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1. Introduction

Very little has been published in English on the history of Dutch lexicography, in spite of the importance and international significance of the subject. After all, Dutch lexicography has always been connected to the lexicographical traditions of its neighbouring languages.

This paper offers a short historical survey of the lexicography of the Low Countries, mainly based on existing literature, especially with respect to the early periods. It will pay attention to innovations, mutual influences between dictionaries in the various languages, cooperation between lexicographers and other aspects which illustrate the connection between Dutch lexicography and other lexicographical traditions.

1.1. Language and language area

A survey of Dutch lexicography through the ages needs some brief remarks in advance concerning the language area and the naming of the language. The language area of the Low Countries (de Nederlanden) in the Middle Ages was roughly that of nowadays Flanders (the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium) and the Netherlands without the province of Friesland. To be added is French-Flanders, the historical Dutch-speaking area in Nord-Pas de Calais in France. The eastern regions formed a transition area between German and Dutch. In fact, there was a continuum of continental West-Germanic dialects spoken and written in the border areas of both countries.

---

1 I want to thank Anne Dykstra, Nicoline van der Sijs and Piet van Sterkenburg for their useful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

2 This survey article was originally meant to be included in a Comparative World History of Lexicography, edited by Henri Béjoint, to be published by Oxford University Press. In a very late stage, when this contribution (and others) had been accepted as a chapter of the book, the publication had to be cancelled. I also want to thank Henri Béjoint for his suggestions and constructive remarks.
The southern part of the Low Countries was culturally and economically strong. Literary and scholarly works, including word lists and dictionaries, originated for the greater part in the southern regions, up to the products of the famous Officina Plantiniana in Antwerp in the 16th century. The revolt against Spain led to the foundation of the Republic of the Seven United Provinces of the Netherlands, which meant the separation of the southern part, the Spanish Netherlands. The centre of prosperity moved from the South to the North, more specifically to the cities of Holland. Many southern immigrants contributed to the flowering of the arts and science. Due to the socially subordinate position of Dutch in the South (in Vlaanderen or Flanders), lexicographical activities since then took place in the North (Nederland), up until the 19th century (Van der Wal and Van Bree 2008; Willemyns 2003).

In Middle Dutch, the name of our language was Diets or Duuts, literally meaning „vernacular; popular”. Already in the 15th century the term Nederlands was introduced, but it was not before the 19th century that it became common. In the 16th century the name Nederduits (Low Dutch / Low German) was invented to refer to the language of the Netherlands and of Northern Germany, in order to distinguish it from Duits as a general name for „German”, and from Hoogduits (High German). After the 19th century it was not used any more (Van der Sijs and Willemyns 2009: 11-13). Vlaams is the general name of the Dutch language in the Dutch-speaking part of Belgium, but can also refer to the dialect of the Flemish provinces. In linguistic literature, Hollands only refers to the dialects of the province(s) of Holland. In English, the most common name of our language is Dutch (used in this paper), but some prefer Netherlandic.

1.2. The historiography of Dutch lexicography

This brief survey is based on existing literature of various kinds. Insofar as I don’t include references to the titles in the text, I refer to the selective bibliography. This is especially the case with the following authors, to whom I am indebted to a great extent.

Frans Claes s.j. wrote outstanding studies on the older lexicography. His dissertation investigated the sources of three Plantijn dictionaries (Claes 1970b). He was a Kiliaan specialist with a broad interest in the international developments of the time. He is also the co-author of Claes and Bakema (1995), a bibliography of Dutch lexicography including about 4,800 titles published until 1990.
Felicien de Tollenaere was an editor of the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* (WNT, Dictionary of the Dutch Language), who published on a wide range of both theoretical and practical linguistic subjects relevant to dictionary making and dictionary history. He introduced the computer into Dutch historical lexicography and reported on these developments in the 1960s and 1970s (e.g. De Tollenaere 1963, 1969, 1977a).

Piet van Sterkenburg wrote a monograph on the history of Dutch lexicography in 1984, *Van woordenlijst tot woordenboek*, of which a revised, enlarged and richly illustrated edition was recently published (Van Sterkenburg 1984; 2011).\(^3\) He was the editor of a number of mediaeval glossaria and vocabularia and treated one of them, the *Glossarium Harlemense*, in his dissertation (Van Sterkenburg 1975). He was the author of modern desk dictionaries of Dutch, and also published about the WNT.

*De Woordenaar* and *Trefwoord* are lexicographical magazines, now e-zines, with valuable historiographic contributions, by Nicoline van der Sijs, Ewoud Sanders, Jan Posthumus, Jan Noordegraaf and others.

Several works on the history of Dutch linguistics (Bakker and Dibbets 1977) and of the Dutch language (De Vooys 1970; Van den Toorn et al. (eds) 1997; Willemyns 2003; Van der Sijs 2004; Van der Wal and Van Bree 2008; Van der Sijs and Willemyns 2009) include chapters on lexicography. Apart from metalexicographical works, other linguistic studies contributed to our knowledge of Dutch lexicography as well. Examples are Karsten (1949; philology from the 19th century till mid 20th century) and Noordegraaf (1985; 19th-century linguistics). Many books and articles on minor and major issues have been published. Still there are gaps to fill. For instance, the complete, comprehensive history of the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* still has to be written.

---

\(^3\) Maybe not useless to point out, that, although I gratefully used this monograph, this article is not to be regarded as an excerpt, but was written independently.
2. The Middle Ages

2.1. Glossaria and Vocabularia

The first lexicographical works with a Dutch component are three manuscripts with collections of words in alphabetical order. They were meant to study Latin and to help translate Latin texts. These rather elementary Latin-Dutch word lists or glossaria, named after the city where the manuscripts are kept, are the Glossarium Bernense (Bern), our oldest glossarium, the Glossarium Trevirense (Trier) and the Glossarium Harlemense (Haarlem). They originate in the 13th, 14th and 15th century respectively. As Van Sterkenburg (2011: 46-50) argues, these works do not consist of original collections of Dutch glosses to Latin words, but they are based on monolingual Latin word lists. In line with the international lexicographical tradition, they follow the dictionaries by the great Middle-Latin lexicographers. Their list of entries is strikingly comparable with some contemporary Latin-French glossaries, such as the so-called Abavusglossaria (the oldest glossaries in which French equivalents were added to Latin headwords), as is shown in Van Sterkenburg (2011: 49).

The later word lists, the vocabularia, represent a further stage in the history of lexicography: they are more elaborate and offer more grammatical information. The Vocabularius ex quo (1479) and the Vocabularius copiosus (or Conflatus, 1477-1483) mention their sources explicitly in their prefaces. From the contents of their word list it is also clear that they are indebted to Middle-Latin authors like Papias, Uguccio, Johannes de Genua, Osbern of Gloucester, and to the Brevilologus (Van Sterkenburg 1977: 200). The Vocabularius ex quo, named after the first words of the preface, was originally German, compiled in the late 14th century, and became very popular in Germany from the beginning of the 15th century. Yet only one printed edition in Dutch is known (1479, Zwolle). The Conflatus was compiled earlier; this large and nicely produced book was expensive and meant for a more scholarly and wealthy public as was stated explicitly in the preface of the Gemmula Vocabulorum (first edition 1484) (Grubmüller 1967).

At the end of the 15th century, a series of dictionaries were printed under the name of Gemmula and Gemma. Especially the Gemmulae became very popular, as they were printed in quarto and not very expensive. Some less well-known manuscripts are left (Van
Sterkenburg 2011: 74-78) which fill gaps between the earlier, concise *glossaria*, and the later, more extensive *vocabularia* and show their mutual relationship. Apart from these works, there is also a direct connection to mediaeval Latin lexicography in a 15th-century Flemish adaptation of the *Catholicon* (Arens 1984).

In the later mediaeval period and the early Renaissance, the Netherlands and Germany shared part of their lexicographical tradition in two ways: on the one hand, some dictionaries were compiled in Germany and printed there as well in the Netherlands, with adapted explanations in the different dialects (*Vocabularius ex quo, Gemma*), and on the other hand, some dictionaries were written in transitional areas between the Netherlands and Germany, for example the *Pandecta* (1410-1420), compiled in the area of Frenswegen, and the *Teuthonista*.

The *Teuthonista*, in full *Vocabularius qui intitulatur Teuhtonista vulgariter dicendo der Duytschlender* was compiled by Gert van der Schueren in Kleve, in the Lower Rhine area, and published in 1477. The word *Duytsch-* in the title may refer to any continental West-Germanic and indeed many dialects are represented in the book (Eickmans 1986: 2-3). The author mentions various mediaeval Latin sources in his preface, but in fact he uses only Hugucio de Pisa's *Magnae derivationes* for part I (Lower Rhine Dutch - Latin), and the *Catholicon* of Giovanni Balbi for part II (Latin - Lower Rhine Dutch). A main source to the Dutch part of part I seems to be the *Vocabularius Teuthonicus*, a late Middle Low German dictionary of the 15th century, preserved in 12 manuscripts (Eickmans 1986: 59 ff). The *Teuhtonista* is the first printed dictionary to take Dutch as its source language. According to Eickmans, its influence on later lexicographical practice was of little importance, but it is one of the dictionaries used by the 17th-century scholar Franciscus Junius, one of the founding fathers of Germanic philology, while compiling his pioneering work: word lists of the Gothic *Codex Argenteus*, i.e. the *Glossarium Gothicum* (1664), and of Old English texts, the *Etymologicum Anglicanum* (1743, published posthumously). This is shown by the copy of the *Teuhtonista* incunable, covered with Junius” annotations (Eickmans 1986: 105). It can be seen as a witness of the role of dictionaries in the burgeoning studies of the Germanic languages.

2.2. Systematic dictionaries

In this and later periods, several systematic dictionaries (thesauruses) were written (De Man 1964). The *Glossarium Trevirense* I and III, and also probably *Trevirense* (II), for instance,
date from the 14th century. The classifications of these *vocabularia rerum* were based on mediaeval encyclopaedic works, like the one by the Gothic bishop Isidorus of Sevilla (6th century). A comparable lexicographic category became popular in a later period: a series of reprints, in various dialects, of the *Pappa puerorum* „children’s porridge”, an elementary schoolbook that was first published in Cologne in 1513 and then in Deventer in 1514. Its author was the pedagogue, schoolmaster and poet Johannes Murmellius, who studied, published and worked both in the Netherlands and in the western part of Germany. The *Nomenclator omnium rerum* (1567) by Hadrianus Junius had a more humanist character. It was more comprehensive in its Latin text and contained references to classical authors (Claes 1970a: 105-107).

3. ‘Glorification, purging and advancement’ of the Dutch language in Dutch dictionaries – 16th and 17th centuries

3.1. Tradition and innovation; Kiliaan

In the 16th century the function of dictionaries was still teaching and understanding foreign-language texts. But the influence of the Latin and French lexicographical tradition became stronger, the art of printing increased the possibilities, the schoolmasters and scholars – lexicographers *avant la lettre* – became more skilled and the influence of humanist ideas spread over Western Europe. Furthermore, in the course of the century the vernacular became an object of attention and study, and an active policy was adopted for Dutch to gain the same status as Latin and French had had thus far. „Verheerlijking, zuivering en opbouw” (glorification, purging and advancement) (Van den Branden 1956) were the stages the language had to pass through and dictionaries have certainly played a role in that process. In the second half of the 16th century, the character of Dutch dictionaries changed considerably from mere translation aids to representations of the vernacular vocabulary, with the addition of various kinds of information that allowed the use of the dictionary for both educational and scholarly purposes.

A brief overview of the dictionaries published in that period shows several innovative features, but also, with respect to nomenclature and microstructure, their continuing dependency on Latin, French and German predecessors (Claes 1970a, 1970b; 1988). An example of Latin influence was an abridged version of Calepinus’ *Dictionarium latinum*
(1502): the *Calepinus Pentaglottos* (1545), of which one of the languages was Dutch. German influence is seen in Antonius Schorus”’ Dutch adaptation (1542) of Petrus Dasypodius”’ *Dictionarium Latinogermanicum* (1535); an adaptation of Dasypodius”’ reverse edition of 1536 followed in 1556 (Claes 1970a: 113-116). Dasypodius”’ dictionaries were modern in the sense that they were more complete and more conveniently arranged; they also demonstrated a humanistic approach to the Latin part. For example, the author wanted to replace the barbarisms of the *Gemmae* by the classical Latin forms (Claes 1970a: 113). Against the influence of foreign lexicography on Dutch, there was a reverse influence of Dutch lexicography on dictionaries abroad. Examples are adaptations of Murmellius”’ and Junius”’ works, and of Beraimonts *Vocabulare* (see below). A survey of these mutual relationships until 1600 is listed in Claes (1988).

The French lexicographer Robert Estienne can be regarded as the most modern and influential dictionary maker of his time. His innovative methods made their mark on the lexicographical publications of the famous *Officina Plantiniana*, a printing and publishing house. Christoffel Plantijn’s office had its seat in the cosmopolitan city of Antwerp and was responsible for the publication of some of the most influential dictionaries in the history of Dutch. Frans Claes”’ study on Plantijn”’s dictionaries (1970b) reveals their sources and methods. The first of his three major dictionaries was the *Dictionarium Tetraglotton* (1562), a translation of a trilingual dictionary by Guillaume Morel, itself influenced by Estienne – an example of Estienne’s indirect influence. The second, the *Thesaurus Theutonicae Linguae* (1573) is indebted to Estienne as well, as it owes a great deal to the German lexicographers whose dictionaries were adaptations and translations of Estienne”’s work: Jean Thierry (*Dictionaire francoislatin*, 1564) and Josua Maaler. A copy of Maaler”’s *Die Teütsch Spraach* (1561) was available in the *Officina Plantiniana*. Under the influence of Maaler, as Claes states, Germanisms were included in the *Thesaurus*, some of which have never been Netherlandic, like *afcirkelen, haderman* and *lulck* (Claes 1989: 261).

The corrector and translator Cornelis van Kiel or Kiliaan contributed to these two works. He was the only author of the third Plantijn dictionary: the *Dictionarium Teutonico - Latinum* (1574), for which the dictionaries by Estienne and Johannes Frisius”’ *Dictionariolum Latinogermanicum* (1554) served as important models. It was methodologically innovative: Kiliaan added cognate forms from other languages to the Dutch headwords. The second edition, published in 1588, was enlarged not only by a number of entries, but also by the
inclusion of dialect material. This could already be found in Hadrianus Junius’ *Nomenclator omnium rerum* (1567), a Latin dictionary published by Plantijn that contained equivalents in various languages, including information on Dutch dialect variants. According to Considine (2008: 150), this treatment of dialect material in dictionaries was unique, and cannot be found in any contemporary study of English. Another feature of this edition was the separate listing of loan words.

The 1599 edition of Kiliaan’s *Dictionarium* was called *Etymologicum Teutonicæ Linguae*. It can be considered as the first scholarly dictionary of Dutch. Claes (1977a: 107-108) emphasizes that Kiliaan was aware of the innovative character of his dictionary. In his preface to the 1574 *Dictionarium* he characterizes his method as „new”: he did not (as in Estienne’s larger works) add many examples and phrases, often translations from Latin, but wanted the entries to be brief and to the point, by including only single words and synonyms as translations. By doing so, the richness of the Dutch vocabulary came out well. The same succinctness was found in Estienne’s concise dictionaries, suitable for classroom use. The brief, clear and convenient arrangement of the *Dictionarium* was maintained in the second edition (1588) and in the *Etymologicum* (1599), although substantially extended, which gave a more modern appearance to the Dutch dictionaries that followed. The *Etymologicum* was frequently reprinted in the 17th century and was imitated by many lexicographers. In 1777 G. van Hasselt published a version in which he left Kiliaan’s text unchanged, but included comments and additions in footnotes: an early and unique example of a scholarly edition of a dictionary.

The inclusion of German and French cognate forms, first seen in the *Dictionarium* of 1574, was also regarded by Kiliaan as an innovation. The results in the *Etymologicum* can be regarded as the onset to the etymological comparisons of the vocabulary of the three languages to be developed in later editions. Kiliaan’s interest in general linguistic matters, especially in similarities and differences between languages, was aroused while he collected cognates to Dutch words in French and German sources. For some of his etymologies he refers to these sources: Junius, Goropius Becanus, Ascensius, Lipsius, Lobelius, Vivus. Dictionaries made up the most important sources for his work; he frequently used Thierry’s *Dicionaire Francoislatin* (1564) for the etymologies of French words (Claes 1990: 159). Like his contemporary fellow linguists, he was positive towards German loans but negative towards French ones as these were foreign, not Germanic.
In Claes (1970a), various networks of mutual influences between French, German and Dutch dictionaries are sketched, of which Figure 1 is an example. These relationships are demonstrated by Claes’ careful comparison of samples of these dictionaries, with respect to their headwords, order of entries and definitions.

Figure 1. Influences on Kiliaan’s dictionaries (Claes 1970a: 122)

Considine (2008) situates the developments of 16th-century Dutch lexicography in the international context of the discovery of old Germanic texts and the construction of a collective identity and national heritage. This coincided with the process of standardization taking place in the Netherlands. With his dictionaries – not only practical tools but also inventories of lexical material of the mother tongue and related languages –, Kiliaan contributed to Dutch scholarship. His close contact with humanist scholars such as Lipsius, Ortelius and Monavius (Deneire 2007) probably widened his views on lexicography and linguistics further in Europe.

3.2. Practical lexicography

Many bilingual and later multilingual word lists, conversational books and schoolbooks were printed, often with at least Latin or French as a foreign language. They functioned as a
production help, rather than as translation help. An example is the *Vocabulare* (first edition probably 1527; first completely kept edition 1536) by Noel van Berlaimont, an Antwerp schoolmaster. The source language of this conversation book with word list was Dutch; the Dutch - French *Naemboeck* by Joos Lambrecht (1562 second edition) was the first translation dictionary for a modern language with Dutch as source language. As a progressive schoolmaster Lambrecht applied the latest lexicographical methods in his dictionary that he acquired from Dasypodius - Schorus, and he included ample collocations and examples, for the advancement of language teaching (Verdeyen 1945 in *Naemboeck* 1562: xviii). Berlaimont’s *Vocabulare* became a popular pocketbook for internationally operating public. This originally Dutch - French conversation book was enlarged in successive reprints with respectively Latin, Spanish, Italian, German, English and finally Portuguese (1598) (Van Rossem ed. 2007; 193; Van der Helm 2010, 2.2). It is one of the several originally Dutch polyglots that were adapted into other languages (Claes 1988: 22). Other examples of polyglot dictionaries were Servilius’ *Dictionarium Triglotton* (1545), a Latin - Greek - Dutch dictionary, which was frequently reprinted; the *Dictionarium, Colloquia sive Formulae Quatuor linguarum* (1558), a French - Dutch dictionary to which Spanish and Italian were added, both published in Antwerp. Dutch also began to be included in polyglot dictionaries published in other countries. Examples are the *Septem linguarum Latinae, Teutonicae, Gallicae, Hispanicae, Italicae, Anglicae, Almanicae, dilucidissimus dictionarius* (1540) and *Le Dictionnaire des huict langaiges: grec, latin, flamang, francois, espagnol, italien, anglois et aleman* (1546).

3.3. Purism

The Renaissance ideal of purging the language of foreign words was clearly reflected in 16th- and 17th-century Dutch lexicography. In 1552 Jan van den Werve published his *Het Tresoor der Duytsscher talen* (The Treasure of the Dutch language; the French loan word *Tresoor* in the title was later replaced by Dutch *Schat*, both meaning „treasure”), a list of mainly legal terms. It was the first dictionary to be compiled for puristic purposes, as stated explicitly by the author in his preface (Van der Sijs 2004: 371). The headwords, all Romanic loans, were followed by one or more Dutch equivalents, which at the same time served as an explanation and a better alternative. Other lexicographers were also purists: Kiliaan started to separate originally Dutch words from loan words in his 1588 edition.
In 1650 an anonymous puristic dictionary came off the press: *Woorden-schat*; the name of its author, Johan Hofman, was revealed in the preface of its second edition (1654) by Lodewijk Meijer, a scholar, scientist and playwright who became responsible for the following editions. This work was very successful indeed; after four reprints of the revised edition, seven other editions followed between 1688 and 1805 (Van Hardeveldt 2000). Meijer distinguished between „Konst-Woorden” (technical terms; in Meijer’s point of view restricted to loans of classical origin, used in science) and „Basterdt-Woorden” (bastard words or un-Dutch words, often French loans). This distinction was connected to Meijer’s puristic view, which was practical as well: the „Basterdt-Woorden” should be replaced by Dutch ones, while on the other hand science could not do without the classical vocabulary, the „Konst-Woorden”.

Some of the purisms included in the dictionaries became common in the general language. Unlike its neighbouring languages, Dutch has indigenous words for certain scientific concepts: *wiskunst* (later *wiskunde*), instead of an adaptation of Latin *mathematica*; *onderwerp* and *voorwerp* instead of *subject* and *object* as grammatical terms. Nevertheless, the influence of dictionaries on the popularization of these words is open to question; the authority of the scientists and scholars who coined or used these puristic terms was probably more important. Thus, puristic mathematical terms such as *evenwijdig* (parallel), *langwerpig* (elongated), *rechthoekig* (rectangular) and *middelpunt* (centre), which Kiliaan most probably took from the mathematical treatises by Simon Stevin (Claes 1995: 62), owe their popularity (until today!) to Stevin’s authoritative texts rather than to the industrious lexicographer who included them in his dictionary. A 19th-century successor of Meijer’s *Woorden-Schat* is Weiland’s *Kunstwoordenboek* (Dictionary of technical terms, 1824-1832), which is rather independent of it (Noordegraaf 2009).

### 4. Bilingual and other dictionaries of the 17th and 18th centuries

#### 4.1. Bilingual dictionaries

The lexicographical products published after the heyday of Renaissance lexicography were of reasonable quality, but could hardly be regarded as innovative. They consisted of a large series of bilingual dictionaries, often published in pairs of D - L2 and L2 - D, and served a practical purpose (De Tollenaere 1977b). Apart from Latin - Dutch word lists and dictionaries, the language described was in the first place French, already treated at the end of
the 16th century by Meurier (1557-1563), Sasbout (1576-1579) and Mellema (1587-1589), works influenced by Plantijn’s *Thesaurus Theutonicae Linguae* (Claes 1977b: 215). Further languages were German, English, Italian, Spanish (De Tollenaere 1977b).

Osselton (1973) is one of the few elaborate studies on this lexicographical category. It sketches the contexts of the making of these dictionaries: the presence of traders, students and political and religious refugees, few of whom spoke Dutch. Osselton also points out that the authors and dictionaries that he treats, Hexham (1647-1648), Séwel (1691-1691) and Holtrop (1789-1801), were fairly dependent of the English dictionaries of their time (especially Holyoke’s adaptation of Rider). Of course this was the normal practice; the total collection of bilingual dictionaries of the European language communities must have formed a complex network of relationships. This holds also for the later 19th-century bilingual lexicography, as is shown in Posthumus (2009). With respect to their Dutch part, many of these dictionaries were indirectly or directly based on the Dutch nomenclature of Kiliaan and other preceding dictionaries.

Thus far, collocation information had not been recorded in dictionaries, at least not systematically. Geeraerts (1986) observes innovative tendencies with respect to this type of information in the first two decades of the 18th century. Apart from a quantitative enlargement and a more precise description of meaning, the French - Dutch dictionaries by Halma (1708-1710) and Marin (1701-1710) differ from their predecessors by providing usage information (stylistic value and collocations) and adding examples more systematically (Geeraerts 1986: 3-7). These innovations most probably result from the influence of foreign dictionaries, especially works by French authors like Richelet (1680) and Furetière (1690), and the *Dictionnaire de l’Académie* (1694). These dictionaries payed more attention to social variation in language use than was done before (Geeraerts 1986: 10).

4.2. Two special dictionaries

In 1670 Cornelis van Niervaert’s *Oprechte onderwijs van de letter-konst* (Sound instruction of the art of spelling) appeared, a reprint of his work from 1600, which had been lost. It is regarded as the first Dutch dictionary for children. In spite of the title not much attention is paid to spelling problems; the focus is on the explanation of difficult words, often French and Latin loans (Van der Sijs 2004: 391).
More important is the *Seeman*, behelsende een grondige uitlegging van de Neederlandse Konst- en Spreekwoorden voor soo veel die uit de Seevaart zijn ontleend* (Seaman, including a thorough explanation of Dutch technical terms and idioms as far as they are borrowed from the seagoing, 1681) by Wigardus van Winschooten, a monolingual dictionary of nautical terms and idioms. This dictionary was unique in its time, in that not only loan words were described as technical terms, but also Dutch words. Furthermore, both words and expressions were explained, in the vernacular. The *Seeman* is considered the first monolingual dictionary of Dutch, albeit on a limited subject. It contains more information on specific words than any earlier dictionary (Van der Sijs 2004: 363-364).

5. The great national dictionaries of the 19th century

5.1. The *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal*

The foundation of a comprehensive, explanatory dictionary of the Dutch language was already laid in the second half of the 18th century. In 1762 the clergyman Josua van Iperen published his call to the compilation of an “oordeelkundig Nederduitsch Woordenboek” (critical dictionary of Dutch). The same desire was uttered by members of the Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde (Society of Dutch Literature), a scholarly association or academy for the study of humanities, founded in Leiden in 1766. They were inspired by the example of the monolingual dictionaries of the Accademia della Crusca (1612) and the Académie Française (1694). It finally led to the first Dutch - Dutch dictionary, Pieter Weiland”s *Nederduitsch Taalkundig Woordenboek* (Dutch Linguistic Dictionary, 1799-1811; 11 volumes), compiled after the example of the German Adelung”s *Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart* (1793-1801) (Noordegraaf 2009).

For many reasons, Weiland”s dictionary was not satisfactory: its nomenclature was incomplete, the sense descriptions restricted, the etymologies unsatisfactory and the number of illustrative citations small. Therefore new plans for a „Nederlandsch Woordenboek“ were made, this time at a series of literary conferences in 1849-1851, organized by a cooperation of both Flemish and Dutch writers and scholars. Such a dictionary should strengthen the position of the Dutch language in the South, where French was the official language. The „Flemish movement” advocated following the northern standard language as the most favourable way to establish a
standard language in the South (Van der Wal and Van Bree 2008: 383-385; Willemsyns 2003: 254-255). In the North, a comprehensive Dutch dictionary was regarded as a manifestation of cultural nationalism; the founder and first editor-in-chief of the WNT Matthias de Vries regularly referred to his work on the WNT as a task to fulfil for the benefit of the nation. This view is splendidly expressed in his Inleiding (Introduction; De Vries 1882: lxxxvii-lxxxviii). The other European dictionaries were being compiled, or had been compiled, in the same spirit - not only the OED, DWB, Littré and others, but also Halbertsma’s Lexicon Frisicum (1872; see Dykstra 2007).

Although historical comparatism can be regarded as the linguistic school that highly determined the treatment of words in the WNT (De Tollenaere 1977: 13; Van Sterkenburg 1978: 88), Moerdijk emphasizes that the origin of the dictionary is also connected with the romantic-historical climate of the 19th century, when the urge was felt to inventory and document the national language (Moerdijk 1983: 3). Matthias de Vries, a Leiden professor, was in fact the founding father of the dictionary: he wrote the „Ontwerp” (Design, 1851) and organized most of the editorial activities during the first forty years. They took place in Leiden; the Flemish contribution was guaranteed by appointing an editor from Flanders. In 1864 the first fascicle was published. The first volume, 1882, contained De Vries” Inleiding to the Woordenboek: 90 impressive pages with high rhetorical content, in which he explained the lexicographical methods and principles the editorial board had applied.

De Vries was an admirer of the Grimm brothers as historical linguists and corresponded with them (Soeteman 1982, Dykstra 1994). He took over some of their principles, e.g. no dates were added to the citations, and etymological information was included. The WNT entries written in the first decades, however, differed considerably from the Grimms model. De Vries” dictionary followed the „academic principles”: he wanted to set an example to the user and to present the contemporary language (of the 19th century), with reference to that of the admired 17th century, by means of elegant citations by literary authors. Especially De Vries practised a long-winded, literary writing style for his articles in which the historical information was put at the end. In that respect his editorial style was more like Littré”s (Cosijn 1892; Moerdijk 1994: 5-21; Considine 2010: xi-xii; Van Sterkenburg 2011: 159-168).

After De Vries” death in 1892 there was still a long way to go. Aware of this, and with an eye for recent developments, such as the compilation of the OED, the editors Kluyver, Beets,
Cosijn and Muller decided to make far-reaching editorial changes. The *terminus a quo* was pushed back to 1500; the dictionary would aim at a diachronic description of the Dutch language in use after the period covered by the *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* (see below). The entries became more concise (although the hierarchical sense structures and classical definitions were maintained) and the selection of headwords more limited and less puristic. Muller, member of the second generation of editors, reported on this more pragmatic approach in his article *Eischen en bezwaren der wetenschappelijke lexicographie* (Requirements and problems of scholarly lexicography; Muller 1899, 1938\(^2\)).

Muller’s discussion is interesting in various respects. He recognizes the twofold character of De Vries’ WNT and he advocates the more modern approach of the „requirements and problems” of dictionary making with reference to linguistic authors such as Hermann Paul and to fellow lexicographers such as Murray, Bradley (OED), Hildebrand, Heyne (DWB) and Littré. He also reports on contacts with the Swedish Dictionary (SAOB), whose editors visited the WNT office in 1894-95 on a tour of the editorial boards of the great historical dictionaries (see Hjelmqvist’s account (1896) of those visits, full of informative details, both on practical facts and on the different approaches).

The change of editorial method in the 1890s has been of paramount importance. In much literature on the WNT, however, more attention has been paid to the explanations of the eloquent De Vries than to the products of his later colleagues, although only 9 % of the dictionary was completed on De Vries’ death (Mooijaart 2004). In general, there was not much reflection on the WNT principles in later time; in the *Canones Lexicographici* (1962) only a few lines are devoted to them.

Five generations of editors worked continuously towards the completion of the WNT. Every year at least one fascicle was published, except during World War II, when shortage of paper prevented publication. In the beginning, the financial conditions were rather problematic, but in 1922 a governmental committee took over the responsibility of the funding and financial management. From then onwards, the editors and other employees were officials with matching rights and salaries (Jaarboek INL 1969-1973: 39-43).

Major changes took place due to various causes and circumstances. First of all, there was the gradual increase of the number of sources (from 1,000 to about 12,000). In 1943 it was
decided to add dates to the citations. The individual approach of the successive editors, mostly without a chief editor, caused a lack of unity until the fifth editorial board got to work. At the same time, the specific knowledge of each of the editors brought valuable contributions in the fields of etymology, philology, historical semantics and historical linguistics.

In 1976 a *terminus ad quem* was fixed: no citations after 1921 were to be included. The series of Supplements were stopped after the first volume (Van Sterkenburg 1978b). These measures were taken to guarantee completion before the end of the century. This completion was celebrated in 1998: 40 volumes, 90,000 entries, 350,000 subentries and 1,7 million citations had been produced during 147 years. Finally, three volumes of Additions were published in 2001; they included entries that were missing in the WNT, but no additions to or corrections of existing entries that were defective or outdated. The *terminus ad quem* of the Additions was 1976.

The WNT served as a source for desk dictionaries like the Van Dale dictionary (see 5.3) and also inspired the *Wurdbok fan de Fryske Taal* (1984-2011). Many metaphors have been used to characterize the WNT (Moerdijk 1998). „Modular kitchen” is one of them: it refers to the various additions, corrections and supplements, whether realized or not. „Museum” or „Treasure-house of the Dutch language” are more flattering ones, and all of these are equally true. In spite of serious gaps especially in the older volumes, no revision will take place, not even online. Instead the content of the Dutch historical dictionaries will be included in a multipurpose diachronic database of the Dutch vocabulary, in which all kind of information will be added to the entries (see 6.2). Moerdijk offers a precise description of the contents of the WNT in his *Handleiding* (Manual, Moerdijk 1994); Van Sterkenburg (1992) sketches a portrait of the dictionary.

5.2. *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek*

The *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* (MNW, Dictionary of Middle Dutch) was initiated in the middle of the 19th century by Matthias de Vries as a natural follow-up of his philological activities. Many Middle Dutch texts had been published shortly before and the dictionary was to document the results, including philological comments. Because of De Vries” involvement in the WNT, the MNW was compiled by Eelco Verwijs and Jacob Verdam; it was in fact the latter who wrote the dictionary practically on his own. Nine volumes were published between
1885 and 1929; a list of sources and a volume on dike building, water management and related terms bij A.A. Beekman between 1927 and 1952. Verdam had neglected this category of technical terms, but in linguistical and cultural-historical respect it was too interesting to be left out. In spite of numerous shortcomings, many caused by the poor quality of the editions used as sources, the MNW has been highly estimated and frequently used by many (Corbellini and Dalen-Oskam 2003).

Verdam compiled a *Middelnederlandsch Handwoordenboek* (Concise Dictionary of Middle Dutch, 1911-1932) on the basis of the MNW; Van der Voort van der Kleij wrote a *Supplement* to this concise dictionary in 1983; it included additions to the main dictionary as well (see Van der Voort Van der Kleij”’s preface to *Verdam Middelnederlandsch Handwoordenboek Supplement*).

5.3. General dictionaries

Another development of the 19th century is the publication of desk dictionaries for school and office. In addition to the continued production of bilingual dictionaries, Dutch - Dutch dictionaries were also written. The first editions of Van Dale’s and Koenen’’s dictionaries date from the end of the 19th century (1872 and 1897 resp.). *Van Dale’s Groot Woordenboek van de Nederlandse Taal* (14th ed., 2005), would become the authoritative dictionary, used, until today, by a large public; its popular name is „de dikke Van Dale” (the big Van Dale). The more modest Koenen dictionary (30th ed. 1999) became successful as an accessible and reliable school dictionary. More dictionaries of that type were published in the 20th century, most of which have run large numbers of reprints by various editors. Posthumus (2009) discusses the history of a selection of the 19th- and 20th-century bilingual dictionaries and Koenen. One of his conclusions is that schoolteachers played an important role in the production of this type of dictionaries, but also that they were strongly dependent on their publishers, who were sometimes professional and dedicated, but could also be short-sighted and indifferent.
6. The 20th century: modern lexicography

6.1. Period dictionaries

The historical approach lost its monopoly in 20th-century scholarly lexicography. The idea of period dictionaries was inspired by the structuralist vision that a distinction should be made between diachronic and synchronic language description. De Tollenaere (1969) and Van Sterkenburg (1978a, 1990) were in favour of the ideas of Craigie and Von Wartburg, who advocated the lexicographical application of this distinction. Of course they could not be adopted for the WNT, designed as it was as a historical dictionary, covering five centuries (Moerdijk 1983: 5-6). However, for periods not sufficiently covered by MNW and WNT the concept of period dictionaries seemed attractive, if only to guarantee short-term and manageable dictionary projects (the WNT had been 100 years in progress by then!). The first poorly described period was the 16th century, which the WNT had only later paid attention to; the same applied to the 18th century, albeit less urgently so (Mooijaart 2004). For the 16th century the gap was partly filled by Mak’s *Rhetoricaal Glossarium*, which exclusively described the vocabulary of the *rederijkers* (rhetoricians) of the 15th-17th centuries. Unfortunately, apart from its limited scope, the lexicographical quality was hardly satisfactory. The vocabulary of the early Middle Dutch (1200-1300) needed attention as well, and it was for this period that a period dictionary was launched in the 1970s.

6.2. Computational lexicography

The *Vroegmiddelnederlands Woordenboek* (VMNW, Dictionary of Early Middle Dutch) was the first electronic scholarly dictionary of Dutch, thereby uniting two modern developments: the compiling of period dictionaries and computerization.

Having made contacts with computer centres in Milan and Besançon in the early 1960s, WNT editor De Tollenaere started to develop and spread the idea of using the computer in Dutch lexicology and lexicography (De Tollenaere 1961, 1963). The result was the foundation of the Leiden Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie (INL, Institute for Dutch Lexicology) in 1967, a Dutch-Flemish foundation subsidized by both governments (Jaarboek INL 1969-1973), which became responsible for the scholarly lexicography of Dutch. It aimed at the completion of the WNT along traditional methods, and at the same time at the construction of an

The VMNW, with chief editor Willy Pijnenburg, covers literary and official texts of the 13th century, collected in the *Corpus-Gysseling*. Many information types are added to the headwords of this electronic dictionary. Especially morphological information is almost completely documented in surveys of inflection forms and structures of morphologically complex words (Pijnenburg and Schoonheim 1996). Another (unique?) feature of the VMNW is the complete description of the onomastic material. The arguments were, that proper names and appellatives can not always be distinguished in this language stage, and furthermore that names are important elements of the language in cultural-historical respect (Van Dalen-Oskam and Schoonheim 1998: 45-46).

After the completion of the VMNW in 1999, first in printed form, two other electronic dictionaries were started: the *Oudnederlands Woordenboek* (ONW, Dictionary of Old Dutch), completed in 2009 (chief editors successively Willy Pijnenburg and Tanneke Schoonheim), and a dictionary of modern Dutch, the *Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek* (ANW, General Dictionary of Dutch; see below). The ONW, the very first dictionary of Old Dutch, covering the period 500-1200, is based on a closed corpus, just like the VMNW. Source material for this period is scarce and problematic. The ONW was prepared as an electronic dictionary and will not be published in book form (Pijnenburg 2003; Schoonheim 2008).

A second application of electronic lexicography was the computerization of MNW and WNT, the two great historical dictionaries. In the 1980s the first WNT entries were produced by text processor, and in the same period the INL started digitizing recent volumes by OCR. Only a
few volumes had been made available in electronic form when OCR-digitization had to be cancelled because of lack of funding. In the early 1990s, the then INL director Van Sterkenburg sought cooperation with AND Software Company in Rotterdam, which had successfully produced the OED CD-ROM. The company started the production of a WNT CD-ROM by means of the same software. All text that had not been digitized yet was keyboarded in India; the typists also added the AML codes (a kind of HTML encoding). In 1995 the first release was ready, containing WNT volumes I to XXVI; in 2000 the second release came out with the complete WNT, and in 2003 a last one was published, including also three volumes of Additions (Kruyt 1995). In 1998, the MNW CD-ROM was also produced by AND, again with the same software as used for the WNT and also digitized in India. The CD-ROM included the dictionary and text material: the Corpus-Gysseling and about 300 other Middle Dutch texts (Geirnaert 1997). As in the WNT, the complete list of sources was included as well. It is an early example of an electronic dictionary with a direct link to its source texts.

Both CD-ROMS are no longer available, but the dictionaries have been freely accessible on the Internet since 2007, later completed by the addition of the Dictionary of Early Middle Dutch and the Dictionary of Old Dutch. This means that the complete vocabulary of Dutch from 500 to 1976 is now available on the Internet (www.inl.nl) (Depuydt and De Does 2008; Geirnaert 2009; Mooijaart 2010).

The dictionary content of MNW and WNT has been consistently improved, by the addition of dates, the completion of contracted compounds and derivations, and by the correction of obvious mistakes. The editorial text, however, remained unaltered. The adaptation of the internal structure of the entries, in order to allow an easy overview of the entries, required much more effort.

The incorporation of the vocabulary of the historical dictionaries into new products such as computational lexica and tools for machine reading techniques of older printed material is one of the challenges of this time. The first project is the Groot Geïntegreerd Lexicon van de Nederlandse Taal (GiGaNT, Great Integrated Lexicon of the Dutch Language), which has been under construction at the Leiden Institute for Dutch Lexicology (Ruitenberght, De Does en Depuydt 2010).
6.3. A new approach: the ANW

The *Algemeen Nederlands Woordenboek* (ANW, General Dictionary of Dutch, chief editors successively Fons Moerdijk and Tanneke Schoonheim), that is being compiled, is designed as an online dictionary. It covers the period 1970-2020. The entries do not follow the traditional format. The information categories attached to each word will make many ways of retrieval possible; not only will the users find the meaning of a word (semasiological search), but they can also search for the names of certain concepts (onomasiological search). Definitions are accompanied by „semagrams”, i.e. representations of the knowledge associated with a word, containing various types of semantic information, including encyclopaedic information (Moerdijk et al. 2008: 19). This is regarded as a novelty but was inspired by ideas of Wierzbicka and others (Moerdijk 2008: 561). A second characteristic feature is the special attention paid to words in context (combinations, collocations, idioms, proverbs) and to relations with other words (synonyms, antonyms etc.). In this respect, the ANW is in line with international work on collocational dictionaries. The project is comparable with *elexiko*, a German project carried out in Mannheim. The dictionary „represents a new generation of electronic dictionaries in the sector of academic and scientific lexicography” (Moerdijk et al. 2008: 18-19). At the moment the first 6,000 entries are available on the website; further additions will be published on a regular basis.

6.4. Other dictionaries and lexicographic products

As we have seen, the basis for a series of school dictionaries and other types of concise dictionaries was laid in the 19th century. Many other categories of dictionaries followed in the 20th century, doubtless due to favourable circumstances such as the high level of education and welfare. Only the more interesting will be mentioned below.

In 1930, J. Verschueren’s *Modern Woordenboek* was published, a „linguistic, encyclopaedic and illustrated” dictionary, meant as a Dutch counterpart of the *Petit Larousse*. Its 10th edition, *Groot encyclopedisch woordenboek* (1996) was edited by F. Claes. Unfortunately, new printed editions of this interesting dictionary, unique in the Dutch lexicographical landscape, are not likely (Van Sterkenburg 2011: 238-240).
Nicoline van der Sijs produced a number of important word collections, among which *Leenwoordenboek* (Dictionary of loan words, 1996, 2nd ed. 2005) and *Chronologisch woordenboek* (2002), a chronological survey of the Dutch vocabulary. The most recent one is *Nederlandse woorden wereldwijd* (Dutch words worldwide, 2010); for the first time in lexicographical history, Dutch words which spread all over the world as loan words have been collected. Van der Sijs’ works consist of detailed introductions and surveys and inventories, both in their production and in their use. Most titles are available in digital form – the computer played and still plays a crucial role. Recently Van der Sijs realized the *Etymologiebank*, in cooperation with several organizations. The website contains the main etymological dictionaries of Dutch.

A concise and modernized edition of Van Dale’s comprehensive dictionary, the *Van Dale Woordenboek Hedendaags Nederlands* (1st ed. Van Sterkenburg and Pijnenburg 1984) became the basis of a series of bilingual dictionaries. Other derived and related products, all published by the leading publisher in lexicography Van Dale Lexicografie in Utrecht, include a children’s dictionary, a dictionary of idioms, a dictionary of synonyms, and an etymological dictionary, many of them in electronic form (Van Sterkenburg 2011: 216-220).

ANNA, which stands for *Afrikaans-Nederlands/Nederlands-Afrikaans*, is the name of a recently published innovative bilingual dictionary (*Prisma groot woordenboek Afrikaans en Nederlands*, 2011). In one volume the lexicon of both languages is described according the so-called „amalgamation model“. This means that Afrikaans en Dutch words are included in one macrostructure in alphabetical order, and that for the many words these languages have in common, only one entry was written. In this way similarities and differences in meaning and use are made clear immediately. This model is suited for closely related languages such as Afrikaans and Dutch (Afrikaans originates in 17th-century Dutch), and designed to be used for other closely related languages as well, as chief-editor Willy Martin states in the preface (ANNA 2011, 6). Honselaar (2011) discusses earlier dictionaries of a comparable design, e.g. of Croatian and Serbian, to compare with ANNA. These dictionaries do not include the complete vocabulary of the languages mentioned, but focus on the differences.
7. Conclusion

Dutch lexicography has a rich history. After influences of Latin lexicography in the Middle Ages, it was the traditions and innovations of our neighbouring countries France and Germany that most influenced Dutch lexicography during the centuries to follow. The lexicography of the Low Countries reached its height in the 16th century, when a large number of dictionaries came off the press. International developments were followed and at the same time Dutch lexicography influenced dictionaries abroad. During the same period Kiliaan compiled his dictionaries, among which his unique *Etymologicum*, a dictionary with some innovative features which made it the first scholarly dictionary of Dutch. In the second half of the 20th century the computer led to innovations with respect to the accessibility, the mutual linking and the design of the scholarly dictionaries. While the influences of other lexicographical traditions on Dutch dictionaries are well known, the influence of Dutch dictionaries on the lexicography of other languages remains to be investigated more thoroughly.
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