Dutch have played a leading role in the study of English grammar. Before there was Quirk, there was the Great Tradition of Poutsma, Kruisinga, Zandvoort and Visser. So strong was this tradition that in 1936 the claim was even made that

10

11

the English should certainly continue to speak and use their language, but could safely leave the study and description of its grammar to the Dutch.²⁷

In these fields there is a clear continuity. In other respects, however, there have indeed been fundamental changes, as a result of which the discipline of linguistics is now completely different from its predecessors in the Golden Age.

A striking feature of the twentieth century in the Low Countries is that it is such a linguistic century, in the sense that the problem of language has evoked a continuous and intense interest from all sides. In Dutch poetry, especially in the poetry of the Symbolist movement, where nebulous notions are tantalizingly hidden behind the simplest of words, there is a strong fascination with the ultimate limits of language. In the sciences the movement of Significs²⁸ brought together, early in this century, a group of scholars from various disciplines, in a growing awareness that language was not the transparent vehicle of thought and knowledge it once seemed to be. The work of intuitionist mathematicians like Brouwer and Heyting has also undoubtedly stimulated an awareness of language as a deep intellectual problem.²⁹ And in the field of language studies, this century has seen the birth of a genuine discipline of general linguistics, focussing on the study of language as such, as a unifying theoretical object in itself, behind and underlying all the particular languages in this world.³⁰

Another contrast with the seventeenth century is that the time of the Renaissance *uomo universale* is over. Today, it is no longer possible to be, like Golius, professor of Arabic and mathematics, and to contribute to astronomy and geography as well. Instead, the advancement of knowledge depends on specialization. In linguistics too, this has led to an ever increasing number of new subdisciplines and new lines of research. In Dutch linguistics we also find this trend and already before the second World War important contributions were made by Van Ginneken in the new field of psycholinguistics, Van Wijk in structural phonology, and Kloeke in dialect geography.³¹ This process of thematic specialization continues, and the growing number of subdisciplines as well as the increasing quantity of scholarly output effectively mean that no person could seriously hope to be able to cover all these developments in a thorough way.

So I too will have to restrict myself here and limit discussion to my own area of specialization, that of grammatical theory. In this field, the logico-semantic mould of traditional grammar was the accepted base for grammatical description for our colleagues in the seventeenth century, and for quite a few today as well. But since that time, a number of new models and approaches have been developed for the study of grammar. There is, first

of all, the discovery of linguistic form in historical grammar and structural linguistics, which has had a very liberating effect, freeing the study of grammar of its logical mould. The same can be said of the discovery of the sign act perspective in semiology and pragmalinguistics, and the subsequent exploration of functional aspects and problems of relevance in language. Now, whether one starts from the concrete forms of language or from its functions in use, it is clear that each of these approaches constitutes a fundamental departure from the logico-semantic tradition, which thus stands out as the narrow, monistic viewpoint it really is.

The various approaches just mentioned can all be found in present day Dutch linguistics too. But they originated elsewhere and have been imported from abroad. This fact, together with the absence of a typically Dutch school or a particular Dutch doctrine in linguistics, demonstrates that the Dutch are no longer as dominant as they were in the earlier period we reviewed.

They are, however, very well informed about international developments, which they follow closely, and their active contribution to the international exchange of new linguistic ideas is a basic and very valuable feature of their role in the present century.

At a practical level, first of all, the Dutch have been active as intermediaries,³² organizing international congresses and housing international organizations, producing important services and scholarly initiatives, and publishing books and journals for the world market. For example, in 1928 the First International Congress of Linguists was held at the Hague, and today there is a lively activity in international seminars, the most notable being those of GLOW and Functional Grammar. The International Permanent Committee of Linguists has its Secretariat in The Hague, which prepares and publishes the invaluable annual *Bibliographie Linguistique* since 1948. Major international initiatives have been taken by Dutch linguists, e.g. the pioneering of a European dialectology by Weijnen in 1975 and the first attempt to define basic requirements for modern language learning in the European Community by Van Ek, also in 1975.³³ In this whole international trade, it even seems that Dutch linguists themselves have become an export commodity, to be found not only in this College, in the Departments of Linguistics, English and Dutch, but in other foreign universities as well, and even at the head of the Jesuit Order in Rome. Dutch publishers also play an important international role. Brill, Benjamins, Elsevier, Foris, Mouton, Peeters, Wolters-Noordhoff, Reidel (now Kluwer) are household names in the linguistic world. An exceptionally large number of the major international journals in linguistics are published by these Dutch houses. And in 1957 Chomsky's epoch-making first book *Syntactic Structures* f h

was published in The Hague by Mouton, when he could not find an American publisher interested in taking it.³⁴

This example is interesting in that it provides a good insight into how the Dutch trade in new ideas in international linguistics is related to scholarly developments inside the Low Countries.³⁵ Chomsky's book was at first strongly criticized by the leading Dutch linguists of the time, but at the same time well received by Dutch mathematicians, philosophers, and logicians working on formal, language-like systems. With their backing, Chomsky's new approach soon became very influential, especially during the sixties, when at times it seemed as if his new ideas would sweep away everything that had been built up in earlier Dutch linguistics. We see here a characteristic Dutch openmindedness and a corresponding lack of traditionalism, a willingness to do away with received ideas in exchange for new and better insights imported from abroad. Acceptance is not automatic, however, and new ideas are usually put to the test in thorough empirical research. This, in turn, has led to important and original contributions by young Dutch linguists like Koster and Van Riemsdijk, who are now among the major players in the international development of Chomskyan linguistic theories. At the same time Chomsky's approach has continued to be challenged from the outside, most directly by Dik's so called Functional Grammar, which provides a Dutch alternative that has found a wide international response. But there have always been other challenges too, especially in the field of formal logical semantics and lexical grammar.

However, the real benefit of the international orientation lies at a far more substantial level of linguistics. Throughout this century, a wide range of languages has been studied by Dutch linguists, not only the traditional Indo-European, Oriental and South-east Asian languages, but also languages as diverse as Eskimo, Basque, Hungarian, Turkish, Creole and African languages, the languages of the Caucasus, and those of the American Indians. Now, the interesting thing is that many of the linguists involved in these languages have then come back and turned their attention towards the study of Dutch. Thus, we find classical scholars, slavists, romanists, anglists and germanists, sanskritists and javanists, who all turn to the study of Dutch and produce highly enlightening studies of particular aspects of it, in syntax, semantics, morphology, lexicography and intonation, which have immensely enriched our knowledge of Dutch by their careful observations and their attention to details that had often escaped their more traditional home colleagues.

This line of linguistic research has recently culminated in the magnificent doctoral dissertation on Information Structure in Russian, English and Dutch, published in 1985 by Keysper. Her critical scrutiny of theories from Eastern

European, especially Slavic scholars, on the basis of careful observations of the facts and meaning of accentuation, scope and word order in these three languages, has led to surprising new insights into the way information is structured and presented in a language like for example Dutch.³⁶

Her results and more generally the results of this empirical and comparative tradition as a whole, demonstrate the effectiveness of this approach in making progress in the study of grammar. At the same time, they suggest that the wideranging experience and thorough acquaintance with languages, which Dutch linguists often have, do significantly contribute to the shaping of their views and theories on language in general. The comparative empirical approach is therefore to my mind among the most valuable contributions the Dutch can make to the development of international linguistics.

Let us now take a closer look at the most recent past, the eighties, and see what is going on at the moment in Dutch linguistics.

To begin with, in the study of Dutch, a number of interesting developments have taken place in the last decade. There is the publication in 1984 of the first comprehensive standard grammar of Dutch,³⁷ exactly four hundred years after the first grammar of 1584. And the great dictionary of the Dutch language, a project that started in 1860, is nearing completion and will hopefully be finished before the year 2000.³⁸ There is a lively scholarly output on the Dutch language. Speaking very generally, one could say that linguists in Flanders, who are closer to the linguistic frontier with French, have a stronger political awareness and are more active in sociolinguistics, whereas their colleagues in Holland, farther away from the front, concentrate more on theoretical matters. An increasing number of publications are in English, but the large majority and in particular the more significant discoveries continue to be published in Dutch.³⁹ This situation is really not very different from that in the seventeenth century: at that time the international language of scholarship was Latin and that has now changed to English, but the Dutch continue to publish scientific works on their own language in Dutch all the same.

The other important development in the field of Dutch is the establishment in 1980, by treaty between the Netherlands and Belgium, of the Dutch Language Union, which brings together the 20 million speakers of the language and aims at their integration in the domain of language and literature in the widest sense. The Dutch Language Union supports a wide variety of activities, one of which is the promotion of the Dutch language abroad, for example as one of the official languages of the European Community. In view of 1992, one could of course imagine a common linguistic future along

the lines of 'Allo, Allo!', where we all use a sort of hard ecu of language, but the Dutch, for all their internationalism, are certainly not going to give up their own language for such a syncretist development.

In the field of foreign languages, we note that the position and role of the Dutch in the international community is dependent on a wide distribution of foreign language proficiency over the population. This has accordingly been identified as a basic national interest, and a National Programme of Action for Modern Foreign Languages has been established earlier this year. The field of Applied Linguistics has advanced rapidly in the past 25 years, and so has the Teaching of Dutch as a Second or Foreign Language. Researchers in these fields are now doing the kind of fundamental research⁴⁰ that is essential if we are to come to a serious theoretical understanding of the factors and processes involved in successful foreign language learning. It would be useful, I think, if our own new Language Centre could also take on such a role in research.

Now, if I mention the study of Dutch grammar and that of Dutch as a Second Language, it should be noted that these cover only two of the twenty subdisciplines mentioned in the most recent bibliography of Dutch linguistics.⁴¹ With such a growth in our field, some kind of coordination is needed, and here a stimulating role has been played since 1977 by the Stichting Taalwetenschap, or Linguistics Foundation. In the past decade the Foundation has developed into a national organization for linguistic research, parallel to the universities, bringing together the expertise of about one thousand working linguists and stimulating their cooperation in research projects.

In order to meet the challenges of the future, the Foundation has recently defined a five year research policy, and set out a number of thematic priorities for linguistic research.⁴² One of these priorities is in the field of grammatical theory. In this field, there has been a proliferation of theories in the past decade, each projecting a different perspective onto something as seemingly simple as the construction of our sentences.

To mention just three of these approaches. The Chomskians want to find the formal principles of the mind that govern the syntactic structures of natural language.⁴³ The functional grammarians focus on the communicative factors involved in the structuring of our sentences.⁴⁴ And Form-Content Analysis attempts to find the linguistic meanings that explain how and why we can interpret and understand sentences.⁴⁵ The central issue that occupies all of them would seem to be the question how exactly form, meaning and interpretation are connected in human language.

On this issue, there is a diversity of opinion that reminds one of the individualistic nature of the Dutch, especially as it appears in religion and

politics, where the Dutch habit of disagreeing is most strongly developed.⁴⁶ On the other hand, this variety of viewpoints may also reflect the essential plurality of the object 'language', which we are studying. At any rate, the diversity of theoretical options, which is far greater than anything we saw in the seventeenth century, is a valuable asset and a strong incentive for serious intellectual debate on the fundamental structure of language.

But when a first attempt to organize a debate between exponents of a number of these theories was made in 1986, communication turned out to be hindered by an almost Babylonian confusion.⁴⁷ Key terms, like form, meaning, function, structure, interpretation and explanation turned out to be totally different from one theoretical framework to the next. The debate was, perhaps, the more lively for it, but the result was that it is not clear whether these theories really involve empirical and explanatory differences of a substantial nature.

Such a state of affairs is not acceptable to a Dutch mind. For all their individualism, and love of disagreement, there is also, among the Dutch, a strong desire for consensus and a wish, when all is said and done, to engage in a constructive common enterprise.⁴⁸ Thus, there is a real need for an integrated framework for linguistic inquiry, within which we can then develop empirically testable theories.

In this respect, I think it would be a sensible move for the grammarians to join forces with the psychologists who are also studying language, especially since on the psychological side there is now a promising model in Levelt's recently published book *Speaking*.⁴⁹ In its 500 pages Levelt gives a comprehensive outline of all that may be involved in the process between first Intention and final Articulation, a distance we daily travel in a split second when we talk.

My point is not that Levelt is right, that what he presents is the correct theory, or the definitive picture of what goes on in our brains when we talk. That remains to be seen. At the very least, his psychological picture should be matched with the empirical findings of a careful linguist like Keysper in her book *Information Structure*. And it is by no means easy to see how this could be done, partly because they work in different fields and directions and are apparently unaware of each other. Levelt starts from the speaker and describes how we conceive, plan, formulate, execute, monitor and repair our utterances, and his aim is to construct a model of how the speaker works. Keysper on the other hand, starts from the listener, and analyzes how and why we can interpret and understand what we hear, and her focus is on our capacity to construct interpretations from the language material before us. Obviously there is a connection here, since speakers and listeners remarkably often succeed in reaching a measure of mutual understanding; but their

mental makeup is not necessarily constructed on the same blueprint, as our daily misunderstandings and miscommunications make only too clear. All the more reason then, to study speakers and listeners and their interactions together. In this respect, these two outstanding books, *Speaking* by Levelt and *Information Structure* by Keysper, which I regard as the most substantial contributions of the decade to come from Dutch linguists, do offer a good starting point for joint future research, and they at least enable us to draw up an agenda for research and a sound division of academic labour.

At this point, the logical - and most exciting - next step would be, I think, to link these fundamental grammatical and psychological investigations with another line of research - also a strategic priority of the Linguistics Foundation - viz. the technology of speech and hearing. Much more is involved here than the mere use of computers and other machinery. In fact, the combination of linguistics and new information technology is opening up new worlds of inquiry, and the development of computerized lexical databases in the past decade already enables linguists to do language research on a quite different scale than before. Of particular interest in this respect is a nationwide project that is now being carried out in the Netherlands, which involves the combined efforts of phoneticians, phonologists, morphologists, syntacticians, semanticists, text grammarians and pragmalinguists, all aiming to produce a complete text-to-speech conversion by automatic means. This new field of inquiry, for which the term 'experimental linguistics'⁵⁰ has been suggested, is of course not tackled in the Low Countries alone. There is an increasing international interdependence here, and the Dutch are also taking part in an eight-nation project on Speech Technology, for which, I note with pleasure, the UCL Department of Phonetics and Linguistics is the prime contractor.

The expected spinoff of such research, in the form of machines that can speak, read and understand, and also e.g. linguistically sophisticated word processors, and multilingual translation aids, has already attracted investments from companies like Elsevier, Philips and Kluwer. We are witnessing here the beginning of 'a real language industry'.⁵¹

Concluding this survey, I submit that in the present century the strong points of Dutch linguistics are much the same as in the seventeenth: the accumulation of diverse linguistic materials, the concentration of high quality scholarship and the availability of a well established publishing trade working for the linguistic world market. One can therefore well understand how it is that the great Chomsky has predicted a brilliant future for linguistics in the Low Countries.⁵²

This leaves me with just two more questions, which I shall answer before I let you go. First, From everything I have said so far, what perspective, what programme follows for the study of a language, like Dutch?

It is clear that one can no longer study Dutch on its own, anymore than a lepidopterist could restrict his or her studies to just one particular butterfly. When we study Dutch, we do so in various different connections. First of all, in relation to a general theory of language and its structure and functioning. Secondly, we also need a comparative approach, and so we study Dutch in relation to other languages and language families in the world. Thirdly, we take an analytical perspective and study Dutch as an entity that is built from a multitude of subcomponents. And working our way through all these interconnections, it would seem that we are taking this language apart in ever increasing detail.

Indeed, when we stand back and take a look at the whole, the Dutch language emerges as an intricately structured and highly complex entity. Now if we multiply this complexity by 6.170 - which is the total number of languages in the world, according to the last reliable count⁵³ - it is clear that what we are facing is a universe of language that is as complicated and intellectually challenging as the structure of the universe out there.

And perhaps the linguistic universe is the more elusive of the two, since it is so near. For it is our own linguistic faculty that we are studying, our own mental instrument, which shapes the innermost workings of our thinking and our soul; and at the same time, it is the communicative instrument with which we build our culture and society, and without which there would be no stories and hence no history; and finally also, language is a material that realizes its highest potentialities in literary art, in novels, essays, drama, song and poetry.

So, if all this is in language, and is language, it follows that if we really want to know a language, like e.g. Dutch, we will have to pursue and investigate all these aspects of it. On this view, the study of language in effect straddles the divide between the world of science and the world of culture. And the real challenge, to me, is to cross that divide and let linguistics be both a science and an art.

My second and last question is: If we adopt this essentially Humboldtian programme for linguistics, what am I going to do here in London to realize it?

Now, as you know, Archimedes said that with a point to stand upon he could move the world. I may perhaps not expect to move the Low Countries from here, but still London offers an ideal vantage point from which to study their language and culture.

It was here in London, in 1568, that the merchant Johannes Radermacher wrote his treatise on the necessity and the usefulness of the Dutch language.⁵⁴ Early in this century, also in London, here at UCL, Low Countries Studies began in 1919, when Pieter Geyl was first appointed as Professor of Dutch, and it has produced a solid tradition of scholarship over the years. In History there is the impressive work done by Professors Renier, Kossmann, Zwart and now my colleague Jonathan Israel.⁵⁵

Literary Studies have flourished, first after the Second World War under Professor Theodoor Weevers at Bedford College,⁵⁶ then especially since 1971 under my predecessor Professor Reinder Meijer, whose standard work on the *Literature of the Low Countries* has laid the foundations on which we in the Department of Dutch can confidently build.⁵⁷

There is a wider context, in that, for many centuries, Anglo-Dutch relations have involved not only Literature, but also Art, War, Trade, Translation, Colonial Rivalry and Scientific exchange. And of course, there is an old Frisian connection. In the study of this wider context, I am confident that the recently established interdisciplinary Centre for Low Countries Studies at UCL can and will play a leading academic role.⁵⁸ And I will be happy to contribute my expertise as a Dutch linguist to these developments.

As for my own work, against the background of the programme for linguistics which I have outlined above, I will concentrate on two things: the grammar of Dutch in the widest sense, and the literary works in which this language has expressed itself in its most entrancing transparent beauty.

Earlier I told you that Sarton saw philology as the first science, or one of the first sciences. It may very well be that linguistics is the ultimate science too, giving us our Alpha and our Omega, and in the galaxies between these two, perhaps, some understanding of Dutch.

NOTES

1. Cf. e.g. John Lyons, *Language and Linguistics*, Cambridge 1981, p. 1.
2. George Sarton, *A History of Science*, vol. I (1952, repr. New York 1970), p. 67: "In spite of many statements to the contrary, we must say that philology is not one of the latest sciences, but rather one of the earliest."
3. For the competing dates of 1916, 1933 and 1957, see respectively: E.F.K. Koerner, *Ferdinand de Saussure. Origin and Development of his Linguistic Thought in Western Studies of Language*, Braunschweig 1973, p. 9, where he claims that De Saussure has effected an almost 'Copernican revolution' in the study of language by providing it with a new paradigm in the sense of Thomas Kuhn. Also B. Bloch, 'Leonard Bloomfield', in *Language* 25 (1949), p. 92: "There can be no doubt that Bloomfield's greatest contribution to the study of language was to make a science of it." Finally, F.J. Newmeyer, *Linguistic Theory in America. The First Quarter Century of Transformational Generative Grammar*, New York 1980, p. 20: "The essence of Chomsky's revolution in linguistics was his gift to the field of a truly scientific perspective".
4. F. de Saussure, *Cours de Linguistique Générale* (1916), ed. critique préparée par Tullio de Mauro, Paris 1972, p. 23: "... c'est le point de vue qui crée l'objet".
5. Cf. my *Leading Conceptions in Linguistic Theory. Formalist Tendencies in Structural Linguistics*, Dordrecht 1985.
6. Cf. P. Geyl, *Noord en Zuid. Eenheid en tweedheid in de Lage Landen*, Utrecht/Antwerpen 1960, and in particular R.P. Meijer, *Dutch and Flemish: Two Literatures or One?* Inaugural Lecture, Bedford College, University of London, May 1973.
7. R.H. Robins, *A Short History of Linguistics*, London 1967, p. 166. Also J. te Winkel, *Inleiding tot de Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Taal*, Culemborg n.d. (1904), p. 81, 240. Battus, *Opperlandse taal- en letterkunde*, Amsterdam 1981, sees Becanus as an early contributor to Recreational Linguistics.
8. D. Brink, 'Goropius Becanus and the Movement to Establish a Written Standard for Dutch in the 16th Century', in: W.H. Fletcher (ed.), *Papers from the First Interdisciplinary Conference on Netherlandic Studies*, Lanham 1985, p. 79-85, especially p. 80. Cf. John T. Waterman, *Perspectives in Linguistics*, Chicago 1970², p. 13: "Probably the most celebrated linguistic chauvinist is the Dutchman, Goropius Becanus (1518-1572)."
9. Desiderius Erasmus, *De recta Latini Graecique sermonis pronuntiatione dialogus*, Basel 1528. Cf. W.J.H. Caron, *Klank en teken bij Erasmus en onze oudste grammatici*, Groningen-Batavia 1947.

10. Cf. P.A. Verburg, *Taal en Functionaliteit*, Wageningen 1951, p. 418, 423.
11. Cf. C.S.M. Rademaker, 'Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577-1649) and the Study of Latin Grammar', in: *Historiographica Linguistica* 15 (1988), nr. 1/2, p. 109-128. And G.R.W. Dibbets, 'Dutch Philology in the 16th and 17th Century', in: *ibidem*, p. 39-62.
12. D. Friedman, 'Oriental Studies', in: A.J. Barnouw and B. Landsheer (eds), *The Contribution of Holland to the Sciences*, New York 1943, p. 219-249. Also V. Salmon, 'Anglo-Dutch Linguistic Scholarship', in: *Historiographica Linguistica* 15 (1988), p. 142-143.
13. F.M.W. Claes, 'Über die Verbreitung Lexikographischer Werke in den Niederlanden und ihre Wechselseitige Beziehungen mit dem Ausland bis zum Jahre 1600', in: *Historiographica Linguistica* 15 (1988), nr. 1/2, p. 17-38. Cf. also 'Enige aspecten uit de geschiedenis van de Nederlandse lexicografie', in: P.G.J. van Sterkenburg, *Een glossarium van zeventiende-eeuws Nederlands*, Groningen 1975, p. xix.
14. *Twee-spraack van de Nederduitsche letterkunst* (1584), ed. by G.R.W. Dibbets, Assen/Maastricht 1985. Cf. also the review by J. Knol, in: *De nieuwe taalids* 83 (1990), p. 74-77; L. van den Branden, *Het streven naar verheerlijking, zuivering en opbouw van het Nederlands in de 16de eeuw*, Arnhem 1967; and H. Kliffman, 'Dutch Language Study and the Trivium: Motives and Elaborations', in: *Historiographica Linguistica* 15 (1988), p. 63-84.
15. Cf. A.J. Barnouw, 'Philology', in: A.J. Barnouw and B. Landsheer (eds), *The Contribution of Holland to the Sciences*, New York 1943, p. 43-60. Also J. te Winkel, *Inleiding tot de Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Taal*, Culemborg n.d. (1904), p. 401.
16. Petrus Montanus, *De Spreekconst*, Delft 1635, edited by W.J.H. Caron, Groningen 1964. See also L.E. Wirth-Van Wijk, *Uit en rondom de Spreekconst van Petrus Montanus 1635*, Assen 1980, and J.L.M. Hulsker, 'Petrus Montanus as a Phonetician and a Theoretician', in: *Historiographica Linguistica* 15 (1988), nr. 1/2, p. 85-108.
17. Vivian Salmon, 'Anglo-Dutch Linguistic Scholarship: A Survey of Seventeenth-Century Achievements', in: *Historiographica Linguistica* 15 (1988), nr. 1/2, p. 129-154. Also R.C. Alston, *Polyglot Dictionaries and Grammars: Treatises on English Written for Speakers of French, German, Dutch, Danish, Swedish, Portuguese, Spanish, Italian, Hungarian, Persian, Bengali and Russian*, Bradford 1967 (= vol. II of *A Bibliography of the English Language from the Invention of Printing to the Year 800*, Bradford, 12 vols, 1965-1987).

18. Th.J.M. van Els, 'Applied linguistics in the Netherlands; The emergence of a discipline', in: F. Aarts and Th.J.M. van Els (eds), *Contemporary Dutch Linguistics*, Washington 1990, p. 80-96, and A.J. van Essen, E. Kruisinga. *A chapter in the History of Linguistics in the Netherlands*, Leiden 1983.
19. F. de Houtman, *Spraek ende woordboek in de Maleysche ende Madagaskarsche talen met vele Arabische ende Turksche woorden, alles in het Nederduitsch verduyst. Noch zijn hier bijgevoegd de Declinaties van vele vaste Sterren, staende omtrent den Zuydpool*, Amsterdam 1603. Cf. *Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indië* (second edition), vol. II, 's-Gravenhage/Leiden 1918, p. 108. De Houtman is also the first Dutch explorer who is known to have used a telescope in the Indonesian archipelago, cf. *Journal van Willem Ysbrants Bontekoe*, ed. C. Eggink, Haarlem 1957, p. 269. Cf. also G.C. Gerrits, *Groie Nederlanders bij de opbouw der Natuurwetenschappen*, Leiden 1948, p. 52-53.
20. C.R. Groeneboer (ed.), *Studi Belanda di Indonesia/Nederlandse Studien in Indonesië*, Jakarta 1989, and the *Encyclopaedie van Nederlandsch-Indië*, 's-Gravenhage/Leiden, 1917-1939.
21. J.J. Scaliger, *Diatriba de Europaeorum Linguis*, Leiden 1610. Cf. Verburg, o.c. p. 171, and A.G. van Hamel, *Geschiedenis der Taalwetenschap*, Den Haag 1945, p. 34.
22. Lambert ten Kate, *Gemeenschap Tussen de Gottische spraek Ende de Nederduitsche*, Amsterdam 1710. D. Brink, 'Lambert ten Kate as Indo-Europeanist', in: *Dutch Linguistics at Berkeley*, Proceedings of a Colloquium, J. van Oosten & J.P. Snapper (eds), Berkeley 1986, p. 125-136. Also L. Peeters, 'Lambert ten Kate (1674-1731) en de achttiende-eeuwse taalwetenschap', in: *Traditie en Progressie*, Handelingen van het 40ste Nederlands Filologencongres, 's-Gravenhage 1990, p. 151-160. Jacob Grimm, *Deutsche Grammatik*, Göttingen, 1822-1837, vol. II, p. 67 fn: "Ten Kate hat die ablaute zuerst in ihrer Wichtigkeit hervorgehoben". Quoted from Verburg o.c., p. 437, n. 1 and from W.D. Whitney, *Taal en Taalstudie*, transl. by J. Beckering Vinckers, Haarlem 1877, p. 38.
23. Friedman, o.c. p. 230-231. Cf. John Goss (ed.), *Blaeu's The Grand Atlas of the 17th Century World*, London 1990, p. 210-211.
24. Cf. C. Busken Huet, *Het Land van Rembrand*, Haarlem 1882-1884; D.J. Struik, *Het Land van Stevin en Huygens*, Nijmegen 1979; and K. van Berkel, *In het voetspoor van Stevin*, Amsterdam 1985. See also below, note 55.
25. See e.g. E.M. Uhlenbeck, 'Enige beschouwingen over verleden, heden en toekomst van de taalwetenschap in Nederland', in: *Forum der Letteren* 23 (1982), p. 163-183, esp. p. 178, where he mentions Visser's Historical Syntax of English and Zoetmulder's Old Javanese Dictionary.

26. Cf. G.E. Booij et al. (eds), *Spelling*, Groningen 1979, and D.A. Daman, *Vijftig jaren van strijd 1891-1941*, Purmerend 1941.
27. F. Aarts, 'English grammars and Dutch grammarians', in: F.G. Aarts and Th. J.M. van Els, *Contemporary Dutch Linguistics*, Washington 1990, p. 23-31, esp. p. 22.
28. H. Walter Schmitz, *De Hollandse Signifika. Een reconstructie van de geschiedenis van 1892 tot 1926*, Assen/Maastricht 1990. Cf. also G. Mannoury, *Signifika. Een inleiding*, Den Haag 1949.
29. Cf. E.W. Beth, *Inleiding tot de Wijsbegeerte der Wetkunde*, Antwerpen 1941², especially chapters 7 and 11.
30. Cf. e.g. A. Reichling, *Wat is Algemene Taalwetenschap?* Groningen 1947, and E.M. Uhlenbeck, 'Roman Jakobson and Dutch Linguistics', in: D. Armstrong and C.H. van Schooneveld, (eds) *For Roman Jakobson, Echoes of his scholarship*, Lisse 1977, p. 485-502.
31. J. van Ginneken, *Principes de linguistique psychologique*, Paris 1907. Cf. also *Mélanges Van Ginneken*, Paris 1937.
N. van Wijk, *Phonologie. Een hoofdstuk uit de structurele taalwetenschap*, 's-Gravenhage 1939, cf. also B.M. Groen et al. (eds), *Nicolaas van Wijk (1880-1941). A collection of essays on his life and work*. Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, vol. 12, Amsterdam 1988.
G.G. Kloeke, *De Hollandse expansie in de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw en haar weerspiegeling in de hedendaagse Nederlandsche dialecten*, 's-Gravenhage 1927, cf. also L. Bloomfield, *Language*, London 1933, p. 325-329.
32. Cf. Uhlenbeck 1982, p. 163-164 and p. 180 (see note 25 above).
33. A. Weijnen took the initiative for the *Atlas Linguarum Europae*, which since 1975 is being prepared at the Centre for Dialectology and Onomastics at Nijmegen under the auspices of UNESCO. Basic attainment targets for foreign languages in the EC were set by J. van Ek and L. Alexander, *The Threshold Level in a European Unit/Credit System for Modern Language Learning by Adults*. Strasbourg 1975.
34. N. Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures*, The Hague 1957. *Janua Linguarum, Studia Memoriae Nicolai Van Wijk Dedicata*, Series Minor 4.

24

35. Cf. E.M. Uhlenbeck, *Critical comments on transformational-generative grammar, 1962-1972*, The Hague 1972. Also H. Verkuyl, 'The contribution of the Dutch to the development of linguistics', in: F.G. Aarts and Th. J.M. van Els (eds), *Contemporary Dutch Linguistics*, Washington 1990, p. 1-22. R. Doeve, *De Ontvangst van de TGG in Nederland*, Amsterdam 1987, and W. Zonneveld, 'De moderne taalwetenschap, in het bijzonder in Nederland', in: *Forum der Letteren* 23 (1982), p. 201-217.
36. C.E. Keijsper, *Information Structure. With examples from Russian, English and Dutch*, Amsterdam 1985. Cf. also C.E. Keijsper, 'Vorm en betekenis in Nederlandse toonhoogtecontouren I, II', in: *Forum der Letteren* 25 (1984), p. 20-37 and p. 113-126.
37. G. Geerts et al. (eds), *Algemene Nederlandse Spraakkunst*, Groningen/Leuven 1984.
38. D. Geeraerts & G. Janssens, *Wegwijs in Woordenboeken*, Assen 1982, p. 96.
39. For example, P.C. Paardekooper, *Beknopte ABN-syntaxis*. Eindhoven n.d. [1986, 7th ed.], and A. Sturm, *Primaire syntactische structuren in het Nederlands*, Leiden 1986. On the latter book, see A. Sassen, 'Revolutie in de Nederlandse syntaxis', in: *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal en Letterkunde* 106 (1990), p. 183-198.
40. Cf. Van Els (note 18 above) and especially P. Jordens, 'Linguistics and second language acquisition', in: *Balance & Perspective. 25 Years of Dutch Applied Linguistics (= Toegepaste Taalwetenschap in Artikelen 36)*, 1990, nr. 1, p. 16-44.
41. P.C. Paardekooper (red), *De Nederlandse Taalkunde in Kaart*, Leuven 1986.
42. Stichting Taalwetenschap, *Vijf-jarennota 1989-1993*, (The Hague 1988), and its *Meerjarenplan 1991-1994*, (The Hague 1990).
43. Cf. J. Koster, *Doellose structuren*, Inaugural lecture, Groningen, Dordrecht 1988.
44. S.C. Dik, 'Some developments in functional grammar: Predicate formation', in: F.G. Aarts & Th. J.M. van Els (eds), *Contemporary Dutch Linguistics*, Washington 1990, p. 58-79.
45. C.E. Keijsper, *Waar gaat de FG heen?* Haarlem 1990.
46. Cf. e.g. H. Schultink, 'Moderne Nederlandse grammatica als wetenschap', in: *Studia Neerlandica* 8 (1971), p. 320-332, esp. p. 331.
47. See the report of the debate in the special issue of *GLOT, Tijdschrift voor Taalwetenschap*, 11 (1989), nr. 1, p. 116-124.

25

48. See Verkuyl o.c. (note 35 above), esp. p. 13.
49. *Speaking. From Intention to Articulation*, by W.J.M. Levelt, Cambridge (Mass) 1990. Levelt is Director of the influential Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics at Nijmegen since 1980.
50. A. Cohen, 'Phonetics in the Netherlands', in: F.G. Aarts & Th. J.M. van Els (eds), *Contemporary Dutch Linguistics*, Washington 1990, p. 50-57, esp. p. 57.
51. B. Al, 'Lexicography: Dutch developments in an international context', in: F.G. Aarts & Th. J.M. van Els (eds), *Contemporary Dutch Linguistics*, Washington 1990, p. 32-37, esp. p. 34.
52. In the Dutch newspaper *NRC-Handelsblad* of 27 October 1986.
53. B.F. Grimes (ed), *Ethnologue. Languages of the World*. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Dallas 1988, p. vii. D. Crystal, *The Cambridge Encyclopaedia of Language*, Cambridge 1987, p. 284-285 mentions a total of 4,522 languages in the world, on the basis of Voegelin's survey of 1977. On the position of Dutch, see A. de Swaan, 'Het Nederlands in het Europese talenstelsel', in: *De Gids* 153 (1990), p. 431-440.
54. K. Bostoen, *Kaars en Brill. De oudste Nederlandse grammatica*, Archief van het Koninklijk Zeeuwisch Genootschap der Wetenschappen, Middelburg 1984.
55. S. Groenewald, 'Kijken met anderen ogen. Angelsaksische historici over de Nederlandse Gouden Eeuw', in: *Neerlandica Extra Muros* 55 (Najaar 1990), p. 49-62.
56. See his *Poetry of the Netherlands in its European Context, 1170-1930, illustrated with poems in original and translation*, London 1960.
57. R.P. Meijer, *Literature of the Low Countries. A Short History of Dutch Literature in the Netherlands and Belgium*, Cheltenham 1978.
58. The Centre held its first international and interdisciplinary conference, on *The Low Countries and the World*, in April 1989, and publishes the interdisciplinary journal *Dutch Crossing, A Journal of Low Countries Studies*.

26

