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Abstract

A survey of the rules for consonantal usage in the various spelling systems advocated by grammars, spelling handbooks, dictionaries and commentators, together with the main usages of representative writers in most periods. Although the rules of grammars and the usage of contemporary writers by no means always coincide, it is usually possible to observe certain trends in the development of various spellings, and in some cases to identify the source of particular variants. Many of the works named add little but mere support for an established usage, some are sincere and rational pleas for improvement, some are eccentric in certain of their ideas. Yet it is noticeable in most periods where there is no official spelling that the majority of grammarians present the basis of a potentially viable system, although almost invariably drawing back from applying their rules consistently in all cases. The overall development of the spelling rules follows the evolution from the Middle Dutch period, with its largely phonetic system, through the rise of the "gelijkvormigheid" spelling from the 15th century, ousting the phonetic system by the mid 17th century, and the classical period, under strong French influence, where the influence of derivation and word interrelationships affected the relative purity of most previous systems, to the increase in philological study in the 19th century bringing the introduction of historical elements into the spelling, and the reaction against this since the end of the century. Since then there has been pressure for the change to a phonetically based system, tempered by the contemporary study of phonemics. All these trends can be seen both advocated and attacked by contemporary grammatical commentators. From their comments much detail emerges both on the motivation of this evolution, and on the dependency of some works on certain of their predecessors.
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Introduction

This introduction is intended to define the contents of the following chapters, the manner of presentation and terms used, and to outline a few of the problems involved.

Throughout the discussion the term "grammarian" has been used as an all-embracing word covering writers of grammars, compilers of dictionaries, vocabularies and spelling lists, and other writers who have merely inset the briefest of comments on language or spelling into otherwise non-linguistic works. It has often been assumed to be probable (though rarely certain) that a writer who has expressed definite views on a particular aspect of spelling, will also have thought about other aspects, and that his usage is consciously adopted rather than uncritically used simply because it is the contemporary norm. This assumption is by no means uncontestable. Similarly dictionary entries are taken to be the preferred form of the compiler and/or printer, whether or not there is any discussion on spelling contained in the book.

Parallel to this the term "writer" covers the whole range of literary figures, both major and minor, theologians, historians, politicians' letters, ship's journals etc.

Within this system the relative standing of the writers is largely ignored, it is the relative merit of the systems employed which is important here, and it is not to be considered strange to find, for example, Ten Kate's monumental work mentioned in the same breath as the most elementary of spelling book. It is moreover a moot point which would have the most influence on normal usage! Conversely it is not assumed that all aspects of every writer's system are equally important: for example it is extremely interesting that Sanderus uses "beloovde" in 1657, but of hardly any significance whether he uses '-d', '-t' or '-dt' at the end of nouns.

A number of works have been included in the discussion which at first sight might not seem to be of great importance, one of the best examples of which are the numerous and often minor Dutch language primers for foreign readers. However such works are indeed of interest in that they are often considerably more objective than grammars written for native readers, and will often list known variants for the benefit of their readers, whereas native works usually merely defend their own usage.
There is no claim to completeness in the following discussion, either in works consulted or spellings analysed. A great many quotations are omitted simply because they offer nothing new; it should not be assumed that those who are not quoted had no views on the subject. Similarly minor writers, on the whole, only have their usage given when it deviated in some way from the norm, whereas major figures, who could exercise some influence on contemporary practice, have their usage given more completely.

The spellings discussed here are usually those which can be included in some contemporary theory or system; spelling variations of the type "hades, kompt, gantsch, elge, meinjeschool" being largely unsystematic by nature, are excluded. Similarly there is no discussion of spellings for the letters J, L, M, N, R, W, since there have been few problems here, save the typographical evolution of J/I and H/I/W; H is discussed only in combinations with other letters (ch, gh, ph, rh, th, sch). Within each chapter the discussion of a number of different spellings are often included, simply because they share a common key-letter, e.g. the spellings '-u(w)' and 'vr-, vr-' have in common the letter 'w', and are therefore included in the same chapter. Exceptions to this are made in the interests of chapter length for final 'd' and for 'ch'. Consequently the alphabetical chapter headings must not be taken too literally, the use of 't' in "hij leert" for example is found in the chapter on 'd' in verbs.

The examples used are often taken as merely representative, if for example it is stated that a number of writers share spellings of the type "handt", it is not meant to imply that they all use that actual word in the texts consulted. Loan word spellings have on the whole not been subjected to the same depth of treatment as native words, since their development is mostly idiosyncratic and bears little relationship to the development of native spellings, although influence can sometimes be seen, as in the replacement of 'c' by 'k'.

Occasionally the discussion has been broadened to cover contemporary controversies between grammarians not directly linked with spelling (e.g. Marin-Halma), and often the interrelationship of grammars is discussed in more depth than the lack of variation between their individual usages might seem to justify. This is done because it is of the utmost importance to know which grammars had the most influence: for example the usage of Richardson, Hillenius, Hexham and Beyer...
is of no great significance in itself, but the fact that they are all based to a
greater or lesser extent on Van Heule (1633) is of considerable interest to the
discussion of the latter's influence.

It has not been the intention to discuss the phonetic development of Dutch
consonants, either in vacuo or as implied by the comments of grammarians. The
actual pronunciation of the words concerned has usually been ignored, except for
a few instances where a contemporary variant pronunciation causes a variant
spelling (e.g. the use of '-tie', or '-tie', and '-s(ch)'), or where a possible
pronunciation may explain an anomalous spelling (e.g. why prepalatal 'c' has
resisted the change to 'a').

Concerning the summaries included at the end of most chapters, the datings given
are usually approximate in the extreme, since they mostly indicate only trends,
not specific occurrences. The only exception to this is where a definite break
occurred in the development, or where individual writers are specified. A linking
of two names in the summary of one chapter naturally does not imply that all
their other usages are the same.

In a number of quotations the spelling has been corrected where obvious
misprints are concerned ('c' for 'e', letters inverted etc.). The punctuation
has occasionally been modernised, where interpretation would otherwise have been
difficult (e.g. the obsolete use of (:) for (,)), though for ethical reasons this
has been avoided where possible within the bounds of intelligibility. The (/) of
Gothic scripts has consistently been replaced by (,), since the use of the former
in non-Gothic typefaces is inconsistent. The use of pairs of (/) or (,) has
where appropriate been replaced by single raised commas ('), since this has the
same function; single raised commas are also inserted where italics are used in
the original text, e.g. to mark examples.

Of the problems involved the most striking is the conflict between writers
and their printers. In very few texts indeed can it be claimed with any certainty
that the spelling used is that preferred by the writer. In such cases a reference
to, say, the usage of Bredero, should be taken to mean no more than "the usage
contained in the edition of Bredero's book entitled..." as specified in the
bibliography. Unless the writer had expressed views on the subject of spelling
either in particular or in general, it must not be assumed that the usage is his.
Sometimes a printer has an identifiable usage of his own, e.g. Waesbergher's use of 'it' in nouns, Lessenije's use of 'd' in verbs, Voorstads predilection for books in odd spellings. Whoever is responsible for the spelling employed in a particular book is, in a certain sense, of lesser importance. More important is the fact that it was in use at a given time. It is however more convenient to refer to the author of the book than to the printer. There are exceptions to this and the influence of the printer should never be underestimated in any period under discussion.

A few examples can show this: The printer of "Vlaeringhe Rederijck-bergh" in 1617 writes in the preface that "wy hebben dezelve, wat de uytspraak ende spelling belangt, soo hier soo daer alternat wat verandert ende gebogen naer het ghemeyne gebryck"; Hendrik Leers writes in the introduction to the later editions of Hexham's dictionary that he is responsible for the spelling used; the printer of Smyters' "Epitheta" seems to render unintelligible the anagram with which Smyters signs the introductory poem: "voor haters zijn zot" can only yield "Anthonija Smyters", whereas the use of the spelling defended by him in 1613 would render a more exact anagram, with 's' for 'z' (unless Smyters considered 's' and 'z' to be absolutely interchangeable!); Overschie, despite his individual ideas on spelling, writes that of the various printers he has come into contact with, he "al na bun zin eens wilde laate bagan" for the spelling of his books. Ampzing and Huydecoper both bemoan the laxity of printers. It is even known that Dutch printers were instrumental in changing contemporary French spellings, by adopting some more radical usages of the 17th century (see for examples "l'Orthographe", Pierre Burney, Paris, 1967, p.26,94).

There is a certain amount of justification however for alluding to the books by the author rather than the printer, since that is what happened in earlier times: many are the times that a spellings has been defended, for example "because Vondel used it", meaning that it is used in the edition of Vondel consulted by the writer. The prime example of the dangers in the uncritical use of this method is where Verpomten uses Cats in defense of his own use of 's' and 'z' in "zijn,zelf", and Wolf, in defense of his own "zijn,zelf" system writes that "By Cats... is er toch immers ggeone 'z' te vinden" (see chap.11).

A relatively minor problem is the familiar "chicken-and-egg" principle: did a spelling become common because a certain grammar used it, or was the grammar
reflecting an existing trend? The best example of this is in the poems by
Neutelenburg, which have exactly the same system as Winschooten's grammar and
dictionary, the first to discuss or defend it. The only drawback is that
Neutelenburg's book was printed the year before Winschooten's grammar! The same
problem probably covers almost every spelling mentioned in the following
discussion.

A minor matter of terminology is the difference between "analogy" and the
system of "gelijkvormigheid", where, for example a certain letter is used
because it is present in another form of the word, e.g. "hand" ends in '-d'
because of the presence of a 'd' in the plural "handen". Although this is
indeed a form of analogy, the two are not exactly the same, - a difference best
illustrated by the verb form "hij vindt", where the '-t' is caused by analogy
with "hij spelt, hij speelt" etc., and the '-d' by gelijkvormigheid rules, given
the plural "wij vinden". For this reason the term gelijkvormigheid has not
been translated (if a suitable word exists!).

The term "progressive" as used below, is difficult to define, and should
often be read as no more than "anticipating accurately future trends", not
necessarily implying a difference in merit between the two systems or writers
concerned. In a similar vein, the term "strange spelling" should not
automatically be taken as condemnatory, - today's strange spelling is tomorrow's
hallowed usage (cf. the use of '-s(ch)', '-gt', and the long vowels of the
De Vries/Te Winkel system!). Many spellings appear strange for no other reason
than that they are not in use now. This does not imply that they are any less
practical or preferable than other more familiar forms, a case in point being
the use of final 'v' in "brieven", or the spelling "lachchen", both of which
have very logical arguments in their favour.
Chapter 1: Final position.

The development of words ending in '-b' from those ending in '-bbe'.

The pronunciation of final '-b' as /b/, according to grammarians.

The pronunciation of final '-b' as /β/, according to grammarians.

The change of spelling from '-b' to '-p'.

As will be seen in later chapters, for words ending in '-d' and '-g', there were often lengthy arguments about whether '-d,-g' or '-t,-ch' or '-dt,-gh' should be used. For '-d' however most of these arguments are not to be found. And for this there is a straightforward reason: throughout the Middle Dutch period and up to the end of the 16th century there were no such words. The normal was the longer form, such as "webbe, ik hebbe", so that there was no problem. The short forms "rib, web, heb" etc. do occur, though less common, in later Middle Dutch (none of Van Halten, Franck or Van Loey list "ik heb" as a Middle Dutch form), but whereas the standard spelling of the other apocopated or uninflected words shows a letter alternation, as in "schrif-schriven, goet-goede, dach-dag(h)en", words are not found with a final '-p' and inflected '-bbe'. There must be a reason for this, and the most plausible is that these words retained a final /-e/ sound, usually very short, which would preserve the voiced sound of the /b/. Most early grammarians use the longer forms, possibly because they spoke Southern dialects where these forms still exist (e.g. Lambrecht, Killian). If the normal spoken form was '-bbe' then, it is not to be expected that grammars will feel any difficulty with the spelling; Lambrecht, Plantijn, Killian, De Haetier all give the longer forms only. De Haetier possibly alludes to the above-mentioned reason, when he writes that "die letter bina atom uit den mont niet kan geraken, voor datse 'e' open dout, wardende (in the name 'Be') door haer hulpe ... met mouite geboren".

Two situations where the shorter forms sometimes did occur were before a vowel (often in inversion), and in compound nouns. Thus we find De Castelein writing "Van eerst heb ick u utvercoren", where the '-be' is elided, and in Plantijn alongside entries "krabbe, webbe" are found "krabsel" and "ik heb hem goet cier gheemaeckt", where the '-be' is dropped (probably elided) before the unstressed "heem". Similarly Killian has "webbe" etc., but "webdraed, webspinne, krabsel", where he retains the 'b' even when (because of assimilation) it must have been pronounced as /p/ (webspinne). This is usually attributed to a primitive sense of gelijkvormigheid, though this would imply that he used other gelijkvormigheid spellings such as "dag," which he does not.

Towards the end of the 16th century the shorter forms begin to appear more
Frequently, Stevin regularly uses "ik heb, cræ", possibly in line with his theory that the shorter the form of the word the purer it was. Even so it is doubtful if he would have used such forms if they were not already known in the language.

The Twe-spraak also uses and lists "heb" as normal, and Van Heule lists "hebbe ofte heb" (p. 51), though for nouns he only recognizes the longer forms. In his second edition he explains his position more fully: "De Hollanders (zeggen)... praeg, ic zeg, ic heb,... in plaats van vraeg, ic zegge, ic hebbe,... Dummenige verkortingen zijn verwerpelic" (p. 41). He is, however, just as opposed to abnormal "verlangingen" in Flemish "lopene, wapene, schuyte".

Neither Asping nor Van der Schuere recognize the shorter forms at all, and the first grammarians after the Twe-spraak to actually use the "heb" form seem to be Plees (1632) and Eek (1649); Leuvenius, in his system, uses "hebb".

Literary use of "ik heb" had been fairly common since early in the century: Hoëft, Freders, Campshagen, Bonleke all frequently use it. Its use in poetry was often especially convenient, whether written "ik heb" or more cautiously "ik hebb" (even when not before a vowel), in order to save a syllable in the line. Similarly the longer forms were useful in maintaining the length of the line, and also the rhythm. Many users kept wholly to the longer form however, e.g. Binnart's Biglotton preserves the forms of the earlier Dictionarium even in the revised editions of 1659 and later.

By the mid 17th century "heb" was fully acceptable, though the nouns "webe, ebbe" etc. tended to keep their longer forms. The verb form "ik hebbe" was not dead however: Moonen always uses the "ik" form of the verb with final '-e', and he and Hylloë both discourage the use of "heb". In 1696, in the contretemps between Rabus and Van der Linden (see chap. 13), Rabus ridicules his opponent for using the shorter forms of such words, as Van der Linden had described as hopelessly old-fashioned those who used the '-bbe' forms. These, unfortunately, tended to be just those who Rabus admired most: "Ja, Hy (VdL.) kan zig niet genoeg verwonderen, dat ook 'Geletterde Mannen dikmaal so slordig zijn op haar eige Moedertaal', dat zi zeeggen 'verre voor ver, hoop voor hoop, ik hebbe, ik hadde voor ik heb en ik had enz.'", and had also "berispt (de genen), die Ezelinne, Kennisse, Gelijkenisse, Besnenisse, Getuignisse enz. schrijven; daar het, naaer zijn nieuwe uitvinding, Ezelin, Kennis, Gelijkenis, Besnijnis, Getuignis moet zijn. Op dezelve Hottentotsche wijze schrijft hy Ondvangnis". Perhaps Van der
Lutien had been a little too forthcoming in his condemnation, but Rabus is hardly justified in calling it a "nieuwe uitvinding". Apocope of final '-e' had begun at least in the early 14th century, even sporadically in the 14th century for common nouns ("zoon/zoon") etc., and although it is admittedly a later phenomenon for verb forms and the suffixes '-isse', '-inne', these were certainly well-known in the 17th century.

Already in 1633 Van Heule had recognized the shorter forms: "De verkorting wort dicmael gebruykt inde gevallen, etc". (p.146). Similarly the resolutions of the Bible translators show the existence of the apocopated form: "Getuygenisse" et similia, cum 'e' in fine post duplex 'ss', aliud est 'vonnis', quod etiam scribitur cum unico 's' et sine 's'". A contemporary of Rabus, and his successor as editor of the Boekzaal, Sewel, states in the volume for 1703(1703b,123), that the forms "heb, weet, verneem" are best used for the indicative, reserving "hebbe, weete, verneme" for the subjunctive. "Neb" is used by the Flemish "Grammaire plus exacte" of 1701, and also by Van Heulden 20 years earlier in 1683.

Rabus then was exaggerating, and it is most likely that he thought such forms vulgar. This too must have been the reasoning behind the writings of De Haes, Kluit, and others later in the 18th century. De Haes has such words only in the longer form: "webbe, ik hebbe" etc., and Kluit says, in discussing such spelling alternations as 'f/v', 'a/z', that there can be no possibility of such an alternation with '-b', as he know of no suitable words! He quotes "ebbe, kwabbe, lubbe, schubbe, ribbe" as being in the same class of words as "kladde, kudde, plagge". Nonetheless he actually uses "ik heb".

Kramer's grammar gives the alternatives in the vocabulary section: "Eb, Ebbe; Krab, Krabbe". He also gives the similar alternatives for '-is(se)': "Die hochdeutsche Endesylbe =niss hat im Holländischen =nis (nisse)".

Even at the present time some word pairs still exist: the 1954 Woordenlijst lists " eb(be); web, webbe; rib, ribbe; krab(be)" (sic). The tenacity of the non-apocopated form suggests that in some way the mechanics of producing a final /b/ inhibit the dropping of the /e/ (cf. De Heuiter above). And it is probably true to say that the continued existence of the longer forms alongside those spelt with final '-b' has inhibited any tendency towards a phonetic spelling with
'p', even when it was pronounced with /p/.

Some, primarily in the eighteenth century, have maintained, possibly for this very reason, that final '-b' was not pronounced the same as final '-p'. But here the power of autosuggestion must not be neglected, especially as several of the same writers profess to hear a difference between final 'd' and 't', 'ch' and 'g' etc., which would be contradicted, in most dialects at least, by well-established Dutch sound laws—namely that a final voiced consonant loses its voicing.

First noticeable is the possibility of autosuggestion in the case of the Twe-spraak: "De b en p in abt, beslabt, krabt, ende tapt, lapt, klap verschelen in geklanck wainigh",—they differ little, but they do differ, so it is claimed. This is strengthened by the fact that in all examples the 'b' is followed by 't', in which position there is even less probability of there being any pronounced difference between the 'b' and the 'p'. The writer chooses the '-bt' forms presumably because words now having '-b,-p' would, as far as he was concerned, end in '-bbe, -ppe', where the difference does not need to be pointed out. For him the similarity could only occur when the 'b' or 'p' was followed by 't'.

At a later time, Wincschooten, like a great many others, claims to hear a difference between 'b' and 'p' in all positions: "Soo de lippen stijf op wankanderen gedrukt werden, soo komt de P in de plaats van de B; gelijk wij weeten het onderscheid tussen slab en slap, slabben en slappen"(p.3). Huydecoper likewise hears a difference between all final voiced/unvoiced consonant pairs, including '-b/-p', yet he concedes that the unvoiced pronunciation actually exists zijheen undesirable: "De voornaamste tegenwerping diemen tegen de spelling 'god, snood, verkeerd') inbrengt, is de uitspraak, dewyl, zegtmen, de T aan het einde van alle die woorden gehoord wordt: 't welk ik ontken waar te zyn. En die 'God' (Deus) uitpreeken als 'Got' (een volknaam), en 'nood' (gevaar) als 'noot' (een boomvrucht) komen met het zelfde recht beweeren, datmen moet schryven 'ik heb', voor 'Ik heb': want daar is geen minder onderscheid tusschen 'God' en 'Got', als 'er is tusschen 'heb' en 'hep'. Doch al spraken zo, wat gevolg, dat een bedorven uitspraak ook de schryfwys bederven moet?"(I,31).

Zeydelaar considers the pronunciations different: "B wordt aan 't einde van de volgende woorden môt haar' natuurlijken klank' uitgesproken, zijnde de overéénkomst van geluid, welke men voorjeëvt, dat zij aldaar môt de 'p' hebbe, mijns oordeels, van zeer weinig belang. voorbeelden: slab, bab, hèb, krèb,...
In de verschillende tijdperken is het verschil tussen ‘slab’ en ‘slap’, tussen ‘schrab’ en ‘schrap’, en andere lijnenwoorden, in de uitspraak, zeer wél te onderscheiden. He uses this difference in defense of his gelijkvormigheid system.

A group of grammarians at the end of the 13th century which often have the same ideas, comprises that of Stijl, published and edited by Bolhuis, that of Bolhuis himself, and some of the various works of the Nut, Bolhuis being the link-pin, as he wrote some of the Nut’s school grammars. Their rulings on this aspect are similar: all are convinced gelijkvormigheid spellers, and all hear a difference in their pronunciations of such final consonant pairs. Stijl: “(het) meem/oud (toont) de rechte eigenschap van spelling en uitspraak des woords in het end van ‘t eenvoudige. En deze spelling maakt ook dikwijls een nuttig onderscheid in de betekenis,...slab, slap, tob, top,...”. (Note that he still uses “betekenisse”, suggesting that for some at least Van der Linden had been just as revolutionary as ‘labeus implied) Bolhuis wrote that “deze letters verschillen slechts in zachtheid, of scherpheid van klank;...Deze klank is zo bestendig, en zo eigen aan de woorden, dat dikwijls hunne betekenis (niet) daar naar verschilt,...krab, krap, slib, slip, tob top, schub schup”. In his section on “Spelkunde”(p.33) he modifies this by saying that “aan het einde is dat onderscheid van scherpheid en zachtheid, bezwaarlijker te ontdekken, vooral in ‘d’ en ‘t’, ‘g’ en ‘ch’”,- the implication being that it was easy for ‘b’ and ‘p’?

The works of the Nut are almost unanimous. The Spraakkunst of 1314 writes that “Dit verschil van uitspraak doet zich voor in ‘tob (tobbe)’ en ‘top’...”, and that “de ‘b’(is) algemeen als sluitletter aangenomen”(p.107). But the Rudimenta of 1305, written for the most part in Siegenbeek’s spelling, claims that “De b, zacht zijnde wordt zelden gebruikt om eene lettergreep te sluiten; behalve in de woorden ‘abdij’, ‘abba’”,- presumably the writer had overlooked all the words with double ‘bb’, such as “hebben, webbe”, where the ‘b’ similarly closes a syllable: The Nut’s Trap der Jeugd by Verick conversely stated that “Aan het einde van een woord of een lettergreep wordt het gebruik door uitspraak, afleiding of verschillende betekenis beslischt - krap krab, slab slap”. A slightly earlier work, that of Wester in 1793, shares their opinion: “Het onderscheid van B en P achter aan eene lettergreep blijkt in ‘slab’ en ‘slap’”.

Such comments now became standard practice, often heavily influenced by preceding works. David, for example, in 1353, lists the word pairs “slab slap,
Despite just having said that "De b, zacht zynde, wordt zelden gebrulkt" he seems to have almost verbatim from the Rut's Rudimental "which in mean't to have lifted almost verbatim from the Rut's Rudimenta!"

However, as a result of the new linguistic, dialectal, and phonetic studies of the early 17th century, by such as De Vries, Te Waterkant, De Jager, it was established that for standard Dutch there was no difference in pronunciation of final "b" and "p". This fact took a long time to settle, normally in the past it had just been stated that "b en p hebben grote gemeenschap tusschen" (Tuwispriek), "De b heeft met de P gemeenschap van geluid" (Van der Schouw), "De b heeft grote gemeenschap met de p" (Louwenius), "De b heeft groot gemeenschap van de p" (W.C. P.), etc., etc., though as mentioned above many of these were only discussing intervocalic use, as they did not recognize the forms "web, rib" etc.

One of the first to have acknowledged the similarity of pronunciation in final position was the society Nil Volentibus Arduum, in around 1673: "De overeenkomst tusschen de 'b' en 'p' (is) groter, als tussen enige van de opgetellde consonantes oft Neêlinkers", - the exact opposite of Bolhuis's claim that the similarity was greatest for 'd/t, g/ch'(see above), - "gelijk isder, die slechts met aandacht op der zelver klank wil letten, terstond gewaar zal worden. Waarom derzêver geluid niet alleen op het einde der syllabe of leettergreep noodwêlfse verscheelt, als in 'krab' en 'schrab', maar ook in 'gekrabs' en 'geschraps', 'gelabd' en 'vorsalapt'! The rhyming of words of which one had '-b' and the other '-p' was deemed acceptable. One of their prominent members, Pels, wrote "zo mag men kindsch met Prins berymen, noord met voort, en kap met krab". Even in 1620, however, Camphuysen can be found using such a rhyme in Godt de Wraek: Ghy evenwel, ghy zijt het, Godt daer ic op sta en hoop on schep;/ Ghy zijt het al wat dat ick heb" (p. 5).

Examples of '-b' rhyming with '-p' are actually extremely elusive, especially compared to the superabundance of rhymes between '-d' and '-t'. Nil Volentibus's Verhandeling goes on to quote examples of rhymed "geschob/op", and with final 't', "hebt/schept, lubt, bedrupt, gekapt, gekrabb, Charybd/ontslipt" in Vondel, Huygens, and Camphuysen. For examples: "...Ten end myn huys een porrend voorbeeld heb/ en deugd lust schep" (Camphuysen Psalm 101); "Tervijl dat arme volck de handen van 't geschrobb/ En tow en takel zeer ten dyuest'ren hemel op" (Huygens Hofwijk).

In 1815 De Neckere (p. 55) quotes Vondel as rhyming "onderschep/ seb", but
i i ' i f i u ' t ,
nill'll,
ry dons not givw his
so u rc e .

The only other example located, after exclusion searching, is in the poem Papaver-bed by Van Looy: "Als een vlinder uit
wijz'p'"atten zij dit lob ha lob,...", though other examples must surely exist!

Huydecoper, in his attempts to discredit the pronunciation /hep/ (see above) actually becomes the first to record such a pronunciation as being with /p/,
rather than just being similar to it; it is doubtful if he would have welcomed this honour. A few years earlier Van Gavoren had come to the conclusion that
final '-b' was very nearly /p/: When Poerzet wrote his booklet defending Moonen's
spelling, in 1704, Van Gavoren reviewed it in the Boekzaal (1708a,357), and most
too favourably: "De maker van dit boekje, P.m.P. (ze 't by toeschynt nog een
jongeling) toont zich allenthalven een persoon van oordeel en bescheidenheit".
With reference to final '-b' Moonen, defended by Poerzet, had merely stated that
"De B heeft in de uitspraak gemeenschap met de P. ... De B (is) een zachte P, en
de P...eene scherpe B; gelyk blijkt uit de woorden 'alb' en 'alag', 'labben' en
'lepen". Van Gavoren disagreed with this: "De B in 'Quab' voor 'Quabe', in
'Neb' voor 'Nebbe'...kost ... nader aan de P dan aan zelver. ... Echter wordt
de B behouden", -- he was no radical!

Ten Kate cautiously went a little further than Nil Volentibus: "Het
onderscheid tussen onze harde en zachte Medeklinkers, wanneer ze ten einde eener
Silbe staan, als tussen eF en eV; eS en e2, eT en eD, eCH en eG, en eF en eB (is)
klein, en zonder proeve nauwelijks te hooren", -- i.e. if one was not looking for it, one would not know it was there!

The first to write that final '-b' sounded exactly as /p/ (apart from
Huydecoper!) was Van Belle:*'Men spelt met B, Ban, Boek, als zagt van vooren,/
Boch scherp als P aan 't einde eens woords te hooren: /Want (zegt A.Pels) 'zo
ryst men Krab met Kap'". (Pels's work was very well known and often reprinted.)
One of the very few contemporaries to agree with this was Schutz: "De B en P op
het einde van een woord staande, geven in de uitspraak geen het minste verschil".
As he considered the /b/ to be an essential element in these words however, he
used this argument to recommend avoidance of the forms ending in '-b'!

As noted above, this view that final '-b' was pronounced /p/ was not fully
accepted until the middle of the following century. In 1826 De Simpel does not
make it clear whether he is referring to the letter only, or to the sound too,
when he writes: "Oorschoon anders de lettergrepen met eene scherpe medeklinker
Omit the letter "o" in the word "het," it seems, when it occurs at the end of a word, or a "geplaatst" suggest that he refers only to the (for him) anomalous appearance of the letter, and he probably hears a normal "unvoiced" sound.

The newer teachings of linguistics, however, now established the situation: "Aan het einde van Nederlandsche woorden komt 'b' niet voor, althans niet in de uitspraak; wordt 'webbe' verkort door apocope, dan wordt de verkorte vorm uitgesproken als 'wep' (W.N.T. "B", §4). Smits had recognized this fact in 1324: "en hoort geen verschil tusschen 'ab' en 'ap'... het verschil (tusschen 'b' en 'p') verdwijnt in 'krab, krap, alib, alip' etc." (p. 7, 25). And Bosma repeats: "welk onderscheiding toch is er in 'rad' en 'rat', 'lag' en 'lach', 'leb' en 'lep'?". Nonetheless this writer of "weinig fonetisch gehoor" (De Vooys, 170), who did not count himself a radical, proposes representing the strongly assimilated spoken forms of such as "heb" by means of apostrophes (analogous to English "I'll" etc.), giving for "heb ik tijd" the spelling "he' 'k tijd" (and similarly "do'  w't" for "doen wij het"). As a defender of the gelijkvormigheid system however, he has no objections to the '-b' spelling.

Yet as late as 1371 Brill still could not believe that the same sound was heard for final '-b' and '-p': "Die konzonanten (kennen) niet onderscheidelijk genoeg ... uitgesproken worden, wanneer zij zich aan 't eind eener lettergreep laten hooren, in wolk geval de 'd' naauwelijks verschilt van de 't', en de 'b' van de 'p', - n.b. "naauwelijks", but, as in the Twe-spraak, still implicitly present.

In explaining the anomalous use of final '-f' and '-s' alongside '-d,-g,-b', Te Winkel had introduced the idea of "onechte letters", - i.e. the 'f' in "schrijf" was really a sharpened /v/, not a real /f/, - and Van Ginneken later borrowed this argument and used it against the Kollewijn reformers, who he (wrongly) imagined wished to introduce a phonetic spelling: "Uit het meervoud van 'tobben' en 'toppen' weten wij toch, dat hier de 'p' van 'tob' een onzignelijke 'p' is en een eigenlijke 'b', dus een ander phoneem, als dat van 'top'toppen'. En daarom schrijven wij ze dan ook beide met een eigen letterteeken" (like Te Winkel he does not apply the same rule to final '-f' or '-s', though the /f/ in "schrijf" and the /s/ in "huis" are just as "oneacht" as
as the /b/ in "tob"). He wanted a sort of phonemic-based gelijkvormigheid, so the /b/ contrast has phonemic value in "toppen/tobben" so it must also in "top/tob".

For him the possibility of writing "top" for "tob" (together with '-lik' for '-lijk' and a hypothetical assimilation spelling "ombuigbaar" for "on-") was "reeds voldoende om te tonen, hoe de phonetische spelling ons aan de meest hopeloze verwarring zou prijsgeven, zoodat wij elkander op schrift niet meer zouden verstaan". (Assimilation spellings similar to that which he thinks so dangerous exist normally in English, French, Italian, Latin, German etc., "impossible, empfangen" etc.. The force of Van Ginneken's wording weakens his argument.)

The replacement of '-b' by '-p' was actually no part of the Kollewijn proposals, any more than the replacement of '-d' by '-t' etc., though some of the more radical members may have wished it,— see for example Wille's comment below. The Woordenlijst of 1954 was the latest of a long line to recognize the pronunciation as /p/, but overrule it with gelijkvormigheid: "niet 'rip', maar 'rib', wègens 'ribben, ribbenkast' enz."

Actual spellers of final '-b' as '-p' have always been extremely rare, and, as mentioned above, this strongly suggests that the final /b/ for a long time preserved something of its voiced character, for otherwise one would expect more occurrences of the phonetic spelling.

The first hints of a '-p' spelling are found in the personal names. Obreen and Van Loey record such spellings as "Jacobpe" already in Middle Dutch (cf. below for '-pb-'). Lambrecht, when discussing '-iae-' gives "Jaekip" for "Jakob", and Sexagius, discussing the pronunciation of French 'g' and 'j' spells the same name as "Ziacop", but these are their only '-p' spellings. Ampzing makes the same exception, and explains why it is restricted to proper names: "de enkele gevolg letter des meervouds, op 't eynde des eenvouds achte ik geheel noodzakelijk soo schrijf ik 'hoofd, heylig',... over al daer enig gevolg aen vast is: alleen de uytheemsche eyge namen eygentlijk uytgenomen, als Job, Jakob, ende andere: latende ondertusschen de onse als Arnout, Arent,... ook vrij aldus te schrijven: omdat het gevolg hier niet te breed en gaet, ende seld en voorvalt, hoewel de 'd' om des gevolgs willen van 't meervoud alhier de eygentlijke letter
15.

The first instances of '-p' spellings outside proper names come fairly late. Such Middle Dutch spellings as "dopbelen, stuphe" (mostly in Limburg) are in the same category as "kalfve, wijfve" and Van Santen's later "geeffver", though here there could be no influence from the uninflected forms (cf. kalf, wijf, geeff), as "dop-, stup-" do not exist. It probably just became a convention to write double voiced consonants as the unvoiced plus the voiced letter signs (cf. the similar "secgen, rochgsen").

Because words ending in '-b' are uncommon in earlier times, the more usual form being '-bbe', there was little tendency to the hypergelijkvormigheid which occurred with '-d', viz. final '-d' in words whose inflection was with '-te' (e.g. "kand") — see chap. 5. One such example for '-b' is recorded in the W.N.T. under "snap" from "snappen", and is to be found in Ogier's "Seven Hooftsonden": "Trouste dan, oft ick langh voor u voor d'eerst een shab door de kaeck". No further examples have been located.

The actual changing of '-b' into '-p' in the spelling was first mooted by Montanus, though like the Twe-spraack he only cites the case of 'b' before 't': "Inde Inlantse (i.e. Dutch words) worden) by veel ten senzien vande acomst 'g' voor 'ch', 'd' voor 't', en 'b' voor 'p' gestelt: als in 'ie liech, deugd, paerd, hebt': voor 'liech, deucht, paert, hept'"(p.25). He does not seem to know the /p/ pronunciation in final position, and always spells "heb" (for "hebbe")?; in the "Letterwisselingen" on p.121ff he only mentions the 'p/b' alternation in "loop/loob-baen, coop/coob-broot", whereas for 'd/t', 'ch/g' and 's/z' he also has such as "gelt/galden, hooch/hoge, wijs/wijze". Huydecoper, as mentioned
It is possible to interpret a comment, found later in the Century, from
Graafland, in which he knew of "-p' spellings: "Men schrijft 'kwab, krah, kab,' en niet 'krap, krap, kap', omdat men zegt 'kwabben, krabben, kabben'". At the
very least it shows that he was aware of some uncertainty on the subject. A
similar comment from the Twentspraak that "vilt niet schicken dat men 'kraap'...
word schrijven", may be interpreted in the same way.

Apart from a brief comment in the Taalkundige Bijdragen of 1760, to the effect
that consistency with '-t', '-s' and '-t' spellings would demand '-p' in "wep"
(see chap.7), Emila, in 1324, was actually the next to moot the spelling with
'-p'. He bemoans the inconsistencies of the spelling system as he finds it:
"Men heeft de zachte grondletters op het ënde verworpen en in scherpen
verwisseld. Evenwel is men de zachte 'b' voorbij gegaan: men heeft nooit bestaan
to schrijven: 'ik krab, wij krapen, zij krapen: hij duft, zij duphen, krip,
kripen; wrap, wophe, top, tophe in de plaats van 'ik krah.... enz". Such as
"krapen" had in fact existed, though rarely (see above), but his point is valid.
He does not, however, wish to advocate a '-p' spelling, as he is a convinced
gelijkvormigheid speller.

Land in 1370 regarded "hept" as plausible, but "de geheele spellingquaestie
is eigenlijk van ondergeschikt belang, - Anders zouden wij nog veel meer moeten
vragen; b.v. waarom het stelsel van de dag 'macht, recht, plicht' en toch niet
'gij moocht, hij zecht, hij licht (liggen)' verkiest, ja om dezelfde reden 'gij
hept, gij hatt (of hat)'?" (n.b. once more only '-bt' is mentioned!).

As Kollewijn had no wish to attack the gelijkvormigheid system, the use of
'-p' instead of '-b' formed no part of his Voorstellen. However Wille felt these
proposals to be the thin end of the wedge, and makes, in the light of later
tendencies, a disconcertingly accurate (or perceptive?) prophecy: "ongetwijfeld
zal dan na de verdwijning van de dubbelheid in 'e/ee, o/co, a/sch' spoedig
moeten volgen die van 'ei/ij, au/ou, l/ie'... en die van het woordbegin 'wr/vr'...
Daarna zal wel spoedig de reeds voor lang gestelde eisch hernieuwd worden, om de
't', 'p', 'ch' te schrijven, waar men tot nog toe gespelde 'b', 'd', 'g' toch zo
zegt: 'hooet, ep, tullch'"(p.49).

He fails to make the historical distinction between the antiquity of the
Dutch spelling began the spelling of final 'b' was never seriously attacked
until 1957, when Leonard brought out his appeal for a more phonetic based
spelling or at least a more consistent one. "An het eind van een woord staat
aan het eind van een woord staat een 'v' of 'v' evenals als 'v' of 'v'. Naar we 't', 'ch', of 'p' horen,
schrijven we ook 't', 'ch', of 'p'... Dan: wep, webben; hep, hebben; maar dan ook:
hij krapt, zij krabben, zij schropt, zij schrobben... geschropt, gekrappe,
geschropte... naar het model van vreesde, gevrees, gevreesde"(p.34). And two
pages later he repeats that "wat voor 'v' en 'f' en voor 'z' en 's' geldt, en al
sinds eeuwen gegaan heeft, aan het eind van een woord staat 'b' en 'p' en voor 'd' en 't'
gaan gelden. Just as "graf/graven" etc., it should be "wep/webben" etc., and
similarly "hep/hebben/heppt" like "geef/geven/geeft", and "epde/ebbent/geept"
like "laapde/lavent/gelaap".

These proposals were also part of the "Doelmatiger Spelling" of the V.W.S.;
"Gebruik één vast teken voor één foneem: 'b' klinkt als 'p' aan het eind van een
woord en daarmee overeenkomend morfem: b.v. 'je hebt' = 'je hept' vgl. 'behept'.
Hierdoor wordt een einde gemaakt aan de inkonsekwentie dat men b.v. wel 'leef'
'en 'vaas' schrijft, maar niet 'hep' en 'huit'. Het onderwijs besteedt enorm veel
tijd aan het leren van deze zinloze 'dt, dd, tt' en van 'b' en 'd' die aan het
eind van een woord als 'p' en 't' klinken".

When the Eindvoorstellen failed to satisfy these demands, the review in
Levende Talen suggested its own "amendementen": "De Commissie heeft voor het
werkwoord de analogiergel gedeeltelijk laten varen, de D.C.N. zou ook de
gelijkvormigheidregel overboord willen gooien: dat er voor het foneem /t/ een
't' krijgen; - dat in verband hiermee het foneem /T/ consequent met het teken 't'
gespeld wordt; - dat in verband hiermee het foneem /P/ consequent met het teken 'p'
gespeld wordt". These are not so much amendments, more a transformation of the
Eindvoorstellen to the tenets of the V.W.S.!

If the replacement of '-b' by '-p' will be accepted, and if so when, is an
open question, as it forms no part of the officially sponsored government
commission reports. Sporadic instances of "hep" etc., used for effect, occur
in literature; this word is used for example by Remko Kampurt (sic) in "Het
Loven is verrukkelik", ridiculed as a "verwoesting" by Kulisch. As yet such forms have still to find a consistent user outside the writings of spelling-reformers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17th century</td>
<td>longer '-bbe' forms used almost exclusively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th century</td>
<td>longer '-bbe' forms die out (not in all dialect use)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th century</td>
<td>final '-b' believed to be different from final '-p'; occasional spellings with '-p' in proper names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early 19th century</td>
<td>'-b' accepted by nearly all as being pronounced /p/.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>first proposal for consistent replacement of '-b' by '-p'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>second proposal (V.W.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'-pt' also suggested by Montanus in 1635.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 2: The Letters C and K.

G = /k/ in initial position in Dutch words.
C, k, ck in final position in Dutch words.
ck, kk in medial position.
C = /s/ pronunciation & spelling.
C = /k/ in initial position in Dutch words.

With the adoption of the Latin alphabet for use in the writing of Dutch it was only natural that the 'c' should be adopted in preference to the 'k' for the spelling of /k/. However the fact that in Dutch, being a Germanic tongue, the /k/ sound could also appear before a palatal vowel (e,i), necessitated the use of 'k' in these positions. This had not been necessary in the Romance languages as /k/ before these vowels was always palatalised; the dual pronunciation of the 'c' could thus cause no confusion. This was not so with Dutch, where /k/ was normal before palatal vowels in all words of Germanic origin. Thus Dutch found itself, unlike (say) French, with a superfluous letter, or rather with the possibility of spelling the same sound by two different letters.

At first in Middle Dutch the Latin/Romance system was adhered to and 'c' was used wherever possible, the 'k' only being adopted where unavoidable, i.e. before 'e' and 'i' (including 'ij' and 'y'). This in turn also caused the medial '-ck-' spelling, since medial /k/ only occurs before 'a' or 'i', as in "drucken, drucking" (see the next section). It was only to be a matter of time, however, before someone thought of using the 'k' wherever /k/ was heard, though on any large scale this was not until many years, centuries, after the beginnings of written Dutch. The Exercitium, for example has predominantly 'c' spellings, though many words have 'k' before 'a' or 'n': "knuppen, kalde, kaal" etc; this is also true of the Ghent Boecius translation, its contemporary.

In 1528 Erasmus already knew of the use of 'k' before palatals and non-palatals, when he wrote "in nostrate lingua ... pro 'c' scribemus 'k', non aliter sonantes em in 'Ky', quam in 'Ka'". Although all the Dutch words he uses have 'k' before a palatal and 'c' elsewhere, he evidently felt it meaningful to speak of a "ka" spelling, so much must have existed. Lambrecht however only uses 'k' before 'e' and 'i', in contrast to the "ce, de welké (é shows an unpronounced /e/ in his system) heeft twee crachten te weten van aan k, ende dat alse staad voor a, o, of u: ende van ean s, ende dat voor e of i staande". In his Naembouck
be hidden by this standard rule except that also uses 'k' before 'a' and 'n' in "kneker, kneken, kn, kneuten" only. Van der Werve has no 'k-' spellings in his list, as there is no call for a prepalatal /k/ in the loan words he discusses.

After the mid 16th century the 'k' spelling began to become more common.

"Kalk" can be found in the anonymous Voorreden attributed to Coornhert (loc.cit. p.11), but a few years before this in 1573 Plantijn had made a reference to these new spellings, which he would not accept in all words: "C is een Latijnsche, ofte Francesische letter, ende wordt weinig in de Duytsche tale gebruik; want in de prelaten van C, gebruiken de letter K, noch tens hebben wy hier by geset dat ons gedoch te berie of t geschreven te worden". These words for which a 'c-' spelling was preferred are not what would normally be considered loan words, but include such as "caken, caf, calc, cain, crabben" etc. There are also many cross-references between the 'c-' and 'k-' spellings, but no word has 'cn-'. His real motive for differentiating 'c-' and 'k-' spellings is discussed below, with reference to 'k' in loan words.

Kilian was of a more openly progressive opinion, preferring the 'k' wherever possible: "Ca incipientia, per literam K scribenda veteri more duximus, Graecâ orthographia potius quam latinâ. ... CL, CN, CO, CR, CV in litera K sunt su ordine collocata" (remarks before and after the 'C' section). Consequently he only uses 'c' before 'e, i, ij, y'. The loan words listed in the Appendix Peregrinorum preserve their foreign spellings: "accord, contrepoint" etc. The abridged Kilianus Auctus still has the same comments in 1642, though translated: "De woorden met CA beginnende soeckt in KA. ... CL CN CO CR CV salmen soecken in K".

Usage in Sexagius is erratic, though there are indications to his preference. In the examples within the text 'k' is normal before 'a' ("caetspel" C4h), 'e, i, n, u', and 'c' before 'l'; either occur before 'o, r', but herein is the clue: the examples "cochte, cool, coorden, corrumpeert, coste, costen, craecten, craet, crgupen" all occur in the first half of the book (all before B6 except "crgupen" on C7), whereas "koep, koi, kost, kouc, konien, kraw, kus, kuir" are all in the second half, and most of them are in the spelling list at the end, where no 'c-' spellings occur, and where it can be reasonably certain that the "ideal" spelling was used. It is a feature of Sexagius's book that he uses accepted spellings more
in the early pages and only adopts each innovation he proposes after he has
discussed it; thus the spellings become, as it were, progressively more ideal
up to the last advances.

The historian had much to say on the use of 'c'. First he demonstrates that the
Romans pronounced it /k/ in all positions, and the palatalisation before 'c; i' was
a later development. Thus the Roman 'c' was identical in use with the Greek 'k',
and any use of both side by side was thus superfluous: "E ende K. zijn uit der
Linten een letter anders allebeiden niet behorende te luiden dan die Nederlandse
k. angenomen c. alzo bide oude Latinen geluid heeft, ende daeren die Grieken geen
c. noch die Latinen geen k. kentende"(p.33),..."om dat (c) nae maechap ia met k.
zoekomen een van beiden ongen verwaren"(p.42). His choice, in initial position
at least, is for 'k': "In theginne schrijft altoos k. nimmermeer c", except in
loan words.

This view was now becoming accepted, at least by grammarians, and it may well
be more than mere coincidence that the rise in popularity of the "Germanic" 'k'
comes just after the rise of national sentiment against "Romance" oppressors.
Whatever the motivation, linguistic or politico-nationalistic, the Tweek-spraack
writes: "De c is int Duits weynigh nut, want wat die voor a, o ende u, klinckt,
daar in dient ons de k die t'selve gheklanck voor e ende i heeft"(p.43). And
although the writer wishes to preserve the use of 'c' because of its function in
'ch' and 'ck', he adds "dôch, datzen de k seer bezighe als na vorighe ghewoonte
vindt betameslyck, alzo vel voor a, o, ende u also voor e ende i daar wyze
dôch noôlyck ghebryuen moeten, want het schickt immers qulcyck datzen 'kemen'
daar 'kamen', 'kennen' ende 'connen' etc. schryft, dat dôch wôorden syn die an
elsanderen hanghen"(p.44-5).

Such a usage was by no means standard yet; Stevin, Valcoogh, Van Borsselen,
Van Beaumont, and Rodenburg all still use 'c-', though they occasionally have
'k-'. On the other hand Van der Noot used predominantly 'k-'. Wellem's
dictionary of 1537 has 'c-' only in loan words, the comment of his given in chap.
9 (concerning 'ph') continues: "le mesme entendez aussi de l'affinité de K & C
come Komen, Kloppen, Kruyden, Coenen, cloppen, cruyden".

In the new century 'k-' continued to spread, and the first grammar (that of
Van der Schuere) recommends just this usage. He was well aware of De Heuiter's
argument that the roman pronunciat ion of 'k' "in kracht met onze 'k' over een (hoof)", but rejects this as an excuse for using 'c' in all positions. "Zoo mochten wij vragen, waar toe de 'k' ons dan nodig is, ende of wy die (als omwegen overalmet) zoogen wagen moerspreken". He then goes on to show that if 'k' has a /k/ sound before 'e,l', and any other letter, and 'c' also has a /k/ sound before any letter other than 'e,' then this is a pointless superfluity. He concludes "datmen over al de 'k' zet, daor 'k' woord de kracht van 'k' behoefde" (p.14). In his description of Ronsard's French spelling reforms in the introduction, he anticipates this argument: "In gaelli voegen kan in onze spellinge ook lichtelijk getoond worden hoe... wanschikkelijk dattet is, C de kracht van K toe te eygenen".

At first, by his 'c-' spellings, e.g. in his Schryf-kunst-boeck: "clacr, cett, connen: kloeck kunst" etc., condemning those who "willen houden staen, dat in vele woorden 'k' in plaetse van 'c' ghebruyckt moet werden". But in his Epitheta of 1520 he seems to have modified his opinion, for he adds a note: "Zoo enige woorden, die met verscheeyden letteren beginnen, in d'woorden van A.B.C. niet en achtervolgen, zal u ghelieven in d'andere oorden te zoecken: ghelijk als 'gonste', niet vindende by de letter 'g', zoect in de letter 'i' op 'jonste', 'clare' op 'klare', ende dierghelijcke meer". Consequently the list under K includes most words, whereas C only has loan words, with the exception of "Calf, Coe, Coghel, Coopsmschap, claer (I), cortheyt". Why only these few native words should retain the 'c-' spelling he does not explain.

Other users at this time mostly prefer 'k-', though few are fully consistent. For example users of 'k-' include Boezer Visscher (the 1612 edition has 'c-'), his daughter Anna, Starter (who always spells "Coningh" with 'c-'), Hooft (who has a consistent use of 'k-' in his Waernemingen), Bredero, Camphuysen. Van Santen uses either letter with little consistency, though many 'c-' become 'k-' in the second edition (see the notes in the De Longhedition); Coster and Huygens are also irregular.

By the 1620's the 'k-' spelling was the normal, certainly, that is, amongst grammarians, though some writers continued to follow the traditional spelling, including those just mentioned (see also below). Van Gherwen, De Hubert, Dafforne, Ampzing, Plem and both editions of Van Heule all opt for the 'k-' spelling in Dutch words. Ampzing is the most loquacious of these on 'c-' spellings, and
thinks the 'c' totally abounds in Dutch words, especially as the primary pronunciation of the 'c' was the palatal sound: "Voor de klinkers a, o, ende u, as veegd de u en klinkers niet, ende en kan de ayttspraek ganschelijk niet bereyken die hier hard wesen moet, ende daern ook als een k moet ayttsproken worden: geval genoord, of wy dan selfs geene k en hadden. ... Wat behoeven wy de C eenen tweederleijen klink zo te dic ten, daer li ons een geene ayygene letters en gebraeckt? ... De c voor de me-klinkers in plaatze van de k te besigen, is al te vreemd, ende en staat anders niet, dan als of wy de k onder onze letters geene plaatze en wilden laten, ende de c over-al met gewald ruym baen maken, of-zer dien, ofte niet. So gebrauyck ik dan de c nergens in het hoofd, ofte begin der zilben in onso Nederduytsche woorden" (p.20).

Despite all these progressive movements the translators of the States Bible reserved their feelings for the traditional 'c-' spellings. Thus in their resolutions can be found the entries: "C 1. C durum, ante A et O et U per C et K promiscue, attendendum ad usum et originem. ... C 2. C ante liquidas L et N et R promiscue C vel K at 'cleyn' vel 'kleyn'... Respiciendum ad usum communiorem. ...'Komen' potest esse K vel C, promiscue". Users of this time who agreed that 'c-' was the "usum communiorem" include Revius, De Ruyter and the Dutch Scholast-measter, though whereas the latter are more likely to be following traditional haphazard systems (De Ruyter in particular is very erratic), it is highly probable that Revius is following the usage of the Bible, as he himself was one of the signatories of the translators' resolutions.

Another user of 'c-', and perhaps a surprising one, is Montanus. Furthermore he is, for him, very unsystematic in his choice; e.g. on p.24 he uses "kan, konne, korte, klinker" but the table on the same page has three instances of "clinker"; similarly "afcomst" is used on p.25, and p.122-3 has "coop, coft, cloen, klaeuwen, claeletter" etc. The only noticeable tendency is a preference for 'k', especially before the vowel 'a'. As he states that 'k' and 'c' are equivalent letters in other positions it is possible that he felt indifferent as to which was used in any particular word, though such laxity would be untypical.

Usage was by now predominantly with 'k-', though 'c-' was far from uncommon. Bolswert, Stalpaert van der Wiele, Van der Venne, Reael, Bontekoe, De Decker, Cats, Vondel etc., etc., all used 'k-' with, as usual, varying degrees of
regularity and consistency. Bolswert always has "verciseerden" in the
"alternative spelling" to each cluster ("kleur" etc. in the text), Stalpaert van der Wiele
considers "Crjrta" a loan word which thus needs 'c-' (De Decker spells "krays",
though many others agreed with Stalpaert van der Wiele), Bontekoe spells three
times out of four "salanderen" - the only Dutch word to have 'c': Only De Decker
Cats and Vondel, who write somewhat later than the others, are more consistent.

The comment given above from Mellema's dictionary is dropped from editions of
1630 and later, presumably on grounds of relevance.

By about 1640 it was standard practice amongst grammarians in the North to
recommend and use the 'k-' spelling in Dutch words (Kok, Van Attevelt, Van der
Weijden, Leupenius, Van den Ende). Hexham, rather unusually, includes the
alternation of initial 'c/k' (and 's/z') in the same section as final 't/de,
c/ke' etc.: "C is changed into K, as Cop into Kop, Pete, Coopmanschap into
Koopmanschap, Merchandize" (On.v). Richardson's Anglo-Belgica of 1677 contains a
similar comment, with almost the same example: "Coopman/Koopman"(p.4). Leupenius,
typical of most, notes that "De c by ons heeft geen ander gebruik, dan de h een
sterker uitblazening te geven, dan sy van de g of h bekomen kann. ... Tis dan
buiten alle grond dat men se tweederleije kracht willt toeschryven".

Not so however in the South. Although some, such as Rodriguez in 1639, and
Van Engelen c.1650 had used 'k-' and Bolognino had advised this usage in 1657,
Hissart shows himself in a typically conservative light in the notes in his
Biglotton of 1659 (the same notes are included in the Northern editions). He
writes: "Aangaende d'orthographie oft maniere van spellinghe, hebbe daer in
ghevolgt d'oude maniere, de natuere selve ende 't advis van verscheyde
verstandige. In oude ende over hondert laeren gedruckte boecken hebbe ick
gewonden, ende wort ooc hedensdaeghs by den meestendeel (?) van de gene die de
panne hanteren, goedserveert, ende de natuere selve, achtervolgende den
generaelen regel van de Latinisten, leert, wort ooc by de Françoisen alsoo
onderhouden, dat de letter c, voor de vocaalen a, e, u, ende voor alle de
consonanten is luydende en gelesen wordt gelijk een q, ende voor de vocaalen
o, i, en y, gelijk te oft z: ende als de c voor de selve vocaalen soude moeten
geprononceert worden gelijk een q, dat aldan in stede van de q genomen wordt de
k, de welcke eygentlijck gheen letter en is (dan by de Griecken) maer alleenelijck
een auxiliair (viz. in '-ck-') oft noot letter (viz. before 'e,i,y'); gelijck ook egentlijck geen letter on is de h, maar alleenelijck een adspiratie; soo dat over al waar een met de c geraecken can, gheen k van doen en heeft. Tck laat steen dat de k, byten noot (viz. not before 'e,i,y') alleenelijck by sommige nauw- enige nieuw-wijze ingedrongen is ende noch wordt. 't Is wel waer, dat de Haaghsuytsche de k meest over al gebruiken, maar even wel ghbruycken sy ook somtijde de c".

According to this rule, the section for K in the dictionary is headed by the following "dota, De woorden die van sommige geschreven worden KA, KL, KN, KO, KR, KU, Rubly seecken in CA, CI, CN, CO, CR, CU, om redenen inde Voor-redene geseeyd", and consequently there are only entries for 'ke-' and 'ki-' where 'k' is a "noot letter". Thus Binnart has the (dubious) honour of being the last to actively defend the use of 'c' as an initial letter in Dutch words. His 1635 Dictionarium does not have the same usage however!

As suggested by the Southerner Binnart (he was known as a bookdealer in Antwerp around 1633), the use of 'c-' was still widespread in the South. Amongst such users are Poirters, Bilius (see below on 'ck'), and De Swaen; and not only in the South, as the 'c-' was also widely used by Jan de Witt and Lodensteyn in the North, though both of these belong to the older school of spelling.

The weight of Nil Volentibus was put behind the 'k-' spelling in the early 1670's. As Pels wrote in his introduction of 1677: "ik (heb) eenige meerder nauwkeurigheid in het spellen van sommige lettergreepen, en het schrijven van sommige woorden, dan in het gemeen gedaan wordt, aangevend, volgens de regelen, die ons Kunstgenootschap, naa lang overleg, daar op gevonden heeft. ... Ik gebruik geen c, omdat het by ons eene overtollige letter is, die wij altijd met de k, of s, uitdrukken kennen".

After this date there is little comment to be found on the use of initial 'c-' in Dutch words, and what there is shows little variation. Comments such as Van Hoogstraten's "Van dese letter beginnen t'onrecht, mijns oordeels, woorden in onze taale, die men beknoptelijk en beter met k ... uitdrukt" can be found, with relatively little variation from a number of grammars, including Sewel, Grammaire plus exacte, Nylost, Moonen, La Grue (esp. the Sewel revision), Kramer, and Neugelenburg. It is remarkable that so many refer to this obsolete use long
Only A.C.G. in 1717 mentions any continued usage, probably because he is writing in the south: "De C in tegenwoordig bij de Nederlanders van karen c a\nblank ... Huisuaal afgezonderd. Wank vooordsen wierdt sy veeltijds als de \nhand gakje, oytgesnoren, gelijk ... noch hood by Somalde gebraukt wordt in \n'isbel, enk, alnhrayt' enz. Voor deze hebben 't, mijn oordeels, niet vol \nwaren". The allusion here (and elsewhere) to the "correct" sound of 'c' being \n't to be /s/ is due solely to the fact that the use of 'c' for 'k' having \ndied out, the only observable use of 'c' was indeed for /s/- before 'o,i'.

This rejection of the 'c' was taken by some so far that they did not even \nallow it a place in the alphabet. The first to do this was Van Belle, in which \nhe was followed by most of the Hut grammars, and ultimately by Behaegel, \nSmits, Wieland and Drill (see chap.19).

It must not be thought however that the use of 'c-' was totally obsolete, \nespecially in the south. The Snoeijjmes, dating from c.1770, bewails the fact \nthat "men vind zoo menige Vlaamse diktionarieën dewelke van elkander verschillen" \nin their use of 'k-'. The worst in this respect, it is then claimed, is Pomey's \ndictionary, - presumably the Novum Dictionarium Belgico Latinum of 1739, which \nis not by Pomey, but based on his Latin-French dictionary (1681) for the Latin \nhalf, as well as being, according to the introduction, much indebted to Binnart.

These seems to have been general discontent with the spelling of 'c/k' in this \nwork, for in the 1753 edition there is an editorial preface to the effect that \nhet gebruik van de letter c voor de vocaalen a, e, u, te stellen, heeft men in \ndesen Druck verandert", and similarly 'cl, on, cr' are now spelt 'kl, kn, kr'. As \nthe Snoeijjmes is clearly referring to the original state, not to the revised \nedition, this may indicate an earlier date for it than that usually given (e.g \nby De Vooys p.150 & Opstellen III,341). Each edition of "Pomey" however has a \ndifferent spelling, and a different defence in the preface! A few later works, \nsuch as Cramer, include brief comments on the obsolete use of 'c-' but these are \nno indication of a continued use of such forms (Cramer still has the notes in the \n1877 edition).
'c', 'k' or 'ck' in final and medial position.

This spelling will naturally be largely influenced by the choice between 'c' or 'k' in other positions, but the development is not exactly parallel. For the final '-c-' spelling persisted a little longer than the initial '-c-' spelling, which really died out very early in the 17th century (see above). A large number of those who replaced initial '-c-' by '-k-' would also replace final '-c-' by '-k-', but other factors came into play. Visually the final '-c-' is commoner than initial '-c-', as '-k-' had to be used before '-e,-i', but no restriction forced a final '-k-' spelling.

The basic Middle Dutch spelling was with '-c-': "druc, pac, zulc, were, denc, boec" etc. Thus the inflection of these words was as regular as for example the words "man mannen, spel spellen", except that the 'c' could not be doubled since the resultant spelling "+drucken" would have implied a /ks/ pronunciation; '-ck-' therefore had to be used, giving "drucken, scken, zulcken, wercken, dencken, boecken". As such a doubling was unnecessary in the latter examples, many writers simplified the spelling to "zulken, werken, denken, boeken". This was not done by all, as 'c' was felt to be the "real" spelling, and the 'k' little more than a diacritic, on a par with the 'h' of prepalatal 'gh'. In "wercken" for example it is not a matter of doubling in the same way as "man mannen" (as it is in "druc drucken") but simply the forced addition of a 'k' to keep the /k/ pronunciation. Later, when '-ck-' was replaced by '-kk-', and '-c/-ck' by '-k-', the analogy with "man mannen" became complete, e.g. "druck drukken".

However, a not inconsiderable number of writers, starting out from such forms as "drucken, wercken" deduced a basic form "druck, werck, zulck, denck, boeck" etc., where the doubling was superfluous in all examples. It is difficult to see why such spellings should have recommended themselves, as nothing in the Dutch spelling system supported them. Some have seen in this '-ck' spelling a German influence, but this would imply a simultaneous and equally great adoption of final double consonants in other words, which did not occur (cf. '-ll', '-nn' in chap.17). The final '-ck' spellings were by far the most common in the period between Middle Dutch and the end of the 17th century,- over two centuries in fact!

In Middle Dutch, as stated above, the final spelling '-c-' was the most common, with the regular inflection forms in '-cken'. As the addition of 'k' was of
little more than discursive value, not part of the "real" spelling, it was also added to 'k' after a long vowel, e.g. "spreec, speecken", - in fact all final 'c's had a 'k' added to them (the spelling 'kk' is very uncommon). The resultant double letter however necessitated the retention of the double vowel. Several, but not all, simplified this spelling by reducing the 'ck' to 'k' and dropping one vowel, possibly under the influence of words with no basic form ending in '-c', e.g. "teken" might encourage "spreken". It is also possible that some thought "spreken" the basic form, and "spreec" derived from it, which would have the same effect.

As an example of Middle Dutch irregularity in this respect the Exercitium of 1439 is typical: in its final spellings can be found "stark, starr, welck, welleck, bleyc, weeck, siec, strick, ick, wijelick, helyelick". The 1433 edition used by Kooiman seems to be much more regular than this Deventer edition, usually having such as "ic, boec, coninck" where the later copy has "ick, boeck, coninck". There appear to be no examples of final 'k'. In medial position a logical system is strictly adhered to: 'ck' is standard after a short vowel, as would be expected, and after a long vowel where there is no basic form in '-c(k)' a single '-k' is used: "teyken, rekenen, wokeren", as also however in "soeken, eeken, maken, ghelijke" where there is such a basic form in "soec(k)" etc. Not so consistent is the contemporary Boecius translation of 1435. There final '-c', 'ck' and 'k' occur, as in "werc, ic, dinc, dienck, Werk" etc.

Even Lambrecht is irregular, at least in final position: 'c' or 'ck' are both used with little appearance of system, e.g. in the Naembouck: "haec, preec, rije, loec, ooc; wijck, bezouck, beluwck, ghebruck; ghebac, bec; werck, zuleck" etc.

In medial position however he is perfectly systematic: after a short vowel he has 'ck' ("wecken"), after a long vowel 'k' ("spreken, breken, ghebruenk"). The only exception to this is after the digraph 'ou' which he consistently treats as a short vowel: "clouckaert, boucken, houcken, doucken, verzoucken, bezoucken (but "zouken"), vluucken, coucke" etc. This 'ouck' spelling was, however, long a traditional spelling in the South, and often forms an exception. Kilian is slightly irregular in his usage, allowing such as "ghebruycken" after a long vowel, and such alternatives as "ake, secke".

The first to show any preference for a final simple 'k' was Sexagius.
Although he does not express himself on this point, and the usage is often irregular within the text, it is significant that in his spelling-list only '-k' occurs: "ik, roek, loeuk". Such spellings occur nowhere within the text, where '-c' predominates, with some '-ck' (only in "haack, wrack, back, beec, stec, good, roeck"). There are no examples of medial use in his spelling list, and though the text has a regular system with '-ck-' after short vowels and '-k-' after long (except "bracken"- bruiken), if he did wish to adopt '-k', then he may also have wished to adopt '-kk-'. Both Lambrecht and Sexagius show one feature that was fairly common throughout the '-ck' period, that of dropping the 'k' in compound or before endings beginning with a consonant: e.g. "haacten, schaacten, waacten, culcts, bowspraters". A secondary influence in the use of '-ct' even amongst those who normally use '-ck' may well have been the popularity of the printers' digraph cliché 'cd'.

No actual comments on these spellings came until De Heuiter wrote his book in 1581, though even he did not wish to be too dogmatic, possibly because of the wide variations in contemporary usage. "In d'elinde der woorden, daer c. of k. mah vallen, geve ic igelic zijn keuze. In tmiddel der woorden, die nature des letters rade ic t'anzien", - this last phrase is probably to cover the differing usage after long or short vowels. It is significant that he allows '-k' as a final spelling, possibly in emulation of Sexagius (whose work he knew), but does not allow, or even mention, '-ck'. His own preference for final spellings was the more conservative traditional '-c'. In medial position only '-ck-' is allowed however, on aesthetic grounds, - "mede verchiert c. t'geschrift daer anders twee c. ofte k. mouten komen bij een, als hier 'backen, shacken"' (had he encountered '-cc-' spellings?). This is probably why he chose '-c' as his final spelling, as a system involving the inflexion "bak backen " would be hard to justify.

The Twe-spraack also preferred '-ck-' and used this spelling, together with the indispensability of 'c' in 'ch', as a reason for retaining the 'c' in other positions: "dies zoud'ick de 'c' laten behouden haar ghewoonlyck gheluyd ende bezighen die 'ock daar de 'k' in gheklank verdubbeld om de niewicheid te myen, van 'kk' te schryven". This does not necessarily imply that he already knew of '-kk-' spellings, he may simply be rejecting an idea that had occurred to him. He
does not discuss the use of final 'ck'. It may be that he did not consider it
important, and he certainly had no qualms about giving "Zack, Kas" as palindromes
on p. 107. Van Weel in later had similar examples: "Zak, Kas; Klok, Kolk" (1625, 113)
and "Floc, Golk; Sok, Kas" (1613, 152). The latter is forced into violation of its
rules to give one of its examples, whereas the 1625 edition and the Twe-spraak
follow the rules and give inaccurate examples.

Not until 1612, 30 years later, did anyone suggest the adoption of 'kk-'. In
this year two pleas for this spelling appeared, from Jacob van der Schuere and
David Mostart. This also affected the spelling in final position, demanding the
acceptance of a simple 'k'. "Over al daer de 'k' 'taynden inde Sillaben achter
ander letteren komt, word in 't geneen ('twalk 'toude gebruyk is) noch een 'c'
voor aande 'k' gesteld, als 'geluck', 'werk' ens. alwaer de 'c' de kracht van 'k'
toege-eygend word, ende volgens dien alzoo vél als twee 'k' gesteld worden, daer
maer een en behoefd: ofte daer moeste beweren zijn, dat de 'k' win kracht heft om
op te rusten (i.e. to come in final position), dan eenige ander letter van den
A.B., die wy alle eenvoudig gebruyken"; - such a usage is as pointless as "staff,
schooff...daer in de Hoog-duydschen met hun 'mm' ende 'tt' na-bootzen: 'twalk
vél meer van overtolligheyd te bestraffen, als naer te volgen is, ende zal
derhalven genoeg zijn, datmen stelle 'geluk, werk', ende alzoo alle anders".

The medial 'ck-' is just as heavily criticised: "Het behaegd ook schier een
yegelijk, dat daer een Sillabe in 'k' eyndigd, ende de volgende Sillabe in 'k'
begind, datmen daer in plaatze vande eyndigende 'k' een 'c' steld, als 'wacker,
gecken' ende diergelycke: als of de 'k' krachteloouzer waer, dan d'ander
me-klink-Letteren om een Sillabe te eyndigen, ende de naestvolgende te beginnen:
ende gelijk ofmen met de zelwe vastigheyd, daer mede datmen schrijft 'tobbe,
effen, padde, dogge, vallen, jammer, konnen, lappen, morren, wassen, letten' ens.
ook niet en zoude mogen schryven 'wakker, gekken, onschikkelyk, slocken,
plukken' ende ander zulke".

It cannot be said that Van der Schuere had too immediate success with his new
spelling. David Mostart supports him in the same year, though as his book is lost
one must rely for this information on Ampzing. That his book comes after Van der
Schuere's is suggested by the fact that the latter makes no reference to any other
users of 'kk-'. Otherwise it was to be another 25 years before anyone else
repeated the argument, and many more years before the spelling became at all

Only one year after van der Schuere's and Coster's attempts at reform,
Cuyper rejects any such change. The 'kk' spelling, he claims, has a "te heren
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Thus he abides by normal usage, though concerning De Heuiter's choice of '-c', he thinks that he "kennelijk ende gewiszelijk gemist heeft".

In the same year as Ampzing, the translators of the Bible are even more conservative, rejecting any attempt to replace 'ck' in any position: "C 7. 'wijcken, dijcken, strijcken' per 'ck'. ... C 8. 'dancken, crancken, dencken,
recken, rucken, abcken' per 'ck'. In fine scribendum 'ck' non 'c' nec 'k'
onae. ... K 1. 'dekk' akkeur. K 2. 'crack' scribendum, non 'crank'" etc. 
The only concession is before 1": "K 4. 'maekte' interdum potest scribi cum
's', ommissus 'k'", and in the Hebrew names "Zadok, Jabbok, habakuk". After a
long vowel they allow either spelling: "C K ... in 'saecke, wraecke, spraecke'
iccol ambigua sit in 'breake, sprake'."

Although Gleem added his weight to the 'kk' spellings, the '-ck-' continued
to be the most popular. Continuus however goes back to the older usage and adopts
'-c-' alongside the medial '-ck-', which in this way once more becomes a consistent
spelling. He is not altogether satisfied with this spelling however. As he
recognises the plural ending as '-en', and the inflexional ending as '-e', a
word such as "dick", must, by removing the inflexion, have the basic form "dick"
(cf.chap.17): "... in 'saecke, wraecke, spraecke' licet ambiguum sit in 'breake, sprake'."

By the mid 1630's however, the '-kk-' spelling was becoming more common, and
the use of '-c-' was even more in decline. Whether reflecting this trend or
contributing to it (or both) it is not clear, but at this time Hooft was
beginning to use the '-kk-' spelling much more, though he is not consistent.
The only example of medial /k/ in his Waernemingen is "drukken" in No.34, and
no words has any final spelling other than '-k'. His earlier works, such as
Achilles ende Polyxena, and Baeto, only have '-ck-', which was really the only
current spelling at the time of writing/printing.

More conservative again are the entries in Hexham's dictionary of 1648, with
'-ck' in "ick, oock, lichamelijk, lichamelicken, wrinckelen" etc., even though
his grammar in the appendix repeats Van Heule's dicta: "'Zaec' and 'Zaecken',
Cause, Causes, 'c' (is changed) into 'k'". This is by now a little out of date,
in grammars at least, though common usage continued to show a strong liking for
"-ck" and "-ck-". The Manly revision of Hexham (1672) omits this reference to
"-ck" and "-ck-". The retention of 'ck' in the dictionary entries was due to the
considerable conservativeness of the printer Arnout Leers, not merely absence of critical
editorship of previous editions (see his comments in chap.5).

Kok is more progressive and departs from these traditional spellings, as does
Leupenius. After pointing out the incorrect use of 'c' in normal Dutch words
("calf", "cost" etc.), he goes on: "zo weinig reeden heeft het ook dat men se
ominolog gebruikt, daar sy geen kracht noch dienst doen kan, gelyk sy gemeenlyk
gestellt wordt voor een 'k', 'ick, maack, kercken', daer niet meer dan eene 'k'
van nooden is, om de kracht van het geluid uit te drukken'.

"Wanneer de 'k' dan noch moest versterkt worden, dat moest niet geschieden door
een 'c', maar door een 'k!', en men moet niet schryven 'stocken, blokken, stucken,
krucken' maar 'stokken, blokken, stukken, krucken!'. He is then in favour of the
"new" spelling with '-k' and '-kk-'.

Van der Weyden too condemns those who "vele overtollige letteren, tot
verlenginge harer schriftten, gebruyken, als in 'ick'! 'Bruck, ... kruck, luck'
"c (werdt) immers alzo qualik geschreven ... als 'hoff, schooff, staff, wall, well,
will, datt, ditt, lott, satt" (cf. Van der Schuere); 'c' could also be dropped in
"bencken, dancken" etc..

Of similar progressive views is Van den Ende, who becomes the first
lexicographer to use such spellings as "drukken". In his introduction however
he only concerns himself with superfluous use of '-ck' in final position and
after a long vowel; one is left to deduce from such entries that he also opposed
'-ck-' elsewhere: "De overvloed van lettren heb geschoudt, zoo veel my mogelijk
is geweest, alzo 't onvoeglijk is, veel letters te gebruiken daar 't weynige
doen konnen; Derhalven spelle ik bondig ende kort: Aldus 'Ik,...Zaken, Waken,
Grotelijx, Strax, Zulkx, Bexken, Taxken, Strixken, Krixken', ende niet na ouder
gewoonte: 'Ick,...Saecken, Waecken, Grotelijcks, Strackx, Sulckx, Beckxken,
Tackxken, ..."etc.. Note that his main motive is economy of letters, not the
logicality of this or other systems.

In the South the situation was more conservatively inclined. Bolognino's
Noodellicke Ortographie of 1657 retains 'ck' in "drukken, welcke", though while
using "ick, druck" occasionally, he prefers '-'c': "men sal achterlaten de 'k'
achter de 'k' omdat... de 'k' niet met allen en doet tot het geluid van de
\('c\'); 'ck' is only allowed before 'i, a', and final 'l-k' is only allowed before
\('l-h-y-d', no 'l' would produce a misleading 'a-h-y'. Thus he uses "hérinc,
courson, sônic, on, clans, sols, gelycmen, trext" etc.. Nor is this an
isolated case, for a few years later Binart (see above) described 'k' as
"alleenslyck een auxilliar oft moest letter... om dat over al waer men met de
't' gevaecken kan, gheen 'k' van doen en heeft". It is only the possibility of
mispronunciation which prevents him writing "boucen, druccen" et cie... Binart's
First DIctionary, of 1636, with the same usage for 'ck', does not contain these
comments, though they would have become more in keeping with that period.

Other Southerners were slightly more progressive. Bilius wrote in his
introduction of 1661: "De maniere van schryven of van spellen zal soo wesen, die
su bedene daeghys by vele Verstandslycke Schryvren gebruyct wert (1); te weten,
al-soom gelyck-son sprecket, met spering van die Letteren, die inde uyts-spraec
geenen clanck en gheeven, of niet gehoort en werden, by examel: 'Daeghelyckxsche,
Opgetogentheydt'; in welke woorden en diergelyke ganaegeen blyckt, dat vele
Letteren geyen clanck en gheeven, oversulkx men de selve derven can, en schryven:
'Dagelycse, Opgetogentheyt". Thus although his views are more progressive than
Binart's, he still favours the use of 'c' rather than 'k'.

In the same year, 1661, Beyer deviated from Van Heule, his model, and
recommended 'k' and 'kk': "De spellinge die door 'c' geschiet wilde ik liever
door 'k' gedaen hebben, soo dikwils het mogelik is; en die van 'ck', of door 'k'
alleenslik, of door 'kk' naer eisch van zaken, om dat de 'c' den Latijnen schijnt
als eigen te zijn; ik zoude se dan seer weinig gebruiken, en mischien niet
anders dan als 'ch' by malkander moeten staen; waarom wy ook de 'c'
alleenslik na het oude gebruik in ons ABC gestelt hebben: ik zoude nog 'ooc'
achrijven, maer 'ook'; niet 'vriendelikke' maar 'vriendelike' &c"(p.102). He
feels obliged however to refer to Van Heule's use of "'c' om (de woorden) te
eindigen;... welke spellinge ik niet zoude durven verwerpen".

Hillenius, in 1664, writes that "some leave out 'c' when it sounds like 'k':
and altogether use the letter 'k' instead thereof: as 'schicken', they leave out
'c' and write 'schikken', 'ghelucken, ghelukken'. Or write 'k' onely when 'c' is
superfluous, as 'zulcke, zulke, welcke, welke".(Richardson copies this in his
Anglo-Belgica of 1677, p.4,)
Whal. may have been a decisive factor in sealing the fate of the 'ck', 'ck-', spelling, for when Vondel changed over to the use of '-kk-' around 1666, up to that time he had used 'ck' in all positions, medial, final, before 't', e.g. *volck, volkon, breeckt*. This is one of the very few spelling changes which Vondel adopted at a stroke, there was usually a transitional phase when he used both old and new spellings side by side. Although many writers were changing from 'ck' to 'kk', possibly in emulation of Hooft and Vondel, a form such as can be found in a poem by Anna Maria van Schurman (ob. 1673): "Die 't swackke sterven last en 't siecke niet geneest" must be regarded as a misprint, however attractive the idea of a "compromise spelling"! Her normal usage is '-ck', 'ck-', as shown by "siecke".

After this date no grammar was ever to actively defend the use of 'ck' (with the one idiosyncratic exception of Van Daele, see below). All Volentibus adopted '-kk-' in around 1673, and amongst those who used '-kk-' in the latter half of this century are Felse, Pruijn, Paier (all members of Nil), Brandt, Layken, Dullaert etc..

Usage continued to tolerate 'ck' to a fairly large extent however (Laconis... had still recommended it in 1666), sufficiently at least for Winschooten to want to condemn it in 1633: "deese letter C ... is tweesins jammerlijk misbruikt geweest (ub);... te waten, als zij gesteld werd bij de letter K agter een tweelank, of twee klinker (= dipthong/double vowel),... als in 'Beek, Haak', voor 'Boek, Haak'...: ten tweede werd de C misbruikt in woorden, die met KK moeten geschreven worden... gelijk 'Slabben' geschreven werd met BB, 'Kladden' met DD, 'Eggen' met GG,...alsoo besluiten wij mede dat het woordje 'Sakken', en alle andere van dat slag met geen CK, maar met KK geschreven moeten worden".

The only word to have 'ck' in his dictionary is "Circkel", a loan word, possibly for the reasons discussed in a later section, for "Mirakel". Kuyper also uses '-ck-' (see the discussion of 'nck' below).

It is also possible that sporadic use of '-c' continued. Although no examples have been noted later than Bilius and Binnart (the latter still in the later editions of his dictionary!), Van Geesdale and Nyloë still feel it necessary to condemn the spelling at the beginning of the next century: "Men hoede zich vooral de 'c' ooit achter een woort of lettergreep te zetten, als
37.

Anno 1753 dictionary, criticized by the Geneesman for its retention of 'c', also brought its use of 'ck' up to date in the 1753 edition, where the introduction states "dat de overtollige letters...te 'c' voor 'k' (achtergelaten zijn)...en dat men gestelt heeft...'gelyk,..ik, pek, zak,'...Sc in plaats van...'ghelyck,... ick, peck, zack'.

The use of '-ck-' was still not entirely dead however, - the Grammaire pour apprendre le flamande of 1757 still uses "boecken, wercken", and the booklet "Sorf Begryp van de Staat Aerschot" of 1766, as representative of conservative popular usage, still uses 'ck' in all positions: "Boeck, gelyck, oock; geraeckt, boecksken; kercke, welcke; drucker; boecken, naecken (cf. "seken")". Such usage did not last much longer however, and the '-kk-' was already very common, under the influence of Bincken's "Fondamenten" of 1757, and Des Roches's Spraek-konst of 1761. Several later grammatical works still found it necessary to condemn the use of 'ck', e.g. Zeydelaar, Craeser, Bolhuis; and the Inleyding of 1785 writes that "onkundige schryven nog: 'ick, back, beck, bock, buck' alwaer de 'c' teemeneel overtollig is: ook word de zelve uit 'boecken, bocken', gebannen, behoorende 'boeken, bokken' te schryven".

Thus although it is possible that some of these comments are merely referring to what readers may encounter in older books, it is equally possible that they knew of some continued use of 'ck'.

Van Daele, in line with his theory that 'c' and 'k', sounding the same, were consequently interchangable (cf. chap.13!), felt that "'decken' so goed geschréven is als 'dekk'".

The use of '-kk-' after long vowels is further discussed in chap.17.

The spellings 'ngh', 'nck', 'ngk', 'nkk', 'ngg'.

The use of '-ng' with a pronunciation as /ŋk/ is well-documented (Schönfeld 841,74; Van Helten 143f; Van Loey 106; Franck 887; Weijnen p.36 etc.), usually using variant forms such as "jonk" taken from literary texts. However several grammarians have commented upon this dialectal feature and its effect upon the
spelling. The pronouncing of /k/ in the combination spelt 'ng' persisted in
local use much longer than the spelling development may suggest. Already in
the late 17th century such forms as "jonk, gink, jank" were becoming less common.
Before c.1650 they were very common, in the forms "jonc, jonk, jonck" according
to the individual writer's use of '-c' and '-k', and such forms were often
accepted as normal. The Bible translators for instance wrote "C s. 'conick,
dineck, dineck, inboringe, vreeck" etc. per CK quod mutatur etiam in G.
'soming, dinge, ringen" (similarly G 12). They regard these forms as on a
par with "lijf lijven" and the Latin "Rex reges, et similium".

As stated by the translators, the final /-k/ was changed to the fricative
/g/ in inflected forms, which is why the 'g' was used in "ringen". Those who
normally used 'gh' would naturally spell "ringhen". Although the final /gk/
eventually developed into /ng/, the transition was foreshadowed to a certain
extent by the influence of gelijkvormigheid spellings. Here the necessity of
spelling '-nga' in the inflected forms led to the use of final '-ng' in the basic
form. This spelling certainly pre-dates the completion of the change from /gk/
to /ng/, as is shown by statements from various grammarians. Some of these give
/gk/ as a variant pronunciation for /ng/, and some go further and allow either
spelling; still others regard /gk/ as a very undesirable pronunciation/spelling.

One of the first to mention such a variation is Kilian. In his dictionary
he recognizes both spellings: "ringh, rinck; dingh, dinck" etc., but under one
word he mentions the difference not only in spelling (both these spellings could
represent /gk/) but also in the sound: "'koninck'dicitur 'koninck'". This
strongly suggests that he considers /gk/ the main pronunciation, allowing the
spelling with '-gh' only because of the inflected form.

Van der Schuere thinks the spelling with '-ck' undesirable, but is not clear
which pronunciation he hears: "zoo word, van velen, daer 'twoord in 'ng' eyndigen
moet de 'e' of 'nek' gebruykt. Daer nochtans elk met reden wel behoord te
verstaen, dat alle woorden (die in't verlangen met 'ge' of 'gen' eyndigen,wanneer
de 'e' of 'en' ... afgevaard word) behooren met 'g', ende niet met 'ch'("dach")
of 'ck' te eyndigen". The spelling "lanck" for "lang" is thus put on a par with
"dach" for "dag" where no difference in pronunciation occurs. He is thus in
favour of only the '-g' spelling, especially as this enables the differentiation
of "lang-bangen" and "bank-banken" etc.

Ampzing used his name as an example of this spelling, and his statement suggests that it is more a matter of spelling than of pronunciation: "Ik schrijf ook 'Ampzinge' niet een 'Ampzine' tydgen, ende niet meer met 'ck': want also ik de
-ck' van oogen weere overwaelligheid naer de rechte spellinge moeste weg-serpen,...
ende also veranderinge maken, so hebbe ik de 'g' in de plaatze liever an te
neren, voor in my toich in de Latijnscye sprake os der soetichcyd wilte korn te
veranderen". The '-ck' cannot be used because he wished to avoid 'c' in any
position, and the '-ng' spelling was thus preferable to the resultant '-nk' form,
evidently on grounds of the relationship of 'c' and 'g' in Latin. As he then
goes on to formulate a gelykverwijzigheid rule, it is most likely however that his
main motive in defending the '-ng' spelling is analogy with '-ngen' in the
inflected forms. On the actual pronunciation of "Ampzinge" with /ng/ or /gk/
his comments are inconclusive.

Van Heule is possibly more explicit. He hears both pronunciations, and
allows both spellings: "Gec verandert de K sombliches in eene G, als 'Koninc,
Koningen, Ganck, Gangen'"(p.62). Although this only mentions the /-k/ pronun-
ciation and the '-c' spelling, he elaborates further on p.143: "Als naer N eene
G volchte zo wort de G in eene C of K verandert, als in plaetse van 'Koning' zegt
men 'Koninc', also zeggen wy 'Spronc' voor 'Sprong'". However it is important
to realise that none of these statements above from Kilian, Van der Schuere,
Ampzinge or Van Heule, necessarily imply the existence of a /-ng/ pronunciation,
they could all be equally consistent with a desire merely to point out that the
spelling with '-g', caused by gelykverwijzigheid, did not accurately represent
the actual pronunciation.

The same is true, probably, of Leupenius: "men moet (om) de wortelletteren
... te behouden ... niet schryven 'rink' ... maar 'ring'"(p.25). He does not
mention the pronunciation. Van den Ende too only refers to the spelling: "'Gang'
...ende niet na ouder gewoonte ... 'Gangh' of 'Ganck', Desgelijx ... 'ding,
ontfang, vang,...'ing' &c ende niet ... 'dink,... ontfanck, vanck',... omdat men
(schrijft)...'ontfang-en' &c". He does not altogether outlaw the alternative
spelling however, as is shown by such entries as "gank ofte gang". Bolognino
criticises Van den Ende for misrepresenting the sound in "'ding, ontfang, vang',
One of the first to mention the /-nk/ pronunciation was Valentijn, where he says: "Modem the "-ang" spelling of such words as "vang-ag"; thus a lengthening of the /-ng/ sound, replacing /-nk/. All Valentijn's say much the same in their pronunciation with reference to "bangst/ank t, jonk/jonk, koning/konink"... die zien wonder vanvoorspel op met /-nk/, of met 'uitgesproken". They then support this with examples of /-ng/ (then pronounced /-nk/) rhyming with /-nk/ in "Vreugdige Vrij": "dessangt/ent Franck" or "bedeekt/ontfankt" according to the edition, and "Jonk/ontfonk" in "Harsdreek", Ruygens ("bonck/dwank" in "Constante kon") and Cagemaan ("derbrangt/drenkt" p. 32). It is very significant here that they use these rhyme-pairs to show their readers that '-ng' could be pronounced /-nk/. If /-nk/ had been the normal pronunciation of '-ng' this would have been unnecessary. Van Helderen (who uses "gink" etc. in his dictionary, p. 54) observes in 1633 that "een 'g' na een 't' woort' in 'gink' galazerd" (p. 3), and in his leef-schrift-boek takes that "lank" heeft een scherper geluid als 'ang'... 'kink, alink'.

Again it is not altogether clear whether Nyloe is referring to spelling only, or also to the pronunciation when he writes "De 'g' en 'k' worden dikwyls verwisselt en men schryft 'Koning' en 'Konink', 'lang' en 'lank', 'gank' en 'gank'". But this is not the case with Dewel. Writing in the Boekezaal (then "Tweemaaaandelyksche Uittreksels") for 1703b, 120, for which he was at that time the editor, he strongly criticises the /-nk/ pronunciation, which must thus by then have been regarded as old-fashioned: "Menigmaal heb ik iemand berispt, als ik hoorde lezen de woorden 'gang, wrang, Koning', enz. met een scherpe uitspraak der letter 'g' (= /g/), en t'elkens daarop gezegd, dat men die letter daar niet scherp maar stomp uytspreeken moet" (is he advocating /-pgh/?).

E.G.P. merely echoes Nyloe: "Voorders mag men 'Koninc' en 'Koning' spellen, 'lanck' en 'lang', 'jonck' en 'jong', 'ganck' en 'gang' enz." (p. 31). But Tuinman was a little more exact: although he only accepts the now standard '-ng' spelling he is aware of the /-nk/ pronunciation- "Dit is noch in de hedendaegsche taal geaan. Men zegt 'Konink' voor 'Koning', 'Koninkryk' voor 'Koningryk', 'lank' voor 'lang', 'ontfank' voor 'ontfang' enz." (Appendix, 67).

Zeydelaar seized upon this variation in pronunciation and put it to practical
One position in which the /yk/ pronunciation was long preserved, and is still in use now, is in compound words, and especially before the suffix '-lijk'. This gives such forms as "koninkrijk, koninklijk, afhankelijk". Two developments have influenced the forms of these words—the loss of '-k' in final position, as discussed above, was often accompanied by loss of /k/ in this position, either through the same development, or because a particular writer thought the 'k' intrusive (in the same way as a 'p' in "koepel" for example), and secondly the increase in gelijkvormigheid spelling caused many to put in the 'g' which belonged to the basic form "koning, hangen" etc. This gave the options "koninklijk" and "koninglijk", both of which are very common.

A third group however applied both arguments, and spelt with '-ng' because of the basic form, and also added a 'k' for the pronunciation, resulting in such spellings as "koninglijk, afhankelijk". These are not as common, but for a certain period they enjoyed some popularity. The normal course was however to retain the historical and more simple spelling with '-nk-'.

Alongside the forms "koninglijk" etc. can be found a similar spelling in the basic words, such as "langk", though these are not common. They are probably formed in exactly the same way as such forms as "hadt, landt" where the 'd' is for gelijkvormigheid and the 't' for pronunciation. Forms such as "langk" are of reasonable antiquity, for De Heuiter is already criticising them in 1581: "Geclaingk, wat douter 'g'?' and similarly for "dwaingk",—note that these are now '-nk' and '-ng' respectively, whereas he pronounces them both with /pk/. His own spelling is '-nc' in both cases. The next to comment on these forms was De Hubert, who allows the pronunciation to overrule gelijkvormigheid on this
occasions, giving "Sprink-Baan", not "Sprong-Baan" (p.136).

For regular users of "-nc(t)", however, the forms presented no problem, "-tic" being usually added to the basic form already ending in "-c", "-ck" or "-k". Van Baal, for example (1633, 30) gives "Koninglic van Koninc", though he uses "Koninglinc" on p.11 of the 1633 edition. Other writers' usage differed, however, for example Van Engelen who, although regularly using "-nek" spellings, uses "Koningrykon" in his Introduction; the actual text has, a little more consistently, "koninkraat".

One of the first to use the "-ngk" spelling before the "phonetic" 't' was Vondel, who regularly uses such forms as "langk, koningklijk". This usage was bound to influence other writers, even in the next century, where, for example, Font uses "gingk", Langendijk uses "Koningklyke", F. De Ruybert uses "langklyk", and Van den Schelling (revision of Van Alkemade's "Diaplecticinen") uses "oorsprongk". (309). (311) In his questions to Vondel (1671) uses "vischvank".

Nyloë refers back to Vondel's usage when, following on from the quotation given above, he adds that "'g' en 'k' worden verwisselt (in) 'gevangenis' en 'gevangenis', ook well 'gevangkenis, langkheyd' of 'vergankbaar', met 'gk'; maar dit leste, schoon ik het op gezag van Vondel en anderen ook gevolgt hebbe, komt nu wat hart voor, en my dunkt dat een van beide 'g' of 'k' hier genoeg is" (p.42). This is not the only occasion that he refers to a recent change in his spelling (see, for example, chap.15).

In his review of the first edition of this book (Boekzaal 1703b, 120) Sewel comments: "De spelling van 'gevangkenis, langkheyd', ens. op't gezag van Vondel en andere, volg ik maar zelden, evenwel dunkt my de 'gk' in de woorden 'onafhangklijk, vergangklijk' ens. niet ongeryad te syn". In accordance with this decision he spells "gevangenis" in his grammars and dictionaries. He only allows the "-ngk-' spelling before the suffix '-lijk', i.e. where it still exists today. In his dictionary of 1703, however, he adds the following to his comments on "'K' in plaats van 'C'": "Vondel spelde in zyne tyd 'Jongk, langk, zangk': maar hy heeft daarin weynige naavolgers gehad; doch 'gevangkenis, vergangklyk, afhangklyk' is by soumigen nog in gebruyk". This insertion is clearly inspired by his reading of Nyloë.

Nyloë's basic "koninc" spelling found no favour with Poeret. As the 'g' is
a "wortelletter" it cannot be left out, and "koningk" should be used. This is
in deviation from Voonen's usage, which he is defending in this work, though
Voonen does say that the 'g' in "koning" is nearer to the 'g' "van den
Vlaanderen".

The paragraph given above from Nylew was also the inspiration of E.C.F.'s
comments: "Het schijnt wel dat 'koninglijk' beter als (\{ dan) 'koninglijk' luidt;
vaar 'Konings-huys' schijnt beter te luiden als 'Koninks-huys'; 'lang-moedig'
al 'lank-moedig', 'jong-man' als 'jongk-man', 'gang-beer' als 'gank-beer' enz.
J.v.Vondel spelde voor-dezen 'jongk, langk, vergangelijk, springkhaen,
Koningklijk' enz. 'E volk met onse uitspraak ten uitersten overeenkomt; en
wanneer het Gesyn dar te gelyckfde te vallen, zou ik dese Spellings, voor twee
anderes, sonder enige twijfeling den voor-gang geven", - the two others being
"Koningklyk, Koninglijk", would E.C.F. thus prefer to see the /ng/ sound always
spelt 'ng', even before 'k'? It would seem so (cf the use of final '-ngk' given
above), but consistent use of this rule would lead to such spellings as "dengken,
dangken". Ten Kate was not attracted to such a move, and regarded the "enk" as
one sound, "'ek met een neusklank", on a par with "eng", thus making the form
"klank" adequate in representing the sound, just as "gang" was.

The existence of Vondel's 'ngk' spellings was still influencing grammars in
the mid 18th century. Van Belle (1743) writes:
"G-K is gants hoogmoedig om 'afhangklyk'
Te spellen, als ook 'Springkhaen' en 'vergangklyk';
Want zonder G waar 't woord te kort gedaan,
En zonder K kon de uitspraak niet bestaan".
Thus 'k' was needed because it was heard, and 'g' because it was part of the
basic word. He is not arguing (as did E.C.F.) that 'nk' did not represent
the sound.

De Haes uses the same argument 13 years later: "De 'gk' bezigen wy in de
woorden 'koningk, jongkvrouw, springkhaen, oorsprongkelyk',... 'g' als
wortelletter, 'k' tot behulp der uitspraak" (p. 14), except that unlike Van Belle
he also mentions words with final '-ngk'. Zeydelaar, who often refers to De Haes,
may have been thinking of this statement when he wrote that "Sommige schrijven
'toegangelijk, oorsprongelijk, aanvangelijk', behoudende de 'g', omdat die in
't woordelwoord gevonden wordt". Holtrop, in 1783, rejects the final 'k' in such
as "zangk", which may thus have still been a current form.
The next comment on these spellings, from Siegenbeek in his "Invloed..."., condemns them as being on a par with the superfluous use of "nl." in names, though if the normal pronunciation is /ng/ the analogy is not exact. The /nk/ pronunciation he claims to be dead, except before '-lijk'; "Koninkryk" should become "Koningrijk" by analogy with "Vindingrijk"! He was not alone in preferring such spellings. Willem wrote in 1824: "Wat 'koninklyk, aenvankelyk, vergankelyk' en meer zulke woorden is betreffens; schoon wy er waere af zyn, van deze sanier van schryven belachelijk te vinden, gelyk sommigen doen, zoo verkozen wy toch liever 'koninglyk, aenvanglyk, verganglyk'(zonder inlaaenschong der 't achter 'g') omdat wy gelooven, dat de 'g', op 'k' overgaende, niet eigenlyk 'k' wordt, maar dat de 'gl' hier gelyk in het hoogduitsche 'gleich' moet worden uitgesproken". He had at least some phonetic theory behind his use of these forms, many others had rejected the '-nk-' forms merely because 'k' was not a "wortelletter".

Smit had a theory too, but it was different from that of anyone else: the original pronunciation had been "genc" with the 'c' pronounced as a Dutch /g/ (see chap.3), viz. /gâch/. But then,"door het invoeren der (Fransche) uitspraak onzer 'c'", the pronunciation became (sic) /gank/, similarly causing "vergangelijk". In this way, he argues, the '-age' spelling is more Dutch (i.e. older) than the '-ake', the latter being only caused by a mis-pronunciation of the Dutch 'c' (= /ch/) in the French way (= /k/).

Some basic feeling that the 'g' of "koning" should really be retained in "koninkje" must have lived on for a very long time, as in 1954 the Woordenlijst still felt it necessary to warn against spelling "koningkje". There is no reason, incidentally, why the diminutive of "koning" (at sim. should not be written "koningkje", with '-kje' regarded as a variant suffix in the same way as '-je' becomes '-pje, -tje' etc.

The factor which caused so many writers to be dissatisfied with such spellings is that the sound /ng/ is usually represented by 'ng', but can also be represented by 'n' alone, - i.e. before 'k'. Rombouts considered this an unavoidable irregularity in the spelling: "Daar er geen aanvaardbare oplossing door vereenvoudiging voor de hand ligt (we zouden 'slank' als 'slangk', 'rank' als 'rangk', 'zinken' als 'zingken', kunnen spellen, maar 'vereenvoudiging' kan
It is arguable whether forms such as "langk" from Vondel are a case of "lang" with a 'k' added for pronunciation, or an attempt to render /ng/ by 'ng' in all positions; the latter may well be the case as the same spelling can also be found in "lengekelen", though it is admittedly much less common. "Via is however, also supported by a particular spelling which many other writers used. Long after final '-ck' ceased to be common, many writers were still using it after 'n' ("daneck, danck" etc.). As these writers used the 'ck' only after 'n' it is highly suggestive of an attempt to use the '-nc-' as a sign for /ng/ with the normal 'k' to follow.

Only one grammar has ever discussed such a usage, but this is sufficient to show that 'nc' was indeed used as a digraph to represent /ng/ before 'k'. This writer was Fontanus, as early as 1635. He is discussing the various misprints in the book when he comes across the use of 'ck' instead of a more regular 'k': "Zoo staat oog wel 'klincken', voor 'klinken'. Doch ben nuu van meening geworden dat het beter is in deze gelegenheit te schrijven 'ck', uit oorzaec en in de zin gecomen is datmen door dezer middelen de 'Eng' zonder grote vreeselijkheid over al in't gewone schrijven onderscheidelijk uitdrukken kan. Want alzoo 'nc' of 'ng' voor een 'erk vande 'Eng' neemt, galijs 'ch' vande 'ech': en datmen schrijft 'clinch, clincken, danck, dancken, Ancchises, bedencking'.

While the use of 'ck' in other positions was widespread it is impossible to distinguish such a use of 'nc' for /ng/. Later on however it becomes quite clear. This practice was still current at the turn of the century, for both Kuyper and Hilarides use 'ck' only after 'n', using '-kk-' intervocalically. The former, in his Vyfde Deel, has for example "puncten, klinckert, klancken", whereas the
other words such as "nukke" have 'k' alone. In the introduction to the Vierde Deel (combining spelling like only), he writes that "In dit Vierde Deel gebruiken (k) voor 't 'k' en ook 'kk' als in de woorden 'gelucken' en 'gelukig' ook (c) enkel in 'cl' ongetrans. en den weer gebruyke, als 'denken', 'denck', of "denken", on dergelycke ween. De reden waarom ik dit alzo hebbe gedaan, is, om dat ik hoope dat de eene d'een en de ander d'ander mafter volgt".

Hilberide's usage is much the same. In his Phaedri Fabulae for example '-kk-' is regular, as is final '-k', but 'ck' is used (only) in "sackele, dunckt, strickten, kweekeligen, snelckelijk, klincckenden, klancchen, denck" etc., cf. "drücken, maskte, welke, vlekken". This is surely a sign that he used 'nc' for /ng/ as defended by Ontanus (whether he was aware of this, or was simply following a tradition of using '-nek' is another matter).

Further support for the view that this was a fairly widespread usage comes from the time when 'kk' was being widely substituted for 'ck'. It was only natural that some who had previously used 'nek' in the manner outlined above should replace the 'ck' by 'kk', resulting in 'ukk' (cf. Dafforne chap.17, and Kuyper above). Several instances of this have been noted.

Before giving these however, attention must be drawn to a parallel spelling. The acceptance of 'nc' as a sign for /ng/ before 'k' led to the use of 'ng' as a sign for /ng/ before a pronounced 'g', giving '-ngg-' spellings. It had been the standard pronunciation in Middle Dutch for the final /k/ of "jonk" to become the fricative /g/ in the inflected form /jonge/. This pronunciation, which is behind the '-ngg-' spellings, died out along with the /-pk/ pronunciation of the uninflected form. Many, however, continued to pronounce words in this way because of the presence of 'g' in the spell forms "jonge, hangen" etc.,. For those who did pronounce the words in this way, whether in continuance of older tradition, or as a pure spelling- pronunciation, it would be tempting to adopt the '-ngg-' spellings, with the 'ng' for /ng/ and the 'g' for the fricative /g/. This is thus an exact parallel to the '-nkk-' spelling.

Montanus, despite his defence of the '-nck-' spelling, was very critical of the '-ngg-' tendency, but only on grounds of pronunciation, which did not affect the '-nck-' words. The /gch/ pronunciation he felt to be induced purely by the spelling: "De natuurlijke verlenging der Woorden die in 'ng' eindigen (en geschist
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In werk de natuurlijke, zijnde de geene, telkens inde gemeene
opnessen gebruict. Want anders wil 't lezen, die dicwils met 'g' verlengt worden:
belijmen met 'gen' toegevoegd, en niet lichtelijk het beteekende geluid onge
kunt uit te spreken'. Thay whereas normal "gemeene genaam" has "vang-vang-ngen"
there was a tendency in reading aloud to pronounce this "vang-chen" with a
fricative /ʃ/. He is prepared, however, to accept either pronunciation, and
consequently either spelling: "een schrijft... 'bedencking, ding, lang' en
bedenckingen, dinggen, langgen", wanneer de verlangzaal of saayvoechseal
met 'g' wil uitgesproken hebben, gelijk in 't lezen meest geschiet: of
'bedenckingngen, dingngen, langngen', gelijk is doe in 'lach, lachchen',
wanneerenze wil met 'ng' doen houden".

These spellings are already known before Montanus, and De Keuiter asks
"jullanggen, zeljunggen, toelieghe, loelieghe, wat douter deen 'g' en 'h'?". These
spellings are caused by the standard fiddle Dutch pronunciation as shown in
"penninche, meninchghen, zinchende, jongghe, gelangghen" (v. Looy). De Keuiter
evidently thinks either that such a pronunciation is wrong, or that it is
adequately spell by '-ngen' without "deen 'g' en 'h'". One user of these forms
from a later date was Van Gherwen, who uses in his Voorloperken of 1624 such
forms as "Taerlingghen, dingghen". The standard common spellings such as
"spellinghe" are not conclusive evidence of either pronunciation.

Both these spellings, '-ngg-' and '-nkk-', were still occurring in the later
years of the 17th century. For example Bruine's Bancket-werck of 1657 has an
apparently innocuous 'ck' spelling, but the later editions are "modernised" to
"Bankket-werck" (1660) and the normal "Bankeb-werck" (1699).

The almost contemporary Dutch grammar by Hillenius (in English), of 1664,
gives the following statement: "If the last syllable of any Noune have but one
vowel, & end in 'c' or 'k', the last letter doth double it self in the Plurall:
as 'Gheluk, Gbelukken... Minnelik, Minnelikken, plank, plankken, rank, rankken';
(p.19). He seems to think these are all the same phenomenon. It is possible
that this, as far as Hillenius is concerned at least, is not so much a case of
using 'nkk' for /gk/, as an abnormal doubling of the 'k' (cf.chap.17). In the
later editions of this work (1677ff) the spelling is normalised, which, as the
examples are retained, has the unfortunate effect of making nonsense of the
Zoet uses "strengen, springgen, zinggen, hanggen" etc. both in Klioos Kraam (T1, 1177), and in his Werkken of 1675 (cf. chap. 17). Zweerds and Duhhels in the same anthology have "gedenkken" and "bedenkke, slinkkerhandt, slinkkcn". This is not a printer's spelling in Klioos Kraam, as Rintjus uses "blanken" etc. He has moreover a quite distinctive usage of bis own. The anonymous J.B.N.C. in the same work (1, 130) has "Ankker".

In 1635 the works of Antonides van der Goes were published, and in these there is an introductory praise by Katryne lascallje, which reads:

"Wie ziet, wie hoord ooit zyns gelyk,
Als hy de krygstrompet laat klinkken,
Der heiden lof, in stryd op stryd,
Goed enigig aan de starren blinkken,..."

All her own published days and prayers however have a normal spelling, both in contemporary editions and in the 1731 collected works, which has a Van Hoogstraten (the editor) spelling. Van der Goes himself also has a normal '-nk-' spelling.

It is an intriguing (and useful) fact that the dedication poems which many writers wrote for each other's works, have a greater tendency to be printed in the writer's own spelling, greater even than in their own printed works, where the printer's hand is often seen at work. In some works the variety of spelling systems shown by the various dedication poems is disconcertingly large; and the fact that each poem often has its individual spellings must imply that it is printed in the spelling used by the author, which is rarely provable for ordinary printed works.

One example of '-ngg-' caused comment in the Boekzaal of July 1693: "P.v.Hove... heeft... een boekje laten drukken, waar uit een nieuwe spel-konst te leeren is. Te weeten, dat men... 'jongge' voor 'jonge', enz. moet spellen" (see chap. 7).

Rabus is a little inaccurate in thinking this to be a "nieuwe" spelling, but such forms certainly seem to have undergone a revival at the turn of the century, -n.b. the same time as Hilarides' and Kuyper's books with '-nk-' appeared.

One of the few persons to comment on this revival was Sewel, in his review of Nyloë (see above). Here he condemns both '-ngg-' and '-nkk-': "Men heeft 'er ook gevonden, die tot voorkoming van de gebreklykhed, welke zy waanden te syn in de woorden 'van-gen, han-gen, klan-ken', gespeld hebben 'vanggen, hanggen, klancken'.

He followed this by inserting a similar comment in the next edition of his dictionary, both on the '-ngk-' spellings (see above) and on the following:"Maar
die de spelling in allen deele met de uytspreek wil doen overeenkomen, zal
moeselyk vruchteloze mvette doen; want hoewel stijle gespeld hebben 'klankken,
vangen, hangen, diggen', en de gewasse geboorelykeyd die 'er is in
'klank-ken, dig-gen, hang-gen' enz. voor he kosen, zijn sy daarin echter meer van
wey nien gavolgd". It is a great pity, from the historians point of view, that
Sewel follows the example of so many others in not naming names! (Nyloe himself
does not actually discuss these spellings, Sewel is following up a line of
thought raised by the former in connection with "land/lant").

Poelet mentions these also, probably reacting to Sewel's consent: he puts
"Singen, Ringen, Stanken, DANKen" on a par with "lachchen, loochchenen", as
results of an over-eager application of the concept of "root consonants", i.e.
that a root-letter (here 'ch', 'g' or 'k') cannot be detached from the first
syllable (cf. chap. 4).

This condemnation coming from such an influential grammarian as Sewel seems
to have borne fruit. At least, these comments on '-ng-', '-ngg-' and '-nkk-
were edited out of later editions, presumably because they were no longer relevant.

Suggested reforms in the spelling of /ng/ and /nd/.

The unsuccessful attempts to introduce '-nek-', '-nkk-' and '-ngg-' have been
discussed above, and it remains only to mention the later moves. No reforms were
envisioned by any oth the official spellings of Siegenbeek, Te Winkel, Marchant,
the Woordenlijst or the Eindvoorstellen, though it is interesting to note that
one effect of the Siegenbeek system was to cause confusion with respect to this
spelling. Because he had supported the dictum "schrifzo als gij spreekt" many
thought that his spelling was meant to be a guide to the pronunciation, as indeed
it would be if the dictum could be consistently applied. This gave rise to such
spelling-pronunciations as "vang-chen", just as described by Montanus Bomhoff
(1347) is very critical of this feature of what he calls the "verbeterd onderwijs",
which gives such pronunciations as "banch, ench, rinch" for "bang, eng, ring".
Siegenbeek himself had originally been unaware that this might result from his
spelling rules, and felt obliged to publish an open letter in 1336 to warn
against such spelling-pronunciations. This could not have been altogether
effective, as Bomhoff's comments came 9 years later!

It occurred to many of the more radical reformers that the whole problem of
/ng/ needing to be represented by a digraph, but sometimes by 'at' alone, could sometimes be represented by 'nt', sometimes by 'ntt'. Montanus, however, in his work from 1675, gave an example of the above, claiming that 'ing' was 'tten Herp', but this may not have been the case of the actual 'vingen' type of spelling.

Ton sent one step further and suggested writing the 'ing' and 'ink' with a tie, as 'i' and 'i': "zulks zoude ook zijn' nuttigheld haman hebben".

The first to reconsider a completely new letter was Land, who, as a result of the rationalisation of the use of letters, found a few spare in 'x', 'y', 'z': "de 'i' (komt) in aanmerking om de 'ing' te vervangen". This would have involved such spellings as "vng, xpi, sechen, koninklijk", and would have little chance of being accepted by the public at large, no matter logical or simple. Nothing more was heard along these lines until J. te Winkel proposed using 'i' for 'ing', as in "konin, xar". The only other suggestion came from Klöck, who proposed the adoption of Greek gamma for this use.

All of these proposals are much too radical to gain any support, however laudable their aim, or efficient their application.

'c' = /k/ in loan words.

For several centuries it was common accepted practice to leave all self-evident loan words in their original spelling, insofar as that was possible. Where this applied to German loans there was little difficulty, as the spelling practices were largely the same, at least in their use of 'c' and 'k'. Where Romance (chiefly French and Latin) words were concerned the matter was slightly different. As long as 'c' continued to be the standard letter for /k/ then there was once more little difficulty, but as soon as a tendency to extend the use of 'k' appeared, then conflict was bound to arise, when some felt a certain word to be foreign, and others felt it to be, as it were, naturalised.

It is thus first in the early 17th century that talk of 'k' spellings in loan words becomes at all meaningful. The only time when a Romance 'c' was replaced by a Dutch 'k' in earlier usage was when other modifications rendered this necessary, as for example in the spelling "mirakel" where 'c' would have implied the wrong pronunciation. This existed side by side with "mirakelen"
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above the 'c' could be retained, thus indicating that the 'k' in "airskel" is
only an expedient, not a reform. The same native lies behind the insertion of
'k' in "caneter, airskel".

Even granted the normal replacement of 'c' by 'k' in Dutch words, there was
always a reluctance to do the same for loan words. Kilian uses only 'c' in his
"Appendix Poranginorum", except where a Dutch suffix was added, e.g.: "socratesklik".
Sometimes the definition of loan word was taken very strictly. For example both
Plantijn and Bellem use many very common words in the 'c-' spellings,
whereas desan's words are all spelt with 'k-'. Plantijn has, for instance,
"Katha vide Cat", Bellem has "Cat svec Katte". This entry is interesting as
it suggests that the strictness of the rule had been somewhat relaxed in the
intervening decades, "Katte" being regarded as the normal form for what was now
so pugled as a new Dutch word. Plantijn is actually so strict with his
definition of loan words, that any word which has a related word in French or
Latin spell with a 'c' must have a 'c' in Dutch. This includes such ordinary
words as "Kath vide Cate" (because of "calamus"), "Kasten voyez Casteen, Kalck
voyez Calc, Krabben vide crabben in C, Kok, Coquus voyez Coc", and conversely
"coop coopen &c vide kopen"—the latter, being truly Dutch in his estimation,
could have 'k'.

Even "Cat", as mentioned above, because it was related to "chatte"; had to
have 'c-' in this system. Thus although Plantijn's system involves the use of
'c-' in a great many everyday Dutch words, it is a thoroughly consistent system,
according to its strict rules. Most other writers did not go to the extremes of
Plantijn, and recognize as loan words only those which were "obviously" foreign,
though opinions on which were bound to vary, as the criterion of "obviousness" is
highly subjective. It covers such words as "Cardinaelen, Capitael" etc. In most
systems however, the main differences of opinion being in everyday words.

The first signs of the change in opinion on the spelling of loan words comes
from Amzing. Although he himself prefers to retain the foreign 'c-' spelling,
"dit doe ik nochtans also wederom, dat ik dan genen, die onse Nederduytsche
spellinghe liever onbeschroom mogle volgen, in 't alderminste, nochte in
genderleije maniere, en begere tegens te spreken: want heeft het den Romeynen
vrij gestaen, de Grieksche Kappa in 'calendae, calamus, academia', ende andere,
In liimno 'c' aldus te veranderen, die dan noch by hen van een uyttsprake met de
'11' war; waarom toch on aubben wy Nederlanders niet met gelijk, ja eerder recht,
de wyche woorden van de '11 met onse '1' ougen spellen'. This applies
espcially where '1' might be mispronounced as /s/ (cf. "mirakel"), and"inde
woordan die wy niet van de latijnen, maar die wy ende wy van de Grieken ontlenen,
... als 'catechismus, Catholiek, academie, katarre, klisterie' ende diergelijke"
(p.32).

This statement shows that some writers were already naturalising the spelling
of loan words, though examples are not overabundant. Van der Schuere's "apokope,
syncope" are influenced by their Greek originals (p.64). Van Heule, by contrast,
spells "Syncope, Apocope"; though he frequently refers to Greek, it does not
seem to have influenced him.

Bredero uses "rekreatie, krediteur" in 1621, De Ruyter spells "ocktober"
in compromise?, Bontekoe spells "adagack"; possibly influenced by his
alternative spelling "adagacker", Bredero (c.1640) uses "inkarnate", cf. Quintijn's
use of "inkarnadine" in 1629 (recorded by W.W.T.). Plemp evidently considers
"claver" a loan word (1632,p.38), as he uses 'k-' in all Dutch words, and this
may also be the reason why Steyters spells "claver" with 'c-', despite his comment
"geeft cleare op klare" in the introduction (see above). Greek 'k' spellings are
common in proper names, such as Van Engelen's "Arkadia, Linko, Koriska, Kupido".

In Van Heule's first edition he includes an appendix on genders which
includes several 'k-' spellings in loan words, for example "Kamelot, Kanker,
Kapittel". He was evidently not put off by the fact that certain Dutch words
were derived from Latin, as he also spells "Kruys" on p.26, and in the list of
such words in the 1633 edition p.157. A certain amount of indecision surrounds
this word, as some, like Van Heule, regard it as Dutch enough to take a 'k-
spelling, e.g. De Decker, Vondel, Luyken. In case it might be thought that all
who spelt "Kruys" merely did so because they adopted a consistent 'k-' spelling
in all Dutch words, including this amongst many, with the corollary that all
'k-' spellers spelt "Kruys", this is not so. Stalpaert Van der Wiele for one,
who uses 'k-' in all Dutch words, still spells "Gruys" with 'c-'. This is also
ture of Mellema in 1539 and Aerschot in 1766: There are no doubt many others
between these two extremes. Van den Ende, also a consistent 'k-' speller,
The use of "Cruys" in Aerschot is typical of the Southern conservatism also displayed by the retention of 'c' in "vocaal" in most Southern grammars, e.g. Den Rodt, Borrevoet, Letterschik, Terbrughen, whereas most later Northern grammars tended more towards the use of "vokaal" (though Zeylelaar for one uses "vocael"). Earlier grammars automatically used 'c' (e.g. Defforce).

One of the major influences in the tendency to adopt a Dutch spelling for foreign words and names was the decision to do so by Vondel around 1644. After this date he adopted quite radical spellings such as "Konstantyn, Kristus (also common since Middle Dutch), Kristen, Terker" (possibly influenced by Greek). In this he was followed by many of the circle of admirers and emulators which surrounded him (e.g. Anslo), but the move was followed by few grammars apart from Van der Leyden who accepted 'k' in Greek loans.

In the early 1670's Willem Valentinus specifically rejected such a move. Pelz, after giving the comment quoted above, goes on to say "Doch dit alles zy gezegd van woorden die oorspronkelyk Nederduitsche of door lang gebruik zulke geworden zyn. Den woorden, en voornamelyk den eigenen namen van andere taalen, laat ik hunne letters behouden. Want hoewel ik op het voorgaan van de beste Schrijvers 'Pabu', en 'Eaeton', zou kunnen spellen, zo zoude ik echter geen weg met 'Sisero, Seres', en 'Kraaius', weeten, zonder een zeer grooten aanstoot te geven. Doch wanneer de namen of woorden van andere spraaken de onze geworden zyn, als in 'Kryn, Kuiryn, Sander', die van 'Quirinus' en 'Alexander' komen, daar zyn wy aan de 'q' of 'x' niet gebonden: zo schrijft men ook 'tytel, Sater, Dokter' heel wel, in plaats van 'titul, Satyr, Doctor'".

The replacement of 'c' by 'k' in loan words proceeded gradually and randomly, until the turn of the century. In Sewell's dictionary the predominant use is 'c-' in loan words, except those which were now naturalised. In accordance with this in the 1766 edition Buys amends the original comment "'c' voor 'k' is by ons genoegzaam ongerymd" by adding: "uitgezonderd in woorden die uit andere Taalen en buzyonder uit het Fransch zyn overgenomen". Sewell himself clearly felt this to be self-evident. This reflects the change of mood between 1691 and 1766, when Buys felt more need to defend his conservatism.

Further evidence of the revising spelling is Verwer's use of "Kostuimen", with
to the unsettled situation, when Stegenbeek fixed the spelling: "Men schryve de woorden eener tale met die letterteeken, welke in die taal aangenomen zijn, en tot dezelve behooren,...

tervijl men in vreemde (woorden) voor zo verre zulks met duidelijkheid bestaanbaar is, ook vreemde klankteekenen mag bezigen". He differentiates two sorts of foreign word: "1o. (die) voor Nederduitsche kunnen gelden,... 2o. (die) terstond hunne uitleemse oorsprong verraden". The second category comprises only foreign names, though he does mention the existence of borderline cases. Welland's Handwoordenboek complies with this rule: the only words entered with 'c-' for /k/ under 'C' are "Colosse, Concilie, Corinthe". Other loan words, ideally, should adopt Dutch spelling as far as possible, in order to avoid any
After Siegenbeek is the beginning of the period of uncertainty which lasted until the present day, concerning which words should be naturalised, and which were still too "foreign". Bilderdijk made many reforms of his own, though there was little system to them, and he was seldom consistent. For this he was heavily criticised by Carlebur, for example for his varied spellings "octaaf/oktaaf, consulat/konsulaat, concert/koncert/konzerf". Carlebur also criticised some of Siegenbeek's decisions and unsystematicness,- comparing "karakter, klasse, fiscaal, procureur; koor, christen" etc.. His own preferences were more conservative, and he felt that 'c' should always be preserved in loan words (except, of course, in such words as "artikel, diaken"), since most Greek words, in which it was argued that 'k' was more original, were in any case borrowed by Dutch via Latin, where 'c' was used. Thus the 'c' could be justified in such words.

Alberdingk Thijm had already voiced his support for a 'k-' spelling in loan words, such as "abdikatie", in 1843, and he too was critical of the Siegenbeek
Thy was also critical of the De Vries/Te Winkel reforms in this field, mostly because of their press. Their theory was that educated people would be familiar with foreign spellings and would have no difficulty, whereas uneducated people would not use foreign words at all. This somewhat oligarchical theory totally ignored the vast numbers of originally foreign words now in normal use in Dutch, but retaining some element of their foreign spellings. Their theory is adequate for the less normal loans, belonging to special jargons etc., but falls down for common words. They realized that the main problem was deciding "waar de vreemde spelling ophouden en de Nederlandische beginnen must"; the age-old problem of when does a loan word become a Dutch word. This was the cause of their dyadic system,- they were guilty rather of drawing the line too much in favour of the foreign element, than of underestimating the intelligence or vocabulary of the average "uncultured" Dutchman. "Wij hebben gemeend een stelsel niet te mogen aanvaarden, dat voor zijn eigene toepassing terugdeinst en daarmede zich zelf veroordeelt" was their plea in justification: if the 'k-' spelling could not be accepted when applied to all loan words, then it was not desirable to apply it to only a few.

One of the several to voice their views on improving the situation in this respect was Van Lennep, but he had no systematic proposals, merely a few alterations such as "categorie, kommissie, makaronie, academie, schokolaad" - forms which Te Winkel, though realizing that such were "spellingen, die de uitspraak zeker niet minder juist zouden voorstellen", felt "op Nederl. wijze geschreven, een al te gedrochtelijk voorkomen zouden hebben".

This opinion was not shared by Multatuli, though he was no hard-line radical: "Als ik schryf 'produkt, akklimatisatie' enz. bedoel ik daarmee niet dat die woorden zouden worden geschreven met 'n K, die slechts 'n C is met 'n stokje. Eigenlyk zou ik moeten stemmen voor C, omdat die makkelijker te schryven is, en kleiner. Maar als ik eensmaal een K gezet heb, laat ik die staan" (No. 43).

That the conservatism of Te Winkel, however well founded in an attempt to be consistent, should have aroused criticism and moves for reform was inevitable. This came in its strongest form in the Kollewijn movement. It was one of their
original Voorstel len that "In Bastaardwoorden ... schri jve men ... 'k' in plaats van de 't'-klank-minderende 'c': 'lokomotief, acteur, actrice, directeur, conservator'. The reaction of scholars from many quarters is now well known and well documented (see Van Dieren, Daman, Royen), though it was really an overreaction, since Killen's only wished to reform the spelling of those words which were in regular use in Dutch. However, it was only natural that the reform movement should have some members who were more radical than others, and whereas the official line followed the moderates in not wishing too much at once, the critics of the reform picked out the more radical elements in an (equally sincere) attempt to discredit the movement.

Van Dieren was opposed not so much to the radicalism of the reforms but their inconsistency: "In de door hem uitgegeven woordenlijst (van 112 bladzijden, telde ik 73 woorden, die, in tegenstelling met hun eigen verlangen, toch een 'c' moeten behouden, daar onder: 'coiffeur, curator, clown, croquetje, coupeur, conservator, confrater' enz. Ja waarlijk, het woord 'cognac' mag zelfs met beide 'c's blijven prijken!". In the chapter on "de door mij gewenste vereenvoudigingen" he writes: "Lijns inziens is het verkèeerd vreemde woorden, die nog niet algemeen gebruikt worden, te vornerländschen door een 'c' in een 'k'... te veranderen", but he gives no examples of where he would retain 'c', or which words he considers "nog niet algemeen gebruikt".

Scharten, Dixi, and Van Ginneken also opposed the use of 'k' in foreign words. The latter felt that "het met 'k' willen schrijven van 'lokomotief, acteur, actrice' zelfs, van 'directeur, contributie' enz" was a threat to "de nog steeds uitgroeiende algemeene Europeesche saamhorigheid". What picture he had of this unity is difficult to see, as he immediately goes on to say: "Zeker, de Duitschers probeeren dat ook hier en daar, vooral in hun hartstochtelijk opgedreven nationalisme na den oorlog: maar kunnen wij klein landje ons dat veroorloven. En zal immers niets anders uit voortvloeien, dan dat wij Noord-Nederlanders nog meer door de groote wereld als gewoon tot Duitschland behoorend worden gerekend". Although this feeling, that "small countries cannot afford to resist a growing European unity, whereas large countries often think they can" is reasonable, one senses an undertone of politics in the statement (cf. chap. 9, on "thee", & chap. 13).
The most complete answer to Van Ginneken's theories of European unity in spelling comes from his major opponent Gerlach Royen: "Terwijl toch De Vries en Te Winkel als cultuurmenschen begrepen, dat de meeste leenwoorden in cultuurkringen worden overgenomen, waar een ook de vreemde taal met haar spelling kent, en dus altijd om den Regel der Gelijkvormigheid (not in its usual sense) geneigd is, zoo'n cultuurwoord ook in het Nederlandsch zijn vreemde spelling te laten behouden, was het Kollewijn, die zich instinctmatig altijd eerst in de positie der onbeschaafde voor vreemde talen ontoegankelijke groepen indenkt, er naar om te doen, om al die
Met zijn zomerechtaans nageklakte jongebeertjes zou het vreemde pakje uit te trekken, om zo een anderheid te voorkomen uit echt Hollandsche phonetische spelling aan te "on" (p. 15). "Een onvolkomen idea behoeft little answer, voor Van Ginneken. In 1947, in termen of het early 19th century than there were two classes of people: the "cultured" and the "un-educated". At such a time his comments would have had some validity, but not in age of universal literacy.

Whatever their motivation, the "ancient changes left the Te Winkel rule intact. But just after the war, in 1947, a government commission was set up to investigate such spellings, eventually producing the Woordenlijst of 1944. The irregularity of their proposals became proverbial, though many of the inconsistencies were due not to negligence or carelessness, but to the following of the rule that any word which contained a "foreign sound" should not adopt any Dutch spelling for any of its parts. Thus whereas "consul" was acceptable, "commisar" retained 's' because of the un-Dutch "air" earmarking it as a "foreign" word. Similarly "kalvinisme" could have 'k', as an accepted Dutch word, but "Galvijn" as a name, could not, even though it had adopted a Dutch 'ij'.

However understandable the theory, and there is considerable justification for it, the consequences were totally unacceptable, not only for the apparent inconsistency in such word-pairs, but also for the division into "voorkeurspelling en toegestane spelling. Als deze twee categorieën waren aaneengesloten met conservatief en progressief, was het systeem begrijpelijk geweest; maar in het ene geval heeft de moderne spelling de voorkeur, in het andere geval de oude. ... De verdeling van het woordmateriaal over 'c' en 'k' is zo willekeurig dat voortdurende oefening (met het woordenboek in de hand) vereist is" (Harmsen, 51, 55). The results of the commission's decisions could be compared with the other attempt at a "committee spelling" in Dutch, the resolutions of the Bible translators; in both cases a high degree of inconsistency emerged (the so-called "camel" syndrome).

Paardekoper expressed his dissatisfaction by means of a cautionary fable in "Ons Eigen Blad" Sep. 1957. "Vóór Galilei was het een eeuwenlange traditie om te beweren dat de zon en alle planeten om de aarde draaiden. Helaas was die traditie in strijd met de feiten. Galilei wees daarop en werd prompt verketterd. Was dat in onze dagen gebeurd, dan zou de Minister gezegd hebben: 'Kijk, ik
...but that of the motions of the planets was not as clearly possible as it is now.

Considerable pressure was now rising due to the dissatisfaction with this situation. Rombouts pressed strongly for the adoption of 'k', as did Verschueren in the introduction to his "Modern Technisch Woordenboek" (1961, similar comments also in earlier editions). Consistency with the Woordenlijst's "akademi, kaktus" etc. should give "kado, Kanadees, muzikus". This was also a major point in the proposals of the V.W.S..

Obiously this confused situation could not continue for long, and a new commission was set up, publishing its Rapport in 1967. This was much more consistent, and also much more radical. "De commissie stelt voor 'k' te spellen; dus: 'aktueel, ekseem, fabrikage, fraksie, kakofonie' etc., with the natural exception of totally foreign words such as "cantabile, corpus delicti, credo, crème, crêpe", though even here some radicals wished to use 'k'. When the Eindvoorstellen appeared in 1969, after some dissatisfaction with the Rapport, a certain number of words reverted to their "conservative" spelling, e.g. "cycloon, cadeau, eau de cologne", though most loans will probably now adopt the 'k' form.
The problem of distinguishing a foreign word and which a native word is even rendered by those and whose the palatalised 'c' precedes 'e', 'i', 'y'. By their very nature all these words, originally, be loan words, as such palatalisation is no feature of Dutch phonetic development. Indeed any word which begins with /s/ followed by a vowel must be a loan word. For in normal Dutch a historical /s/ always became voiced in this position, with a few solitary exceptions, usually where /s/ has developed from /ts/ (e.g. "assen" see chap. II). It is thus highly probable that any word pronounced with prevocalic /s/ will always be felt to be un-Dutch, no matter how frequent its use or how indispensable its function. It must not be thought though, that all words in this section are of Romance origin, for there is a small but often controversial group of words adopted from German, where they begin with 'z' (/ts/), e.g. "sierad" from "Zierat".

In these words borrowed in Middle Dutch from contemporary French, one aspect of French phonetic development is of vital importance for the spelling (and pronunciation) of the words in Dutch. It is a feature of several Old French dialects that a prepalatal 'c' represented the sound /ts/, with the standard 's' representing /s/. Other dialects, e.g. in Picardy, pronounced these two sounds respectively /tζ/, /z/ (English 'ch', 'sh'). Consequently Middle Dutch borrowings, where the writer was presented with an un-Dutch sound, be it /ts/, /s/ or prevocalic /s/, will reflect any tendency to maintain the original sound in the adopted form of the word.

Several examples exist of 'ch' occurring in Middle Dutch instead of an original French 's': "chantuerie, chukade, chuker" (= "sanktuaire, nukeade, sukre"), which may represent a Picardy pronunciation (cf. similarly the very common spellings "Prinche" and "chijsa", the latter also with the alternative "cijs", e.g. in Plantijn), or which may, conversely, be used simply to show the /s/ pronunciation where a Dutch reader, for the reasons stated, would tend to pronounce prevocalic /s/ as /s/. This may also have been the motivation for such Middle Dutch forms as "tsiedse, tsimpel, tsoudier, tsout, metsagier, dantsen" and possibly "peertsch" for "paars". Salverda de Grave thinks it also possible that there are hyper-correct spellings caused by other words where a Dutch /s/ corresponded to an old French word with /ts/ (e.g. "plasts/plass"); it might thus become standard to
while French loans with 'ts' even when only /s/ was heard. In support of this, he gives (n. 235) several examples of hypercorrect use of 'c' instead of 's', 'Waarvol mede het langere deel boeide medeklinkers, zelfs in de eerste periode, doende versnellen in uiterlijk bestonden': e.g. in "broleel, consuuer, cyroop, Tijns, Thorend, balan". Hoebeke similarly records such alternative spellings as "cerue, cruise, cruuse, curuse". He also notes the sporadic forms "boch, wicneerc, stoevich" which may be examples of 'ch' for /s/, or may simply have led the 's' accidentally omitted from the 'sch', the only examples are for words normally having 'sch'.

Thus whereas a 'c-' spelling may represent a /ts/ pronunciation, it is by no means certain that this is always the case, and an adoption to a more Dutch /s/ pronunciation would not cause a change in the 'c'-spelling, as this would still be felt to be French. De Grave gives examples of word-pairs which may reflect such a development: "canser, boeisemar; certain, pertain; siglatoen, siglatoen; siper, siper; cirongen, colongijn; teollen, sollen"; cf. also what are now standard Dutch spellings "fateen (fagon), plaats, rots, caetsa" etc, with such Middle Dutch variants as "fortretse, grimats, palijtsae".

The 'c-' spellings thus became established as an accepted spelling for /s/ in the Dutch language, as is shown by the hypercorrect 'c-' spellings, though there may (originally at least) have often been a parallel pronunciation with /ts/, both being spelt with 'c'. That such a situation could exist can be seen from the very similar modern situation with the two pronunciations /s/ and /ts/ for such words as "natie, politie". This may well have been the cause of the widespread use of 'c' in these words in Middle Dutch (see chap. 14).

From this acceptance of 'c' in foreign words it was a relatively short step to use the 'c' occasionally in native Dutch words, though of course this could normally only happen when the writer in question pronounced 'c' as /s/. Hoebeke gives "huced,"dicendach (=dinsdag), ducent, ducentech" are recorded by Van Loey, who also gives "scheren, shiers" for "'s heren, 's jaars". These last two, as distinct from the others, in all probability conceal a /ts/ pronunciation, from "des heren, des jares", otherwise it is difficult to find motivation for abandoning a perfectly good and normal Dutch spelling.

It would seem then, that two pronunciations existed for the palatalised 'c'-
the original /ts/ and the modified, or possibly also original (from later French) /s/, and the majority of the argument on any simplification of the foreign 'c-' spelling to a Dutch 's-' spelling automatically centred on how 'c' was pronounced. Some claimed /s/, some claimed /ts/; probably, almost inevitably, both were correct, but that has never prevented argument. The /ts/ pronunciation of 'c' may explain its use in "naie", as mentioned, but it may also explain its adoption in the word "ciernao", deriving from German "zierat", and thus having a /ts/ sound. They would probably, for this word, also be influence from "cler" in the phrase "goed cler maken", from French "chier" (late Latin "cera").

Just as much argument developed as to which if any of the original loan words with their foreign spellings were "Dutch enough" to adopt a native spelling, and this was aggravated, as suggested above, by the alien nature of prevocalic /s/. For this reason it is a matter of the greatest relevance for the spelling, which pronunciation a given reformer ascribed to the 'c', for no /ts/ pronouncer would be able to countenance a substitution by /s/.

The development of the argument as to the pronunciation of 'c'.

The first pronouncement on the pronunciation of 'c' by Dutch speakers came as early as 1523 from Erasmus, though only in their pronunciation of Latin. This will probably reflect, a fortiori, the pronunciation in Dutch loan words. He writes: "aliud enim sonat Latinis 'c' quam praecedet 'e, i, y, æ, o' quam cum praecedet 'a, æ, u'; ut in 'coreo, cinis, cynicus, coelum, caecus': aliud in 'canis, colo, & curo'. Nam in illis vulgus nostratum pene nihil discernit inter 'c' & 's'; ut vix aures diuident, 'coena' dicas à 'coena', an 'sena' à 'senex'; & utrum 'silicem' pro lapide, an 'cilicem' pro gente". Kooiman (p.66) notes "dit 'bijna' (pene) zal hier wel overbodig zijn", but this need not be the case if Erasmus were describing a /ts/ pronunciation for prepalatal 'c'. There is no reason why he should have said "pene" if he did not mean it, as he was by no means a poor phonetician (see Géron "Klank en teken"). Especially is this so when he repeats his claim, with the same modification, a few pages later. Having shown first that 'k' is superfluous in Latin, because for 'c' "eodem fuisse sono, quocunque vocali sequente", he claims it is a different matter for Dutch: "atqui supervacanea non est si nostrum 'c' crebro proxime accedit ad vocem 's'", once more it is not exactly the same sound.
But although it seems likely that Erasmus heard this 'c' as /tɛ/, it is not, as with loud 'c': 'c'... heeft twee krachten te weten van een 'k', ende dat
allemaal voor 'a,k' of 'a'; ende van een 'k', ende dat voor 'a' of 'i'
'zeker'... there is no difference for him between 's' and prepalatal 'c'. Kilian
probably knew both pronunciations: he lists several words under 'Z' with a cross-
reference to 'C', including 'zieren', whereas other (Dutch) words under 'Z' have
a cross-reference to '1'. For French loans however he lists several variants with
's-' spellings, as also for 'steren'. The Two-spraak explicitly hears /s/:

"dat de 'c' voor 'a' onder 'i' doet, daar toe mogt ons de 'k' dienen": De Reulter's
"...beent... luidt onderscheid met 'c'" probably comes into the same category
as Erasmus's argument, though auto-suggestion may play a part.

Unfortunately not all were as explicit as the Two-spraak or Lambrecht. Van
Hoeve (1633), recording the unvoicing of the /z/ writes that "als naer
'H,C,D,F,G,H,K,P,S,T,X' eene 'Z' (volcht) zo wort die eene sene '3' of 'C'
ytgesproken". As in the examples of such assimilation (p.7, the comment in p.143)
there are none where /ts/ could be the pronunciation represented, it seems
probable that Van Hoeve hears no difference between "s" of 'G'... he merely adds
"of 'G'" to show that he means the unvoiced pronunciation of 's' as /s/, not as
the still prevalent use as /z/.

Montanus is in no doubt that he hears /s/: "Pharao, Psalms, natie, citeren,
Abt" voor "Psaroe, zalm, naam, siteeren, apt" (p.25), and on p.62 where he
unequivocally states that 'c' is pronounced "als 's'". Hexham agrees with this in
his list of pronunciations: "'c' (is pronounced) as 'ce' or 'se', as in the first
syllable of these words, 'cement, senate'". Although this agrees with Van Hoeve's
The statement "De woorden 'cieraet, vercieren, cierlyk', die men van ons met een C schreef, worden vonglyker, naerdien men by den verbasterden klank der C niet behoort te blijven, met eene 3 gespelt", is ambiguous: he could mean "let us now abandon the /ts/ pronunciation and adopt /s/", but (slightly) more probable is that he does hear /s/ in these words, which implies the second interpretation of "een s scherpe S".

E.G.P. uses a similar phrase, but here the interpretation is probably the opposite: "Dewijl nu de letter C, nu in haere uytspraak den klank niet en geeft, die (by exempel) in't woordt 'Kegel' gehoort wordt, maer die een hoort in't woordt 'Cederboon'; en overzulks tegenvoordig de C niet anders is als een sterke S...". This sounds the same as Moonen, but E.G.P. then goes on "My dunkt dat de C eenigens noodig is om 'celle, cyther, cederhout, cieraet'... hunne volle kracht te geven: want de S schijnt daer toe niet ten vollen bequaem te zijn". This would seem to imply the /ts/ pronunciation, though once more another interpretation is possible, that the 's' is inadequate because it might be mispronounced...
He himself avoids the 'z' as far as possible, which may explain his retention of 'c' as never the /s/ pronunciation.

Ten Kate, as might be expected from a more expert observer, is not ambiguous, and does not heed /s/; "prece (ke) (klinkt) eveneens als onze 's'. ... Here in the c's of several other languages and some other languages, the 'c' dubbelt-klinkig, uitspreek, normal als bij ons 'Teil'. He is not influenced by a foreign pronunciation. Overschie uses 'c' with a /ts/ pronunciation however, e.g. "kollen-kyl" from Italian "colluzioni" which has /ts/.

Like Ten Kate, Van Belle disagree with such a usage: "C, E en X zyn enkel onzeker klanken; Onwaard daar voor een ander Wolk te danken; Italiaans de C ons Kase of Ka-geluid...bedaald" (1743); and "als ter eene E of S I van volgt ... den hoortoe den klank van eene S, 'Pesse" (1750). In this he may well be influenced by Ten Kate, from who he borrows occasionally (see chap.7), and who may have influenced him in other spellings (cf chap.7). The opposing view is still held by Bincken however: "Den oogen klank van de 'c' is wat harder dan de 's', als in 'vercieren" (p.12). Pallieu later repeats this comment, and his first part in fact shows a great indebtedness to Bincken.

Although Ten Kate was not influenced by foreign pronunciations, this is probably not true of certain German grammars of Dutch. Kramer writes: "abcdef. Diese Buchstaben lauten in allen ihren Silben wie bey uns Hochdeutschen", i.e. 'c' is pronounced /ts/. Von Moerbeek, the later editor and revisor of Kramer's works, records, however, that 'c' "klingt wie eine 's' oder 'k' (1) wenn 'e, i' und 'y' folgen" (1791). Bolhuis and the Nut works agreed that /s/ was heard, which now represents the majority opinion.

Bilderdijk presents the usual problem: "De 'c' is tegenwoordig by ons een scherper 's' (p.53), by which, to judge from such pairs (in his system) as "konserf; consent" he means a normal /s/, though he also spells "konserf" and "konsonant". But the comparative "scherper" might suggest /ts/, so that no conclusion is certain. De Sumpel certainly heard /s/ in one word: "men schrijft thans "siersaad", omdat de 's' volstrekt beter aan de uitspraak voldoet", though this suggests that other words may have had other pronunciations.

The view that prepalatal 'c' was not pronounced the same as the normal /s/ is still held by Thijm however: "De 'c' voor de 's' en 'l', werd, zoo lang onze taal (als taal) heugt, steeds, bij de weinige (vreemde) woorden, waarin zij de
The majority view was shared however by Bosshoff, To Winkel etc. Even Saits agreed that 'c' had been used 'voor een scherpe 's', also 'sedert, uleren', in de plaats van 'sedert, uleren', though he felt that neither /k/ nor /s/ nor /ts/ were pronunciations proper to the letter 'c' (see chap. 3).

Out of all this array of mutually contradictory statements, one very significant fact emerges: ignoring statements after c.1730 when the differing functions of the letters 's' and 'z' were well-established, all those who claimed that prepalatal 'c' was not pronounced the same as 's', namely Kilian, Amsing, Leempoening, Siinart, E. C.P., and possibly Erasmus, did not use the letter 'z' to spell /z/. Consequently for them the 's' fulfilled both functions, /s/ and /z/, and the 'c' with its unambiguous prepalatal /s/ pronunciation was indispensable for their systems. Conversely all those who claimed that prepalatal 'c' was indeed pronounced /s/, namely Leembright, Van Spraeck, Van Sinkle, Montanus, Sewel, Mannen, Ten Kate, Van Salle etc. did use 'z' for /z/ and 's' for /s/, and thus had no need of a 'c' to indicate an unvoiced prevocalic /s/.

It would thus seem that it was not basically a phonetic difference which led to the retention of the 'c' by the first mentioned group, but a deficiency in their spelling systems caused by the non (or limited) use of 'z'. This does not imply that all those who used 'c-' spellings did not use 'z' in the normal way, but it seems to hold true for those grammarians who expressed views on the subject, and thus showed evidence of having thought on their system. Nor does this imply that those who claimed to hear /ts/ were suffering from auto-suggestion.

The development of the spelling.

As outlined in the section on 'c'=/k/ in loan words, there was for a long time no tendency to adapt foreign words to Dutch spelling. This is especially true for words with a prepalatal 's', with its un-Dutch sound. This for a long time was considered the only possible spelling. However, there have always been some who did not agree with this, possibly because of the differing views on the pronunciation of this letter (see above), and also the much controversy as to which words were or were not naturalised.

Middle Dutch already knew the spellings "sier, sieragie, sieren, tseren,
b'or r n i " for "cieragie, cieron" etc.. But it was quickly assumed that such words should have an 'e' spelling, presumably by analogy with "goed cier maken", though this made no very explicit spell "sieren" (cf. Prinche). The Exercitium uses "verdieren" (Lill V), alongside "yzeren", the Sociaal used "prienne, verchieren" alongside "schieren". Van der Werve uses "vercieren" but gives it not as a loan word but as the Dutch translation of "orneren"; possibly he simply meant that "vercieren" was more acceptable than "orneren", being of Germanic stock, rather than implying that it was actually Dutch. The 'ch' spelling mentioned above is also found in Comynsburt's introduction to his Officlia translation, in "chieraet, chierolijck".

Kilian mentions a new spelling, though he is not its initiator, for he only mentions it to reject it: "Zobolle, zedal, zeghe, zieren, zitteren etc. vide Scholle, cedel, cee, cieren, citteren". This almost certainly indicates the /ts/ pronunciation, though not necessarily, for the reasons stated above. All the other words entered under 'Z' have cross-references to 'S'. He also has several cross-references between 's' and 'c', such as "facelen j. faselen; cijfken, sijfken". Although the entry "faselen j. faselen" together with "Gijnghel j. senghel" suggest a preference for 's' spellings ("j. j." is an abbreviation for "id est", and refers to the main entry), other entries belie this, for in certain words he rejects the alternative with 's-': "sip, sippier vide Cip cippler", and most important "sieren vet. j. cieren, ornare Ger. zieren". The 's-' spelling is, he claims, already obsolete! The rejection of the 's-' alternative supports a pronunciation with /ts/, for if he heard this sound he could not approve of the 's' spelling, being unrepresentative of the sound. This explains why only those words have cross-references from 'Z' to 'S' and all the others refer to 'S'. Yet as usual the evidence is inconclusive and he may merely wish to avoid mispronunciation with /z/. Several of the entries in Kilian were taken from Lambrecht's Naembouck (see Intro. to Verdeyen ed.). For example he too recommends "sip z. cip", "sieraer j. cieraaet" ("b." = "beter"). As mentioned above however, Lambrecht definitely hears /s/ not /ts/, as he explains in his Nederlandsche Spellijnghe: "c' voor 'e' on 'i' veranderd in 's'". This is (unfortunately) not the proposed spelling reform it appears to be, but only a comment on the sound. The 's-' spelling of
Kilian also reflected in some of the usage of Simon Stevin, who lists "Zier" and the Dutch form of the base "Ciron, Chiron" (French/Greek).

The switch in De Hubert, though recognizing the pronunciation of prepalatal "ts/ž" Dutch and in Dutch, still uses the spelling "verschiet" (see the pronunciation in below, the list). The Two-squack too remarks that "k" would in theory be used for "klek bet" (see above), but decides in the end to replace it, because of the necessary resonance in "kch".

One interesting feature which developed and in which there the replacement of "t" by "ž" was unavoidable. This is parallel to the case of "kerkel"-mentioned above, and concerns words such as "perek, orangen". When the final "-e" was dropped, the writers found themselves obliged to spell "perek, oranje", deviating from the foreign spelling in order to retain the /ʒ/ pronunciation. This resulted in a spelling change in the inflected forms on a par with the change of "-l/-dè", i.e. Van den Abeele (1625, p.26) writes that "Kruys ... met oft de Neer" ... "Kruyzen". This has been used by deelen in his dictionary, and later by Devlin, Lodenhof and no doubt many others. The only other grammarian to comment on this change in Pijns, who observes that "wij van 'Frins', en 'Kruis' 'Prinsen' en 'kruizen' nakende, 's' in 's' veranderen". No grammar entered such a change in any section on letter changed such as "-t/-de, -t/-ve" etc.

De Hubert was one of the first to renew popularity for the 'ž' spelling mentioned by Kilian. He himself uses 'ž' in Dutch only in 'ck, ch' & 'sch', but as he uses 'š' for /š/ and 'ž' for /ʒ/ he decides to apply the 'ž' also to prepalatal 'č': "De letter 'ž' hebbe ik gebruikt voor eene dubbele 'ss' (i.e. /ʒ/)

... De Hoog-duitsen leeren ons, hoe wij die behooren te gebruiken; so spellen zij "zierlich" met 'ž', ende "sieden" met 'š', welke twee woorden wij ook in onze tale gebruiken, ende so als de Hoog-duitsen uitspreken". Does he mean by this the German /ts/ pronunciation? - this would make his statement somewhat contradictory. Note that this brings him into line with those mentioned above who do not use 'š' and 'ž' in the standard way (/š/, /ʒ/ respectively).

The next two deviations from the main-stream 'č-' spelling also come from this group, - Ampzing and Leupenius. As noted above, and in chap.11, both these, together with De Hubert, use the 'ž' and 's' as it were "reversed". This system precludes any possibility of an 'ž-' spelling for prepalatal 'č-', but invites
The use of 'z-' which is thus of the same motivation as the 's-' spelling used by
other. Amzing uses "sizer", Binnart uses the 'z' in any words in common
and "De Ruijder" uses the 'z' in any words in common
or "ckeen" and even "snoekke", and where the 's' or 'c' is sharp
"cicken" and "ckee SR", end 'sd" he schrijven: onde waerom wy diet
'zedert', onde "s" or "c" end 's' of to
'zedert', onde "s" or "c" and end 's' or "c" end 's" or "c", onde 'sizered' end end 's" or "c", onde 'sizered' end end 's" or "c", onde 'cesert' onde 'teckal', met end 's' spellen. ... (near) diet 'Zizero, Zesear, ...
Sier. de Sier. de Sier."- These words are apparently still
felt to be too foreign. The gist of this is that he considers any of the three
spellings acceptable, i.e. 's-', 'c-', 'z-', but wished that it should be applied
with consistency. This implies an /s/ pronunciation rather than /ts/.

Binnart argues along similar lines, but prefers 'z-' above all other
options: "voor een 't', en 'l', (hoest 'l') de kracht van een 'z', als 'cyferen', 'tilderen', (ciceren). Those should, in his system, become 'sizeren' etc., as he
uses for example on p.23. This is the last to be heard of this and similar
proposals, and no other grammarians argue for it; though some use related forms,
without comment. Binnart and E.C.P., the others of the group mentioned above,
both opt for the 'c-' spelling. Binnart could not adopt 'z' for these words as
he avoided the letter altogether. The majority of "s" for /z/ spellers used
'c-' in the traditional way.

De Ruijder, as representative of contemporary less-regular usage, often uses
's' in loan words, e.g. "prynsepael", though often also 'ts', e.g. "geswanteert".
He even uses a hypercorrect 'c' in Dutch words, e.g. "cedert (cf. Amzing)", and
in loans, e.g. "cekonde". Sometimes it is not even before a palatal vowel, as in
"clakke, cloep" (= slakke, sloep)! This is illustrative of the fact that /s/ was
often held to be the basic pronunciation of 'c-', simply because so many words
with 'c' used for /k/ had adopted 'k', leaving only 'c' = /s/ (see for example
the comments of E.C.P. given earlier). Jan de Witt, as an example of educated
extra-grammatical usage, regularly has 'c': "avanceren, concepten" etc., as would
be expected from one with an excellent knowledge of French. Radical (or
uneducated?) spellings with 's' must have been known before this time, as
Dafforne, after giving several words with 'c' before 'e,i,y', warns that "Deze
Woorden en moeten met 's' niet geschreven zyn, maar met 'c'" (p.94).
One spelling practice which became more common at this time, and was to remain in use for a long time, was the use of 'g', e.g. in "gierad". This is probably in emulation of the French usage, though it has some curious implications. As the use of the 'g' before a palatal is totally unnecessary, it would suggest that the writers did use it in these words were trying to prevent a possible mispronunciation with /k/. There can be little other explanation short of mere exhibitionism, a desire to show a close familiarity with French, or an utter ignorance of the true (normal) function of the 'g'. Both these are incompatible with the evidence of the usage, and the first explanation must be the more probable. Although it is tempting to see a differentiation of use between prepalatal 'c' and postpalatal 'g' when a given writer uses both in different words (e.g. the 'c' for /s/, the 'g' for /ts/), the total irregularity and lack of consistency rules this out as a general premise, though it may be valid in some cases.

The first example noted comes from the end of the preceding century, from Simon van Beaumont, and, in the earlier years of the 17th century, from Van der Venne ("vergierad"). Of the major users, more influential than either of these were Cats and Hooft. In his Spaens Heydinnetje the former regularly uses such swellings as "Constange, medegijn, gieraet", and Hooft has "gieraeden" in his Gedichten (e.g. 1663 p.316). To show for just how long a period this practice was common, suffice it to mention that Langendijk still uses it in 1721: "Tragys, Wagoedoonsche, gieraeden", alongside "Alcione, Ceix, Cezar", even in the same line: "Een krans van graan qiert Ceres 't hoofd" (p.23); and that Zeydelas¢ is still attracted to the spelling in 1772 (see below). Vondel also used 'g', e.g. in the "Olyftak", and so did Krul. Later users include Van Yk (1697), Rusting (1699), Van Alkemade (1713 only, his other works have "sierraad" and 'c'-forms). Winschooten also discusses the use of 'g' (see below).

In most of these cases it is undoubtedly the hand of the printer which is responsible for the use of 'g', rather than the choice of the writer. In the mid 13th century Des Roches gives the pronunciation of 'c' as 'g', presumably to avoid confusion with 'c'/k/, and this does not imply a use of 'g' in spelling. However Holtrop still felt it necessary to criticise such a usage in 1783 as superfluous. The hardness of the 'g' may have been a Southern phenomenon, e.g.
the 1620 edition of Blacket still has 's' in the comments quoted above, where the
1637 and intermediate editions have 'c'.

Whilst these minor variants 'c-' to 's-' were rising and falling, the battle
between 'c-' and 's-' continued unabated. Van Beule retains 'c' in loan words
(Cijs, Cieren, Cijferen, Cingelen, Cirkelen, Cieraet), as did the Bible
translators: "C 2. 'c' ante 'e' et bP liquiscens ... ut 'circkel, cieren,
vercieren'". Around 1644 one impetus for change came from Vondel's decision to
naturalize foreign words and names as far as possible. This caused the use of
'c' in "Cezar", but did not cause any replacement of prepalatal 'c', such words
remaining as "Cicero, Cezar" etc. Several ordinary words (i.e. not names) however
did adopt a more Dutch spelling, such as "siment, sirkel". Hooft also used the
latter, as well as "goode sier", though his earlier works almost invariably have
'c', as in "cieraedt, Princen (Prins), Prophecijen" in Achilles,1614.

It may well have been the result of such reforms amongst the followers of
Hooft (and Vondel) that Van den Ende is so earnest in his defence of 'c': "Nota
C. Zomlge willen de letter 'c' uyt onze taal bannen, doch 't is tegens van den
zie, kan 'cieraad, cierlijk, verzieren, cingel, oncingelen' te spellen, zonder 't
geleys op 'c'? hier en zoud' men immers geen ke mogen gebruiken", and his
entries correspondingly retain 'c-'. It is strange that the idea of using 's'
did not occur to him, though this probably implies that he heard /ts/. Pels and
ill Volentibus were of much the same opinion: "Ik (zoude) echter geen weg met
'Sisero, Seres'... weeten" (Pels).

Usage during the latter half of this century was predominantly with 'c',
though the use of 's' in "sieren, sieraad" was spreading. Users of the latter
include Luyken, Meijer and Winschooten. Meijer also includes the less common
spelling "citteren ... waer voor nu in gebruik is 'sideren'", the former clearly
showing its German origin. Not all felt "sieren" to be Dutch however,- Laconis,
after commenting that 'c' only appears before 'k' or 'h' adds "Intellige in pure
teutonicis; quale ideò non existimo verbum 'cieren', cum compositis suis &
derivatis".

Winschooten actually objected strongly to the inconsistency of using pre-
palatal 'c' in loan words, and replacing all other 'c' spellings with 'k': "het
sama woord te schrijven met een C, als'er een A, of 0, of U, volgd: wat is dat
and O T - s, a Lu oen klaare saak do nr veele ornwoegen te verduLnteron, en den oorspronk
(b - r - wonrb.>: ic vta'b o :  tar - ' U i " .  - ' ' o i '  cdwlou.sly "  I'oreign" words l i e  would thus prefer
a cons, i  aient and
i  n , ; ,  ei tlier all with *n-' or with 'k-/s-' where appropriate;
i  aition shows that his own inclination is to preserve 'a-'.
He made an exception for "sierlijk, sierael"("sieraad" is not listed),"goede
sier saeken", although he realized that the use of 'a' here was still too radical
for some: "ons dunkt, dat wij tegen alien gaapen, die ons tegenwerpen sal, hut
ontwiste moed 'sieren', want dat te schrijven met een 'a', dat moede bij hem een
God goede aijn... wij bevienden dan, dat dit soord voortmendelijk op
vlierderhands zijnen gespeld werd". These four "principle" way (what are the
others?) are "chier, cier/gier, gier, sier", though "chier, vier" were by now not
in very widespread use. "Chier" was unacceptable because the 'sh' was "al te
bruil", i.e., the normal /ch/ sound was not heard; "Gier" was wrong because the
basic sound of 'c' was /k/, the /s/ being a corruption, and "sier", "quansuis op
sijn frans" was no better, unless to show a 'ts' pronunciation, viz. /ts/ in his
system. In the end he decided that "sier" or "zier" was best, dependant on the
individual writers' use of these two letters. His own system, avoiding 'a',
prescribed "sierlijk" etc.

More radical is Van Gelderen, in his Spelkonst of the same year (1633):"voor
've, vi, oy' behoort men te schryven 've, vi, sy'... 'C' behoort men in Neerduits
diet te schrijven dan tusschen een 's' en een 'h'"- he actually wishes to use the
's-' spellings. The comment given by Kuyper is ambiguous: "de C staande voor de
Vocalen E en I word genomen als S,- Ceres, Cederoom, Sidderen... of Sere,
Sederoom, Sidderen...", but a similar comment by Galliers is not: "In de Zyllaben
daar de 'c' voor een 's' ofte 'i' komt te staan, speld of spreekt men de 'c'
gelyk een 's', Als: Cisero, Ceresonic, Calinder, leest aldus Sisero, Sersononic,
Sylinder", n.b., they can also be spelt with 's-'.

Certainly there must have been a significant number of people who, like these
just mentioned or even more radical, adopted the 's' in any word in frequent use
in Dutch, for Sewel felt obliged to condemn these forms in his dictionary and
Guider: "... but now ('c') is almost rejected, only in some few words it remains
still in use, as 'Ceel, cieraad, cierael, cyfer'; which yet some will spell 'Seel,
sieraad, siersel, syfer'". Later editions repeat this, inserting translations for
I. not adopting this "new" spelling in the dictionary entries. In
the 1703 Dictionary, in the Dutch section, he adds a note (almost certainly
repeated, see below): "Cesare geschryven 'sieren, sierael' enz., en niet
'sieren' of 'sieraad' enz., den lat. 'sieraad' reikt zo sierlyk schijnt, of ten
taak doel behörger, on recht gebruikelijk is". E.g., in 1704, inserts a single
spelling word at the end: "gewoont".

Buys' conception was of such a sense opinion as Goos's, though he allowed "sieren"
not the example of "woot": "De letter C (sient) vaalijx ergens toe ... dan (in C)
... behouden dat een regt regi gesten woorden uitzonderen, die, om het ingeworteld
gewricht niet te willen te zijn, ligt met een C, schoon anders een S of K
gebruike, willen geschenen zijn: als 'ceder, celie, cierent, cilbel, cingel,
cirkel, citroen, civel, cipres' en veleige meer". The only reason for not using
's' here was tradition. Kylau agreed with this: "In dese volgende woorden 'Cesar,
Cicero, Cypres, Ceder, Cyperns, Oraniaan, Cichorei', en enige andere, uit het
Grieksch of Latyn oorspronkelyk is de 'C' niet te verwegen. Doch 'sieret,
sieren, versieren', is beter met een 'S', E.G.P. retains 'C' even in "cieraet".

In 1706 however, an apparently completely new spelling appears. This comes
from Noor, who, basing his theory on the undeniable fact that Latin prepalatal
'C' was originally pronounced /k/, as shown by Greek transcriptions of Latin
names, mooted the idea that 'k' should be used in all words of Latin provenance
which had originally had /k/, and naturally also Greek and Hebrew words with /k/
that had "become" /s/ on their way to Dutch via Latin. Words which did not have
an original /k/ could use 's'. A concession to usage allows 'c' to be retained in
purely Latin words, but "de woorden 'cieraet, vercieren, cierlyk', die men van
uits met een C schreef, worden voeglykher, naerdien men by den verbasterden klank
der C niet behoort te blyven, met een S gespelt; gelyk van den Drost Hooft
geschiedt; als 'Sieraet, versieren, sierlyk'. En dezen woet men houden in
het schryven van 'Sedel' voor 'Cedel', en van 'Syferl voor 'Cyfer', als uit
andere taalen, en van 'Schedules' en 'Sifra' afkomstig.

"Alls andere woorden, van Latynschen oorsprong, en met een C beginnende, als
'Celle, cipier, cynes, cingel, cirkel', Moogen (!) met de C onder de Nederlanters
ook geschreven worden; terwyl weder andere, uit het Grieksch oorspronkelyk,
schoon ze van de Latynen de C ontfanger, by ons hunne erfelyke K nootwendigh moeten
"Names, which, taken to be names of Greek origin, should be pronounced with /k/.

Such a suggestion was bound to cause arguments. First however there appeared a pamphlet "De spelling van Moonen in eenen brief verdedigt door P.H.P." presumably the future editor of the Boekzaal P. Poerct (P.S. identifies him thus already in 1712). This did not get a very favorable review in the contemporary Boekzaal by the then editor Van Gaveren: "Dat men de C in 'Cesarconst', Cicero, Ceder, Cypres, Ocean, Cichorei', niet zou mogen verwijderen, en de K voor de inlassen, om de hardheid der uitspraak, is, naar 't oordeel van den Schryver, van kleen of geen belang; want de harde spraakklink aet onze taale somtyts groote deftigheit by". A new supporting argument is also introduced: "De Grieken vertaalen 'Cicero' door 'Kikeroon', waarom ook wy niet door 'Kikero'. Immers wy zeggen wel 'Kelder, Kerse, Kist'; en deze woorden niet zijn afgeleidt van de Latynsche 'Cella, Cerasus, Cista', werpt de schryver (P.H.P.) eens op als een balletje van gissinge". This acknowledged development is supposed to justify a revision in the pronunciation of /c=/>k/.

The next to criticize this 'k' spelling, after Sewel's "Aanmerkingen op het boekje genaamd de spelling van A. Moonen verdedigd" of 1703 (cf. Boekzaal 1703a, 556), was Nyloe, who added a special "Vervolg" in the 2nd edition of his work, specifically to answer P.H.P.. On this spelling in particular he writes "Dit moet ik hier noch by voegen, want meer over de spelling der letteren te schryven verveelt my; de reden waarom ik 'Cesar, Cicero, Cypres, Ocean, cibori, ceder, celle, citer, Cyrus', enz. met een 'c', en niet met een 'k' schryve ... is deze, omdat het ongewone geluit der 'k' in deze woorden de meeste oren verveelt, ja die dikwyls onverstaanbaar maakt,... want schoon deze woorden volgens hunne oorsprong ene 'k' vereischen, zo is'er echter de 'c' door het langdurig gebruik onder ons eigen aan geworden, en daarom zo ligt niet te verweren".

Van Hoogstraten, a supporter of Moonen in many spellings, could not accept this ruling of his: "Zeker Moonen (!), die dit ('c' becoming 'k') zoo stip heeft willen nemen, in de woorden van Griese afkomst, dawyl de Grieken van geene C
v. "(van, ooit) enkel in gebruik door onzen, dat niet heeft gehad, om dat het gebruik by ons dat niet heeft.

Van: ooit' heeft in een byna recht geschreven vond 'Keeder, Kyprès, Ocean, Sikero', enz. maar achter altoon 'Ceeeder, Cyprès, Oceaan, Cicero', enz. die een ditsprecht 'Ceeeder, Sikroë, Oceaan, Cicero' enz: zo is 't best dezelve woorden niet met K, doch ook met C (vul het tóp vast gaat dat de Nederlanders die niet behoren te gebruiken) maar met S te spellen. En waarom ook, by voorbeeld, vóór niet 'Cicero'... met S gespeld als 'Sisera' (the biblical name)?

... Indien de Nederlanders ook schou onwaar 'Kikero' enz. te spellen, zo waare hen mede in het Grieks (en die veele hoe veele andere Taalen meer, daar enige in het Nederlandse gebarentwijlijke woorden van oorspronglijk zyn) eerst te leeren, om hunne bloem 'Keerde, Sikkoë, Oceaan, Sikero' enz; zo is 't best dezelve woorden niet met K, noch ook met C (vul het tóp vast gaat dat de Nederlanders die niet behoren te gebruiken) maar met S te spellen. En waarom ook, by voorbeeld, vóór niet 'Cicero'... met S gespeld als 'Sisera' (the biblical name)?

"Ik geloof evenwel (dus zoal onlangs een hoog geleerd Heer tot my) dat alio Taalen van de Waereld verwantschap met malkander hebben; en dit zo zyné, moet volgen, dat men, om zulks te erkennen, is 't niet met de K, 'Kikero', ten minste met de C, 'Cicero' spellen, maar bissensmeer met de S'.

"Doch ik voor my geloof niet slegs, maar weet zeeker, dat alle mensen, van Adams of Noags wege, verwantschap met malkander hebben; en nogtans is die verwantschap zo oud en ver, dat wy, Hollanders, geene of bezaalachtige reden hebben om, by voorbeeld, na te gaan, of wy van Sem, Cham of Jafet (Noa's Zoonen) herkomstig zyn. ... Indien wy al na den oorspring van eenig woord willen vragen, zo zullen wy beeter te recht komen by onzer Taale nóg leevende Noeder, de Hoogduitse Taal, dan by de zaaelige meer-dan-bet-oud de 'Griekse of Latynse Taal' (p.2-3i,1743).

Several interesting points arise from this; his comment on the need to know other languages in order to spell Dutch correctly could have been fruitfully read by many later theorists; he dared to suggest that Dutch was only a distant relative of Latin, and should not copy its spelling habits; but more important,
in the final to suggest the regular use of 's' instead of 'c' in foreign names.

This in turn were raised than any predecessor.

By comparison De Haes's equally extensive criticism is very tame, though none the less valid. He goes through the various spellings suggested by Moonen and investigates each (or most) of them: "schedel" from "schedule", most Latin words with 'c-' were pronounced in Dutch with /sk-/, thus this word should really be spelt "schadel", resulting in confusion with "de krui van het hoofd"; "syfer" from "sifra"—"doch in welke tale dat woord, aldus gespeld, gevonden word, is my te beteekoe onbekend" (it is in fact Arabic, but, as De Haes points out, it is not spelt "sifra") etc., etc. He even agrees with Bowl that 's' is "clieryk" in "ciereaal" etc., because of the older and better established usage. De Haes's arguments and usage were later admired by the "Kunst" grammar of 1770.

The fact that Greek spelt Latin words with 'k' was irrelevant as far as De Haes could see: "De Grieken onthoren de 'k', maar wy niet: waarom zouden wy ons dan ontgenomen teenen van de beboetje der Grieken, daar wy in de ruimte kunnen leven". Zeydeber rejects 'k' in loan words, but then he rejects loan words in general: "zulke woorden behooren uit onze Taalte verbannen te worden". Holtrop too mentions Moonen's "Keder" spelling, and rejects it.

It would seem then that Moonen had no followers in this respect, except for Poepraet. Only two other writers hinted at the use of /k/ or 'k', one of whom was just as much condemned by his contemporaries as Moonen. This was Van Daele, early in the 19th century, who argued that 'c' and 'k' were identical, and could be interchanged. De Simpel voices the opposition to this when he feels that "Het zoude een angstvallige kiesheid, of eigentzinnheyt zijn van met een Vandaele 'Kikero' voor 'Cicero' te schrijven en uit te spreken" (n.b.). The other reference came from Kramer's grammar's reviser, this time writing in his own work (Van Moerbeek, 1791): "(c) klingt wie een 's' oder 'k' wenn 'e, l', und 'y' folgen".

Majority opinion ignored Moonen's unworkable suggestion, continuing to use 'c-', with a fairly widespread use of 's' in "sieraad". Other 's' spellings occur haphazardly, "Prinses" for example being very common, probably by analogy with "Prins", and the Boekmaal had "Desember" for one year only in 1716, after which it reverted to "December", presumably under the weight of public opinion.
In the revision of La Grue’s grammar in 1719, echoing this tendency, writes:

“Das ’c’ ist unmitlässig in der Holländischer Sprache, weil man es als ’k’ ausgesprochen und man beliefert sich auch dieser lüden Nachtstücken, alle von den ’c’ gebrauchten solte. Einige behalten das ’c’ in den Wörtern, welche aus den Lateinischen oder Pranfliischen ihren Ursprung haben, als in denen Wörtern: ’Cedel’ Zellet; ’Ceder’ Ceder; ’Cement’ Gips, Kalk; ’Ceremonie’ eine feyerliche gewohnheit; ’Citroen’ Citrone; ’Cyffer’ Ziffer; ’Cyrr’ Zins.

Rather than merely being similar, this is obviously a direct translation of Sewel/La Grue, with substitution of German meanings as appropriate. In fact on closer examination the entire book of Cuno is nothing more than a translation of Sewel/La Grue, with almost identical spelling, even down to the irregularities and misprints of the original! There are also not a few mis-translations (see other chapters). The only alteration he carries out is the use of German parallels instead of Sewel’s French.

This may not be thought remarkable, as plagiarism was not so great a crime in those times, but it is indeed surprising when the reader has just seen what Cuno has to say on his new work: “Der Verfasser ... hat dem Ansehen nach dem bekannten Sprach-Künster MATTHIAS KRAMERN gefolget. Doch hat er in der That, bessere Dienste als jener gethan”! Apart from not being inordinately modest, which is quite normal when advertising ones own book, he fails to mention his true source, possibly he felt that as only French people would read Sewel/La Grue, and only
Cuno wrote his own work, nobody would notice the resemblance. (Cuno was a German
mercenary who resided in Amsterdam for a couple of years 1740-2, working as
proof reader to one of the printers, possibly Z. Romberg who printed his work.)

In mid-century, Juchuts prepared to accept 's' in "versieren" (alongside
"geschoren") 3. Not in others: "dose spelling set 's' word by
word, his geen liycbheren van de 'c' in onze Taal zyn, ook in andere woorden
in acht genomen, schryvende 'syffer, syfferkinst' enz.", he would not accept
anything but 'c' in "oecean, cingel" etc. De Roches, however, felt 'c' to be
admissible in what he considered "de enigste opregte Vlaamsche woorden, die met
ene 's' geschreven moeten zyn", namely "cier(asd), 'als ook een 'Cysken',
soken vogel".

Another radical proposal for the replacement of 'c' in loan words came in the
Snoeijmes of c.1760, where the anonymous writer asks "wat gaat de afkomste van
die vreemde woorden de Vlamingen aan?", the avoidance of 'c' forming part of a
radical system also abolishing 'ph, qu, x'. He opted, however, not always for 's',
but also for "versieren" with 'z'; this is a little strange as he otherwise makes
a normal use of 's/z'. Had the influence of Dutch phonetics caused the prevocalic
/s/ to become /z/? It is certainly used in the sense of "opschikken" (see chap.9).

Zeydelaar, who, as mentioned above, opposed Moonen's 'k-' spellings, chose
for himself 'c': "niet 'c' schrijv' ik de volgende woorden: 'cédé, cédé, cel,
ciment,... cier, cieraad, cierlijk' 'vercieren' spéll' ik met 'c', niet met 's',
on dat't betôkent opschikken. Maar met 'z' schrijv' ik 'verzieren". This
argument is a little difficult to follow, as surely an's/z' differentiaional
spelling would be just as effective as the 'c/z' he prefers. In his Vervolg,
however, he modifies this view a little. First rejecting Van Belle's 'Sisero'
spellings, he then voices support for the system of Petrus Francius in his use of
"vergierten, gieraad, gierlijk". Such a spelling is somewhat anachronistic by the
time of Zeydelaar's writing (1772), assuming that the Francius he refers to is the
one who wrote the famous "Voorreden" on Dutch in 1699. At that time the 's'
spelling was indeed current (see above).

Two more radical moves come now, both, like the Snoeijmes, from the South. The
first in Janssens in 1775: "De letters 'c, h, j, q, x, y', dewelke tot nu in de
Vlaamsche Taal of Letterrol gebleven zijn, dienen om eigennamen en onegte woorden
to spellen". 'C' is to be rejected in all but the mostly obviously foreign words.

It is interesting that he also wishes to abolish the use of 'k'! (by 'k' he means "de Prussische gel - /s/ not /j/). Nonetheless in his English works "Janson" makes a slight concession: "In modern Dutch spelling no words begins (sic) with a C except 'Claron'."

But even more radical than Janson in a later work, the "Inloyding": "Indien het middel waar os de 'c' in de geheelen 'c' te spellen, dit zoude geass voor de Tweel hybragen, behoorende dan haar gebruik in de weynige vlaamsche woorden niet in de geheven te houden". The writer would thus not use 'c' at all, if such were feasible.

By this time, although 'c-' was the normal spelling, the majority of grammars recommended the use of 's' in "sieren" and its derivatives, probably in recognition of its origin in a language (German) which did not use 'c' in it. This is true, for example, of Stijl, Bolhuis, the Gut works, and ultimately Siegenbeek and the Belgian Commission spellings, and all the works based on them. Most of these classify "sieren" etc. not as exceptions to the "'c' in loan words" rule, but as native Dutch words, e.g. Bolhuis: "in woorden van onze tale gebruike men de 'k' of 'c' voor 'c': Koning, sierlijk"; others regarded the words as originally foreign but now thoroughly naturalised (in use if not in sound). At first the 's' was only accepted in this word, but it soon became extended to a few other words, e.g. Siegenbeek allowed "singel".

The rest of the loan words with prepalatal 'c' were to retain the 'c', this at a time when 'k' spellings in loan words were becoming much more widespread. It is not unreasonable to assume that the alien sound of prevocalic /s/ inhibited the acceptance of the very many common words (such as "cent") as Dutch, whereas loans with 'c'=/k/ had relatively little difficulty (q.v.). Some, however, were even more conservative than Siegenbeek; De Neckere for example resisted any attempt to replace a foreign 'c' of either pronunciation by a Dutch letter, thinking "cingelen" the best spelling, or even 'z': "'T is waer wy hadden dese en meer andere woorden ... konne schryven ... met de letter Z in plaats van met de C; maar hier bij souden wy immers of van de Ouden of van het oorsprontelyk afwyken" (p. 61, note that he too uses 's' for both /s/ and /z/, see above). He rejected, however, the radical suggestion of Van Daale that "ssieraed" should be used (chap. 11)
Other conservatives include De Jager (Versch., p. 32), and Carlebur, who both thought that as many loan words as possible should retain their original spelling, though Carlebur also includes "cierlijk" in this category.

It is more normal, however, to find the 'c' rejected, as for example by Schuyler, Renier, D'Hulster, Willem, and the Belgian Commission spelling. Seats rejected any use of 'c' in Dutch words with any sound other than /ch/: "Men is bêk óm dat de 'c' in Nederlandsche woorden ongedijt gebruikt wordt... voor 's' altherde 'cat', als 'sedert, sieren', in de plaats van 'sedert, sieren'" (p. 19). Seats highly individual theories concerning 'c', explained in chap. 3, no doubt influenced this comment. Land too, as part of his reform plan, wished to use 'c' in a new function, thus needing to abolish it in any words in frequent use in Dutch (there is no reason why his plans should imply that all loan words should lose their 'c', they would just form exceptions to the normal use of 's').

Thijms, who pressed strongly for the adoption of Dutch spellings for many words in common use, did not support the replacement of 'c' by 's': "en eerste om dat 'sedert', en 'either', en 'sent', en 'sales' wellicht niet verstaan worden; ten tweede, om dat haar uitspraak nauwkeuriger door haar-zelve wordt afgeleend (did she hear /ts/?) ; ten derde, en voornamelijk, om dat de 'k' in haar gesproken een bijnaar verwantschap met de 'c' vertoont, maar niet met de 's', en er tussen de 'c' van 'abdijeren' blijv. en de 'k' van 'abdikatie' verband bestaat, maar men in 'abdiseeren' vruchteloos naar overblijfsels van het 'abdikare' der Latijnen zou om zien". This is a very weak argument, relying merely, it seems, on visual tradition, which he sees no reason to extend in favour of retaining the 'c' used for /k/ in "abdikatie". It is possible that the replacement of 'c' by 'k' in Dutch words, which every schoolchild would have learnt about, was so well known that the replacement of 'c' by 'k' in loan words did not result in a great feeling of alienity at the sight of the new spelling. For 'c'=/'s/ this would not be the case.

Much of the argument against 's' in these loan words has in fact been concerned with problems, whether real or imaginary, of word recognition. Yet it is difficult to see why "sent" is further removed from "sent" than "kat" is from "cat" - it is only a matter of what the eye is accustomed to, aesthetics plays no objective rôle.
Du Vrius and To Winkel present the same argument: "De woorden 'cedel', 'sijt' en 'eijns', ofschoon volkomen Nederlandsch van kloon (2), behoren tot 'e', die hunne vreemde herkomst vertaalt, omdat zij steeds wet het zijn gedreven, en uit dien hoofde onder den vorm 'seel, seder' en 'sijn' bestuurlijk herkend worden"; if they had applied this rule with full consistency they could not have changed any of the spellings they proposed. Indeed if all grammer-had used this ruling, no spellings like steeds (ze) zijn geschreven would ever have been changed, and the Middle Dutch system would still be in use.

Radical spellers, who had awaited some improvement over the Siegenbeek system were naturally disappointed. Van Vloten was amongst the first to criticise these spellings, but he is in favour, not of the 's-' spelling, but of the wholesale acceptance of foreign spellings in naturalised loan words: "Wat wijzelf betreft, laat in voorop de volgende punten, dat ik een wijziging in de spelling van 't Woordenboek verlangen zou. Toekening der vier uitgesprekken letters als Nederlandische en daartoe voortvloeiend gegeven gebruik der 'y'(als overgangs- of verlovingss-1), der 'x', 'q', en 't', in woorden waar de afleiding die vordert (b.v. text, quitancy, concert); 2"...". On the other side stood Van Lennep who numbered amongst his suggestions for reform such spellings as "sijfer, sijferaar, sjokolaad, sjerrit", alongside the (relatively) more normal "singel, sier, sigaar, seder".

The Kollewijn movement at first made no mention in their Voorstellen of replacing 'c' by 's', using "aktrige" as an example of a 'k' spelling, see above; but several such changes were included in their later publications. This intensely annoyed Van Dieren, who felt that some radical amendment was being secreted in by the back door, as it were: "En nu komt nog iets over de 'c', wat óók niet in de 9 regels, maar wél in de 'Woordelijk' te vinden is; de 'versenvoudigers'... vinden het wenselijk om woorden als 'cent, cijfer, ceel, citroen, cement, December' met een 's' te schrijven, ofschoon ieder kind door het A.S.C. weet, dat we in 't Nederlandsch een 'c' bezitten en er dus geen bezwaar tegen bestaan kan, deze letter te gebruiken. Des te kleiner en onlogischer vind ik dit verlangen, omdat ze de 'c' in 'cichorei, eijns, cider, simbaal, cirkel, cito, centrum, cipier, circa' ens. willen behouden". Again it is inconsistency
Hiat irri l /... or possibly he is merely using this as a means of...

'...he possibly does not explain how "unity" can incorporate a choice between "locat" and "locat". He does not explain how "unity" can incorporate a choice between "locat" and "locat".

Rombouts, one of the pioneers of the next reform movement, wished to replace all 'c' spellings in loan words by 's' "waar ze als 's' klinkt", thus also in "sent, sijfer, sinteroen". Verschueren wished "c gespr. s = 's": SIAAR, SIGARET, SINGEL. Dus ook "wuzisi, sent, sinteroen", gespr. s = 's' 'fasade, resu'".

This then became the policy of the V.W.S.. Many concessions were made in the Eindvoorstellen, for example "abces, insident, publiseren, sent, vermiselli, akcent, sukses" etc., though the more"foreign" words such as "circa, cello" and words with foreign sounds in them retained 'c', e.g. "nuance" because of the nasalization, and "cyclocon, cynies" where the group 'cy-' is considered an
Unchangeable unit (see chap. 13). Acceptance of the Eindvoorstellen would mean very few lexical spellings ever, and then only in words where only the most radical could suggest reform. The result would then be that 'c-' would be used only in the diagraph 'ck' (including 'sch') and in foreign words (as remains in loan words).

\[\text{\textit{ck}}, \text{\textit{kk}}\text{'final- \textit{ck}':}\]
- pre 1650: 'ck' only used on the whole ('kk' rare)
- 1650-1670: 'kk' becoming more common, also '-k'
- 1670-1700: 'ck' still common in the South, rapidly dying out in the North
- 1700-: 'ck' dies out in the South too.

Pre 1661 defenders of 'ck': Van der Schuere, Fostart, Daormer, Ampzing, Plemp, Montanus, Kok, Leupenius, Van den Ende, Beyer.

Post 1661 defenders of 'kk': Binnart (late editions), Bilius, Pouyat (pre 1753)

Defenders of 'c-' De Heuiter, Van Heule, Montanus, Bilius.

Defenders of 'ck' Binnart (very many used it without defence)

'c' = '/k/' in Dutch words:
- Ampzing, Van Heule, Niervaert, Overschie, Van Belle, Snoeijs

- limited use: Stijl, Bolhuis, Siegenbeek, Schaegel, Willena, Silderend, etc.

- radical use: Thijse, Hollstein, Peemont, Rombouts,转型, Verschuieren, Rapport, Eindvoorstellen

'c-' Kilian, De Heuiter, Montanus, Dafforne, Plemp, Van den Ende, Volentibus, Sewel, E.C.F., Das Roche, Zeydelaar, Letterschik, Thijm, Van den Ende, Sewel, etc.

pronounced '/ks': Van Heule, Montanus, Siegenbeek, Sewel, Mooney, Ten Kate, Van Belle, etc.

pronounced '/ck': Ampzing, Meijer, Overschie, Van Belle, Snoeijs.

spelt 'ck': Kilian, (Stevins), De Hubert, Ampzing, Leupenius, (Winschooten)

spelt 'ks': Van Beusonta, Van der Venn, Cats, (Vondel), Krui, Van Yk, Francius, Ristling, Van Alkemade, Langendijk, Zeydelaar.

spelt 'chk': Middle Dutch, Beehnus, Lambrecht, De Heuiter, - For a few words only; 'chiere, chyns' still quite common in 17th century.

spelt 'ck': Mooney, P.H. Poer, Van Daal.

'sieren' and derivatives only spelt 's-': Luyken, Meijer, Winschooten, Nyhoff, Mooney c.s., Hueydecoper, Wagenaar, Inleyding, Stijl, Bolhuis, Net c.s.

'sieren' and a few others spelt with 's-': Siegenbeek, De Winkel (singel) Van Lempen (sijfer).

all loans spelt with 's-': Van Helderan, (Gelliers), Van Bell, Snoeijs, Inleyding (in theory), Jansaens; Rombouts, Verschuieren V.W.S.
Chapter 3: The digraph CH.

The nature of 'ch' as a digraph or a single letter.

For many years it was a matter of much discussion whether 'ch' was one letter or two, and also whether the sound it represented was compound or simple. One aspect of this, the granting of an alphabetical name and inclusion in alphabetical order, can be seen to be almost wholly dependent on the views of the writer in question. - see chapter 17.

Already in 1612 Jacob van der Schuere was undecided: 'Men zal ook vete, dat 'ch' over al inde spellings een-seen-geknocht blijft, also oft maer een Letter en waer: net velke in'lachen, pochen', ende vél meer ander wel blijkt"(p.54). Here he alludes to the fact that the 'ch' in such words is not split between the syllables ('lac-hen), but he realises that it cannot be a single letter ('also oft...'), as it does not behave like one, since a doubling would then have been needed. Many later writers did in fact do this, -see chap.4, but for Van der Schuere does not seem willing to accept this.

Like Van der Schuere, Dafforne regards 'ch' as a single sound, which he calls the "hieghende GT, and which is only split "als de aillabe 'heyt' (door misbruykinghe) na de C komt, in 'Goedic-heyt"(p.92). It is distinctly possible that some grammarians, when they say that 'ch' is "one letter", may in fact mean that it has a single sound /ch/, rather than it being a single letter in the way that would be implied now. This is due to the triple meaning of the word "letter" in early grammars, - "nomen, figura, potestas", the name, the shape or form, and the sound,- categories borrowed from Latin tradition. With Van der Schuere it is clear that he means "figura", as he is discussing its use "inde spellings", but Dafforne is probably referring to the "potestas" as well.

Less ambiguous than most is Montanus: he realises that 'ch' represents a single sound, and points out that it is consequently illogical to regard it as two letters. He wishes it to be accepted that 'ch' "geen verschillende twee.
Letteren;... wees alleen een enkelde letter \\y\,... en dat het geen van die twee letteren on is, maar dit een 't will spelen". Not quite as clear is Pels in 1777, when he writes (p.1) "de 'ch', die \(\times\) niet, syn wel twee tekens, doch by sy onen enkele letter, de wat betreft der Tabel van de 'p', so in het Grieksch 'x' erin geroepen wordt"; here he could conceivably mean by "letter" the sound (harricon), but his spelling of "leuchten" (p.1) suggests that he also meant it to be regarded as a single composite "figura".

The same reasoning may be applied to Sewel in the "Korte Verhandeling" in his dictionary: "CH te verenemen, wil by niet, by ooit het oogelyk de Griekse x" is, en gevolgelyk naar 'én letter, schoon twee merken"; however this last phrase may also mean that for him it was "één letter" (potestas), but a double "figura", hence not "one letter" in the sense used by Montanus. The Grammario plus exacte of 1701 has a similar view: "CH,... est aussi un son treo-simlo, exprime par deux caracteres".

Moonen is unambiguous; he uses "in het opmaaken van de dubbele letter, die de Grieken \(\chi\), Chi noemen", for all its representing a single sound it is still for him a "dubbele letter". Yet he always uses it with a singular verb: "Deze 'ch'... wort altijt in het midden en einde der lettergreep gebruiikt" (p.3), whereas Pels, as noted above, though regarding it as a single letter, uses a plural verb: "de 'ch'... syn wel twee tekens". This difference may indicate that Pels meant his statement to be read "de 'co-ha'..." whereas Moonen meant "De 'che'('chi')...", cf. chap.1.

Tuinman, like Moonen, regards the 'ch' as two letters, but differs in that for him it is not so much a double letter, as a 'c' affected by the following 'h': "Den eigentlyken klank van de Griekse letter 'chi', b.v. in 'Christus', kunnen wy met onze boekstaven niet uitdrukken. De Latynen gebruikten daar voor wel 'ch', en dat volgen wy: maar hoe koot de 'c' voor de 'h' aan een geluid dat naar de 'g' gelykt, en als tusschen 'g' en 'k' is?" (§142). He does not elaborate on his pronunciation of "de Grieksche letter 'chi'", but his comments show that he means the fricative pronunciation /\(\chi\)/, rather than the original Greek aspirated /k\(\text{̣}h\)/.

His reference to the Dutch pronunciation is also of interest, as he was certainly aware of the lack of voicing in 'ch', though he does not mention it as such; this is what his final phrase means "tusschen 'g' en 'k'\(\text{̣}\)- i.e. it is fricative like
like 'k', but unvoiced like 'k'.

De Van jod the view of Ephraemi (that 'ch' is a 'c' altered by a
following 'h') that Van Cornelia criticises heavily in his Aedeling (I,22): "De
CH, ... want in den rang van ons gewoon Asee niet getelt. De waan, uit
bovenstaande opgetaakt, doet liijder als tweeklinkig geooruom", whereas 'CH' is
simply a 't' 'verschillende letter, en de scherpe'.

Perhaps going further than most others in the use of 'ch' as a single
phonem, and ignoring Van Cornelia's comment (which he almost certainly knew), was
Van Jod: "De letteren van Tweeklinkers, Doe, Den, Dee, Chee, Ka, Jee, Ke, Pe,
nee, Xee, Xee en Xee" (1951, 11). 'CH' is thus completely on a par with any other
phonem, "niet nomen, petestas", although regarding 'ch' as a single
"Tweeklinker", he considered 'che' to be a "Vierklinker", i.e. a group of
four consonants (1755, p.2). De Haes also treats 'CH' as a single letter (figura),
with the logical consequence of this on his spelling "lachchen", he thinks the
spelling "lachen" as incomplete as "lachen" would be for "plachten"; it is for him
"eene enkele 'ch'" (p.114).

Sinkel, in 1761, presumably feels 'ch' to be self-evidently two letters, as
he expresses a scathing, and mildly sarcastic, criticism of Moonen: "Dat 'ce ha'
het geluid van een scheer 'g' hebben, dat immers zo klaar is, als dat Klaas en
Jan een spitze Pieter maken" (1761, v1). He does not appear to have understood
Moonen's argument (cf. his comments in chap.13).

As with some of the earlier grammarians (see above), it is not perfectly
clear what the implications are when Stijl writes that "Hem heeft echter de 'c'
nodig tot het dubbeld letterteken 'CH', waarvan de naam en klank niet 'ce-ha',
maar enkelvoudig 'che' is". The "naam en klank" (nomen & potestas) he rightly
describes as "enkelvoudig", but he describes the "figura" as a "dubbeld
letterteken". This could be interpreted to mean a combination of two consonants,
or a single complex symbol 'ch'. The sentence seems to imply the former, but it
is not without ambiguity. C.W.Holtrop is clear however, speaking of "de CH,
die hier voor eenen letter verstrekt, gelijk het behoort" (1783, p.8).

The schoolbooks of the Nijt present a varied picture: the Spel en lees Boekje
voor Eerst Beginnenden (all editions) contains a paragraph on the "Zesengestelde
Nede-klinkers ch, sch, kl, kr, ss, ff, ö, ò, sl, fl", which is a strange mixture of
Illustrations of the different consonants (ct, sl), included because of their special form, some double consonants (ff, double long s) for the same reason, and some double "samengestelde letters" (i.e., digraphs (ch, sch); it is not immediately obvious why "ll" and "ll" are included. It is evident however that for the earlier "cut and Zach" were on a par with "ll, ct", which thus designates 'ch' as a combination of two letters, not a single one. Nonetheless the earlier Trap de Jong (1793) informs that "de 'ch' wordt voor een letter gehouden"; and the 1825 Edition refers to "de samengestelde 'ch'".

The Spelboekje voor eerstbeginnenden of 1303 (a different book contemporary with the Spel en Lees-boekje), is as inexplicit as the other works as to the reasoning behind its word lists; the lessons are graded according to the number of syllables in the words (ending with "o-ver-al-on-te-gen-woordigheid", also used incidentally by Schwiers p.37), and in the section on syllables "van twee en drie letters" gives the lists "sa, ta, va, wa, cha, scha, kla, pra, sla, pla, pha...". On reaching "cha" the reader assumes that he is now on the syllables "van...drie letters", but the next entry "scha", thus having four, contrary to the title, invalidates the assumption, and the only possible conclusion is that if "scha" can have no more than three letters, then "cha" must have only two, and 'ch' itself must be a single letter.

This view is confirmed by their more advanced Spraakkunst of 1314 (not the same work as the Nut grammer by Bolhuus of 1303): "Wat betreft de wijze van verdubbeling des medeklinkers..., het zou zeker eigenaardiger (more consistent) en net de gewone regelmaat overeenkomstig zijn, dat men, met herhaling der 'ch', 'lachchen, lichchaam' schreef". If the 'ch' is thus capable of being doubled, it must be a single letter. The writer then concedes however that the 'ch' is "dubbelvormig", though he still treats it as one letter. Varick felt that either view was acceptable: "men (moet) CH als een letter op zich zelf, of een samengestelde letter beschouwen".

The view of Siegenbeek is in essence the same as that of Pels: 'ch' "hoe zeer dubbelvormig, (bezig) in der daad slechts een' enkelvoudigen klank"(p.151), i.e. the "potestas" is single but the "figure" is double. This is the opposite view to that held by De Simpel: "Men behoudt dan deze 'ch', in navolging der griezen voor een enkele letter"(p.21), though once more it is not clear how many
meaning he includes in the word "letter". Behaegel is more explicit: "CH,
waarvan het (n.h.) uitgesneden woord, is eer een (= één) teken of geluid; waer
zie geadvoceren bijstuk dat C en H. De claims to be rather dissatisfied
with the lack of clarity in the arguments of Segenbeek/Weiland etc. (1,370).

Considering all these statements it may be thought strange that Bilderdijk
was unwilling to accept the singleness of 'ich': "Het ware (n.h. subjunctive) niet
onvoldoende dat een voor 'ich'... als één letterteken aanzag(Spraakleer
n.13), which is the more strange as he is opposed to the logically consequent
inter-vocalic doubling after a short vowel, "dewijl zy (ch) zich aan wederzijde
aandeelt" (n.40), i.e. in the same way as "zet-ten". How he intends that "één
letterteken" can divide itself between syllables he does not explain.

After Segenbeek it has generally been accepted that although obviously
representing a single sound, the 'ch' is two letters forming a digraph, in just
the same way as 'oc' represents a single vowel but is two letters. This view is
not without difficulties, as can be seen in chap.4.

The spelling 'ch' and suggested reforms.

With very few exceptions the spelling of /ch/ (or /x/), i.e. the unvoiced
Dutch fricative /x/, has always been 'ch'; but as with other spellings, it is
just these few exceptions which offer the most interest. Although the use of a
single 'c' for /ch/ occurred very sporadically in Middle Dutch, e.g. "acterste"
(O'Brien & Van Loey), "licitalic, noo" (Van Loey, ZW2), this is mostly restricted
to the spelling 'sc-' (see chap.12), and before 't'. This practice did not
survive long after the early 16th century, and the spelling with 'ch' became
standard. Conversely 'ch' is sometimes found in Middle Dutch for /k/, e.g.
"cherch, gheechacht" (V.Loey, ZW3).

Many grammarians have realised either the inconsistency of spelling a single
sound with two letters, or at least the difficulties caused by so doing, but only
a handful proposed doing anything about it, though they span a considerable
number of years. In fact one must go as far back as De Heuiter for the first
attempt to abolish the 'ch'. He first notes that whereas in Latin and Greek /h/
only occurs before vowels, in Dutch it also occurs before a consonant, where it is
usually spelt 'ch'. Following from this he wishes to change the spelling from
'ch' to 'h': "In 'achter, achten, acht, mach, dach, sach, lach' of 'ahter, ahten,
90.

It was perfectly justifiable therefore for De Heuiter to propose spelling 'h' in all positions (cf. "labben" chap. 4), except that in the letter combination 'sch' he preserved the existing spelling, for in this position he considers it to be like 'th'; "hen wel 'sh' en 'h' geheel haar (c) zouden te verdrucken en als de letteren " - the 'h' and 'sh' do not affect the 'c' that it almost disappears. In this too he is historically correct, as the 'ch' in 'sch' did not develop from /l/ l' but from /k/. Whether he was aware of this cannot be sure, though he must have known the dialectal pronunciation with /sk-/. He found very few followers for his "'h'-for-'ch'" spelling, although many later writers knew of it. The word "beschana" in the Twee-perroek p.43 (1584 only) is certainly a misprint, as Spiegel has just declared the 'c' to be indispensable here.

One of the first later grammars to comment on this 'h' spelling was Snyters (1613), who, discussing the latest tendencies, laments that "eenen anderen noch absurderlijker, wil in plaats van 'ach, licht, noch, deucht' &c (de 'c' vervorrende) 'ah, light, noh, deuht' &c. gespelt hebben ... het welcke ... men voor (een) onnodighe spitsvindighe(id) houden moet". Dafforne, some years later, felt that De Heuiter had "vanden rechten ghebruyk verdwaald" in this usage and others. De Heuiter actually used his spelling system in his Gechiedenis van de Gravine... van Bourgongie...
91. Ai'ipziTig, ho d o u r n o t actniil.y a d o p t t h e  ' h ' s p e l l i n g , th o u g h  he o f t e n  w ish ed to
Lh(' sound o f  'h ' and 'c li* . T' s l s  is  i n  f a c t  th e  l a s t  a p p e a r a n c e  o f  th e
Mi' ; u-V'ing.

"it" f i .r .l  fo V  I  i  C O  a d e i s i r e  f o r  th e  i n t r o d a c t i o n  o f  a t o t a l l y  new l e t t e r  f o r
M  i  sound W H S  Loipoen i.iis ; "Ons dnnkî, d a t  men d e ' c ' g e h e e l soude konnen o n t b e e r e n ,
w an n eer men een 'c h ' In do r d a a t s e  liadde, g e ly k  de lie b re e u sc h e en G r ie k s c h e d i-
ven dus in de rije vande dobade letteren s ingte stellen: maar soo lange men n i e t
goed w i n s t a b l e n letteren in te voeren, soo mocht men ik met de oude beholpen:
doeh n i e t b u t t e n de kracht van haare eerste instellinge": Three interesting points
arise o u i . o f  Miir: f i r s t l y  t h a t  e v e n  i f  a new letter were in tr o d u c e d , he would
stil i n t e n d  i t  t o b e i n c l u d e d "in de rije vande dobade letteren", he does not
regard it as a single sound. Secondly his use o f  "sik" with 'b'. This is n o t a
change in spelling but in pronunciation: "nie t ' s i c h ' o f ' s i g ' , om dat wy het van
de boopliitsche taal o n t l e e n e n " , forming a parallel to the development of "ik"
from "Ich". The form "sik" existed since "Middle Dutch in the North Eastern
provinces, and by the 16th century in Holland and some more southerly areas; it
was used i.a. by Varnix and Cats. The third point of interest is the last phrase:
"noch n i e t b u t t e n de kracht van haare eerste instellinge", he was opposed to any
assignation of a new sound to existing letters, which would presumably inhibit
his adopting De Heuiter's 'h' forms. On p.15 he rejects the spellings "menagen,
spaapen" as not representing the sound, but does not say in what way, or if he
knew of such forms, or is merely postulating them to show that 'g' would not make
a suitable substitute for the double letter 'ch' (for 'sg-' see chap.13).

Ten Kate, like Leupenius, felt that the problem of the dual/single nature of
'ch' could be best solved by the creation of a new letter, or rather in his case
by the adaptation of an existing one. He would spell all digraphs with a tie,
thus 'âe, âu, ûg, ick' as well as 'ch':'zulks zoude ook zĳn nutligheld kunnen
hebben"(I,125). No more suggestions for the abolishment of 'ch' in favour of a
new letter or usage appeared for a considerable time, although many writers went
so far with their substitution of 'g' for 'ch' that the latter was almost never
seen in their systems (see below). Very often 'ch' is only found in the
combination 'ach' and loan words.

The next suggestion was in fact that of Smits in 1324:"De regelmaat verejacht
Van onmiskenbare dat ch, v, en de, met enkele letters geschreven worden" (p. 14).

Waarom dit, zal ik wegd, dat is ongetwijfeld gebaseerd op het verkeerde voorstel.

Men zegt dat de Griekse c omvorming heeft plaats gehad (p. 43) — z.b, in Latijn en Dutch 'c' en 'l'

welke is niet gelijk voor uitgesproken. Wij zien en in de volgende paragraaf: "Door eerst de

uitgesproken worden als een scherpe (Dutch) 'g', zó als wij beweren dat de Griekse
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uitgesproken worden als een scherpe (Dutch) 'g', zó als wij beweren dat de Griekse

een zorgelijke kwestie heet" (p. 33). We zien en in de volgende paragraaf: "Door eerst de

uitgesproken worden als een scherpe (Dutch) 'g', zó als wij beweren dat de Griekse

een zorgelijke kwestie heet" (p. 33). We zien en in de volgende paragraaf: "Door eerst de

uitgesproken worden als een scherpe (Dutch) 'g', zó als wij beweren dat de Griekse

een zorgelijke kwestie heet" (p. 33). We zien en in de volgende paragraaf: "Door eerst de

uitgesproken worden als een scherpe (Dutch) 'g', zó als wij beweren dat de Griekse

een zorgelijke kwestie heet" (p. 33). We zien en in de volgende paragraaf: "Door eerst de
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The same also applies to 'sch' which he accordingly treated as ungrammatical. Omitting his premisses, his conclusions and reasoning are without flaw, and even though his assumptions were in part faulty, his proposals would have been of greater regularity in Dutch spelling, giving the simple full-replacement 'll, 'sv, 'sc', 'c/p, as he pointed out. His analogy between the new look 'th in 'ship' and the proposed losing of 'ch' in 'ch' is one which escaped long before him.

It was a co-incidence, and though he often uses the 'c/sch' spellings in his examples (..., "...schrijft u'sch met 'sch' of 'sch'": "voegen (rejigen), ik" use, ..."voegen")), his texts contain on the whole only 'ch/sch' spellings, though "...coincidence occasionally be found" and he has to admit that "...weel dan het gebruik 'sch regt hoogstens in met 'ch' en 'p' vrij te spelling éénparig
to verbannen, en dat deelde reden plécht tegen 'ch', moeten alle reden en
pragmatist evenwel meten voor de dwingendheid van het overheerschende algemeen
schrijf, in der zelve te behouden".

It is probably coincidence that the next proposed replacement of 'ch' also
suggested the use of 'c'. This comes from Land in 1370. As he makes no mention
at all of his predecessor by 46 years, it is probable that there is no question of
influence, especially as Land's motives are not the same, and his proposals bear
no other resemblance to those of Schits.

Land's first priority was to dispose of foreign letters in the Dutch alphabet,
'-c, q, x, y'; and this being done he proceeds to find new uses for them: "De 'c'
der drukkerijen, door 's' en 'k' overbodig geworden, zou dus beschikbaar worden
voor onze tegenwoordige 'ch'". Then, after analysing the vowel sounds, he gives
an example of his ideal phonetic spelling: (a key is necessary: i = /ie/, u = /ee/,
ä = /au/, y = /au/, æ = /æ/, x = glottal stop, q = /ng/, e = /ee/, e1 = /e/,
e2 = /i/, e3 = /ee(j)/)- "xe2n doen bœge2næe scip God doen hemæl xe1n dé
zaardæ. De zaardæ ny was vast xe1n le2dœng, xe1n dœystœrne2s was xo2p dœn
xafgro2ndæ. As can be seen this represents a departure from the traditional
spelling, and some effort is involved in deciphering it ("In den beginne... "). He
had no wish however to introduce changes into any of the existing spelling systems,
rather to introduce a completely new one: "Of zulk een spellingrevolutie in onzen
tijd uitvoerbaar is? - er is zooveel goeds tegen alle verwachting in tot stand.
A strange sight in 1931 was Van Ginneken showing himself in an unaccustomedly radical pose: "Het zou misschien beter zijn deze twee letters (ch) in een te smelten, tot één letterteken, waarin, voor de periode van overgang, de twee deelen nog herkenbaar waren, want ik geloof, dat de 'ch' van de meeste schrijvers geen gesochte, ja zelfs een gemeden spelling is. Pas De Vries en Te Winkel wisten ze in woorden als 'kragt: kracht, magt: macht', een beetje drukker in gebruik te brengen. Maar hard nodig is deze verandering niet". He wishes thus to see a totally new letter composed out of a combination of 'c' and 'h' to facilitate the transition. As he considered 'c' indispensible for loan word spellings, the simplification of 'ch' to 'c' would not have suggested itself to him.

25 years later a new suggestion for abolishing 'ch' appeared in Ons Eigen Blad, where Klück proposed a completely new alphabet (reproduced in later numbers of the periodical), basically a streamlined version of the existing forms, plus several
new letters where needed, e.g., for the long vowels and diphthongs. Naturally a
new letter variation to replace the digraph 'ch'; this was similar to a sans-serif
modal 'l', with a tail, resembling a final Greek sigma (approximately 'q'), and
the 'l' was streamlined to what appears to be a sans-serif 'q'. The sound /ch/
was correspondingly to be represented by 'lq', using the same letter 'q' as for
/ch/ in final position and before 'l'.

When Rombouts presented his formula for a better spelling in 1957, he too,
like Van Simonken, did not conceive of simplifying 'ch' to 'c'. This is a little
strange as he was aware of the inconsistency in the present system, and also
wished to avoid using 'l' from loan word spellings. On p.34 he writes that "Twee
letters voor een klink, 'eh' voor de stemloze 'g', is zeker niet gevoelig, maar we
wilden roeren iets de riemen die we hebben"; and p.36: "Zoals 'v' staat tot 'f',
't' tot 'l', 'h' tot 'g', 'd' tot 't', we staat 'q' tot 'ch'. Het enige verschil
bij dat we, jaarnames, geen onderscheidelijke letter voor de stemloze 'g' hebben,
en aangezien zijn on de gebruikelijke dubbelvorm 'ch'. Probably he felt that
such a use of 'c' was too great an innovation, or had no desire to reform the way
the alphabet was used, but there is no indication in his book that such an idea
had occurred to him.

But it did occur to others: when Seeldraeyers reviewed Rombouts's system in
the Wetenschappelijke Tijdingen for 1953, he suggested certain modifications: the
introduction of a new letter (which Rombouts wished to avoid), viz. the Greek
epitheon for /e/, leaving 'e' for /a/ and further the simplification of 'eh' to
'c'. This, as was also pointed out by its two other proponents Seits and Land,
is a logical simplification, though once more direct influence on Seeldraeyers is
unproven. As Seits also pointed out, a certain elegance would be a result of the
reform, restoring the simple letter opposition 'c/g' so familiar in other
languages, and making obvious the relationship at present obscured by the use
of 'eh'.

One more proposal remains— that put forward in a series of articles by
Willie Wellekens in De Standaard in June 1961, entitled "Beginning over Spelling".
Amongst other changes was the substitution of 'x' for 'ch', no doubt influenced
by Greek, or by the international phonetic alphabet (which in turn gets the 'x'
from Greek), resulting in such a spelling as "atoomschepen". Despite
The present system, and the all too obvious complications of the present system,
but W.T. does not include within each needed simplification in its proposals,
and however, needed by the government committees.

The ending situation for those words is, as for most spellings, clouded by
Hindoos. That most literary texts have been copied and recopied so often that the
original spelling is lost, especially where more editors have modernised the
spelling for earlier spelling, and others, even more serious, have deliberately
archaised the spelling, as often happened with folk poetry only written down
respectively recently but known to be much older. To be really certain of
spellings one must turn to contemporary texts such as official records, and to
the early printed books.

Occasionally the use of 'ch' for /ch/ mentioned in the previous section is
found in final position ("schulbe, "sacs" in V.Loeys data), but in most early
texts (and also the much ferequent form in archaised texts) the spelling for the
words involved was 'ch'. This can be regarded as a purely phonetic spelling,
just as words later spelt with 'ch' were almost universally spelt in Middle
Dutch with 't' (see chap.5).

In inflexion this final 'ch' would automatically become 'gh' in most words,
to represent the now voiced sound, the 'ch' being necessary before 'e' for the
reasons described in chap.1. Resulting from this inflected spelling, analogical
forms are occasionally found with final '-gh'. These are unusual in early texts,
but became more common in later times. Obreen & Van Loey record "heiligh,vervolg".
The rise for '-gh' spellings is usually dated (e.g. by the editors of W.T.) as
the 15th century, being especially common in the 16th and 17th century. In most
of these cases the use of final '-gh' is solely by analogy with the inflected
forms with '-ges', but later on it is found that some used '-gh' where they did
not use '-ges' but '-ge'. Whereas these (e.g.Noonen) added the 'h' for a definite
purpose (see below), the form 'vervolg' above is probably a dropping of 'h' from
the relatively more normal '-gh', rather than a conscious adoption of the '-g'.

As an example of a 15th century text the Exercitium Puerorum has only 'ch' in
final position. In the 16th century much the same situation obtained. Van der
The pronunciation of the final stem '-ch' in the 16th century was almost exclusively '-gh', both in Daelman's and Plantijn's manuscripts. Plantijn had notably '-ch', while Daelman had almost exclusively '-gh', though he also used '-ch' in a few instances such as 'driucht, droech'.

In 1592, Plantijn's spelling '-ch' is used almost exclusively. He used this spelling for words such as 'dacht, dach', and 'zacht, zach'. In contrast, Daelman's spelling '-gh' is used for words such as 'dagh, dagh', 'zagh, zagh', and 'haagh, hagh'.

Daelman's spelling '-gh' was used in words such as 'dagh, dagh', 'zagh, zagh', and 'haagh, hagh'. However, Daelman's spelling '-ch' was used in words such as 'dacht, dach', 'zacht, zach'.

In 1592, Plantijn introduced a completely different way of spelling this final sound, namely with the single 'h', giving such forms as 'gestedih, mah', and other examples noted above. He had few if any followers in this, though several knew of his proposals. Certainly he had no influence on the Twe-spraak, which preferred the '-gh' spelling to the phonetic '-ch': "Dat enighe de 'gh' voor 'ch' willen bezigen vind ich pryslyck ende nondich in woorden die voort met 'gh' vervoegt worden: als 'dagh, zaghe, haagh, reehg', om datmen 'dagh, zagh'... zeyd ende niet 'dachen, zachen'" (p.43). He does recognize that 'gh' and 'ch' are pronounced differently, and is arguing solely...
on grounds of gelijkvormigheid, since the words in question are "met 'gh' vervoeget". Thus he spells "'lagh' dat van 'leg', ende 'ick lach' daar van 'lachen' komt". A few words have ' -g' spellings (cf. also chap. 3), but none have ' -ch', apart from printer's errors (and parts of "lachen" etc.).

As the model for this usage, Spiegel (the putative author of the Twe-spraack) quotes the "Ghentschen Boëtius gheuct int Jaar 1485. (Hier) vind' ick 'voegh, wegh, dueghd, hoogh, jaagh, lagh' etc. met 'gh' ghespelt". It is to be hoped that most of his readers took this at its face value, for by far the greatest part of the Boethius (spelt there "Boecius") of 1485 has ' -ch' forms. It may be that this is reading too much into Spiegel's comment, as he does not actually claim that the whole book has ' -gh', just that such are to be found there. Given this qualification, his choice of only relevant examples is perfectly justifiable, and he is by no means obliged to say that ' -ch' spellings are in the majority, as that is irrelevant to his argument.

It seems probable that Spiegel had some influence with this suggestion, but how much is impossible to say, as the spellings were already current. Amongst numerous ' -gh' spellers are Van der Noot, Van Borsselen, Hooft, etc. Van Beaumont's works are as varied in their ' -ch' spellings as in those with ' -d' (see chap. 5), but show a significant development from approximately 90% ' -ch' in the Grillen (written c. 1595) to approximately 60% ' -gh' in the later Jonckheyt. But even long after Spiegel the ' -ch' spelling was far from dead, and is used at the turn of the century by Stevin, Valcoogh, Roemer Visscher, Rodenburg, etc.

It has already been noted that sporadic ' -g' spellings are to be found in Middle Dutch and in Sexagius and others, but up to the end of the 16th century no grammar had ever recommended its use as standard. In 1612 the first such proposal appears from Van der Schuere, who rejects both ' -ch' and ' -gh': "Dat (g) by velen in eenige plaatsen verachtelijken verworpen, ende in haer plaatse 'ch' gebruykt word, dat geschied (dunkt ons) met al te weynig opmerkinge van eenvoud ende meervoud; als ook mede van de eygenschap der woorden zelve, alsoo genoeg kan gemerkt worden inde woorden 'lach' ende 'lag', die meest elk op eenderley wyze schrijft. ... De 'g' volgende haer kracht ende uytsprike in een Sillabe (en vereenigd) haer nimmermeer met de 'h'. Dat nu vele, oft meest alle Nederlanders in zomme woorden de 'h' aende 'g' koppelen, voornamelijk daerze voor 'e, i, y'
These ideas did not immediately find support. The following year Smyters protested against the spellings "dag"..."dog"..."wegh"(sic)... daermede in twijf'el settende oftmen dag, lour, ofte een poock verstaet, oft men eenen koeck oft wech, om te gaan meynt"(p.5). And it seems that his views are fairly representative of contemporary opinion, for few books of that time have ' -g' spellings. For example the 1614 edition of Hooft's Achilles uses ' -ch', whereas the 1626 Baeto has ' -gh' (from a different printer). Similarly the 1614 edition of Roemer Visscher's Brabbeling has mostly ' -gh' with a less frequent ' -ch', but the pirated edition of 1612, entitled T'Loff vande Mutse"(printed "sonder (diens kennisse ende weete") has the older ' -ch' forms.

And so was it for most writers: Works from this time by Coster, Heinsius and Revius show ' -ch', Van Mander and Brerero have ' -gh', and Huygens and Camphuysen have both spellings, each with a (slight) preference for ' -ch'. In 1624 De Hubert gives the same reasons as Van der Schuere in defence of final ' -g', though with little more success.

It is still the more traditional view which is presented in Van Heule's works, though the number of irregularities in both editions suggests that the typesetter did not fully agree with the views which he was putting into print. In the 1625 edition (p.32) Van Heule declares that "De woorden die in 'ch' eyndigen veranderen in het Veelvoudig ende 'ch' (wordt) eene 'g', als 'Heylich, Heylige, Zalich Zalige, Goedich Goedige'". Yet on p.31 he lists "Dach Dagen; Slag Slagen; wech weegen; Zog Zeugen; weg weegen", and on p.35 he gives the verb forms "zie zag; lach, loug". All of these cannot be blamed on the typesetter however, as Van Heule himself writes p.12 "Zalich of Zalig, Zalige", and most words with the suffix '-ig/-ich' in fact show the ' -ig' alternative. In his 1633 revised version, as noted in the previous section, he expresses an inclination towards the ' -h' spelling of De Heuiter, but does not actually adopt it, and reiterates the formula of the 1625 edition: "Heylich Heylige" etc., though again with the same irregularity elsewhere: p.61 "Dag Bagen" p.62 "Dach Dagen".

Between these two editions of Van Heule, three other grammars appeared: those of Dafforne, Ampzing and Plemp, and of these two agree with Van Heule. Dafforne, the first of the three in 1627, in preferring ' -gh', follows the example of the
Twe-spraack, although he knew of the efforts of Van der Schuere to substitute 
'-g'. Ampzing, like Van Heule (1633), admires De Heuiter's 'h' spelling, but does 
not adopt it. It is possible that Van Heule received encouragement in the 
adoption of De Heuiter's spellings from Ampzing's praise, as although he mentions 
De Heuiter in the 1625 edition, he does not recommend adoption of any of his 
spellings, nor discuss them in depth; for example no reference is made to the 
'-h' spelling in the 1625 edition.

Ampzing in fact follows Van der Schuere and De Hubert: "De enkele gevolg 
letter des meervouds, op 't eynde des eenvouds, achte ik geheel noodzakelijk, ende 
en kan niet sien, hoemen anders kan oordelen, als wy de reden plaatsz willen 
geven. So schrijf ik ... 'heylig heylige', ende niet... 'heylich'... De 'g' heeft 
in 't eynde der zilben het selfde geluyd met 'ch'" (p.34-5). This reasoning is 
rejected by Van Heule in 1633, as such a spelling suggests to him an inaccurate 
pronunciation: "deze woorden "Dach, levendich, Hant, geleert' vallen in het 
uytspreken lichter als 'Dag, levendig, hand, geleerd'... Wy oordelen ... dat wy 
meeder reden hebben om volgens onze uytspake te schijven dan dat wij om des 
gevolgs willen, anders zouden schrijven, dan wy behoren te lezen".

Plemp, the third mentioned above, rejects both the '-gh' and the '-g' forms, 
saying with Van Heule that one should not take the 'g' from "geloovige" and 
deduce "geloovig(h)" , but preserve the traditional manner of final 'ch'becoming 
'g' in inflexion; his ruling is "dat wij makende, niet (als 'shederd mijns vrunds 
H.I.Spigel's tijden) van 'geloovige' 'geloovig', of 'geloovigh'; maer ouelik ende 
el van 'geloovich' 'geloovige', stellen 'g' voor 'ch'; om de woord-leden beter 
an een te binden. Angesien dat de... 'g' in 'geloovige'...bind(t) beter, dan... 
de 'ch' van 'geloovich' soude doen, voor welcke 'ch' onse achteloose Letter 
voochden... te quaelik 'g' of 'gh' ghaen setten". This spelling here proposed was 
used by Plemp in his book "Der Herdoperen Anslach op Amsterdam" of 1631.

The traditional view was also adhered to by the Bible translators, rejecting 
'-g' and '-gh': "In adiectivis et substantivis, an interdum 'ch', an 'gh', an 'g', 
ut in 'goedich, moedich, rechtveerdich, heylich, eeuwich'... Conclusum scribenda 
per 'ch', quod in incrementio syllabarum et plurali mutetur in 'g'. 'heylige, 
eeuwige'". But the "Revisours" seemed doubtful about this, and added "promiscue", 
- i.e. either spelling is acceptable. Further on the resolutions show great
One of the few dictionaries to use final '-ch' spellings in the 17th century was that for French and Dutch published by Waesberghe, first edited by Mellema, and later by D'Arsi; this has '-ch' in all editions between 1587 and 1694. The first edition (only) has the then current Southern spelling "dagh" (only), where the other editions have "dach". Even when the editorship was taken over by Th. La Grue in 1699 the '-ch' spelling was retained, though it was well out of date.

Although the usage of the States Bible was to have considerable influence on the spelling practices of many, the arguments of Van der Schuere, De Hubert and Ampzing began to find ever more support, and '-g' spellings become more and more common, though at first still in the minority alongside the '-gh' spellings recommended by the Twe-spraack. These latter are still used for example by Starter, Hooft, Vondel, Stalpaert van der Wiele, Krul, and alongside the '-ch' spellings defended by Van Heule, by such as Barleus and De Ruyter; many, such as Bontekoe, used both systems with little consistency.

Appearing just after Van Heule's 2nd edition, Montanus's Bericht of 1635 also advocated retention of the '-ch' spelling. However, whereas Van Heule may be considered as carrying on the traditional forms, Montanus had evolved a thoroughly re-thought spelling, and uses '-ch' as part of his phonetically based system. Like Van Heule he rejects the rule of gelijkvormigheid: "Inde Inlantse (woorden, wort) by veel ten menzien vande afkomst 'g' voor 'ch'...gestelt: als in 'ic lieg, deugd, ...' voor 'liech, deucht'". In accordance with the usual rule "dat deeze 'ch' int verlengen der woorden in 'g' verandert, eeven gelijc de 's' in 'z', en de 'f' in 'v'", he spells all words with '-ch'. At least, he considers this to be the spelling for words whose inflected forms have '-ge'; for those which have '-che', e.g. "rochen", he is attracted to the rule of retaining the form which is obtained by removing the inflectional ending. As he spells such words with a double 'ch', e.g. "rochchen", this gives "rochch", although he does not in the end adopt this system (see chap. 17). On p. 78 he expresses his dislike of the "new" '-g' forms: "In't Nederduits (en eindigen) geen woorden, zonder vercorting, in 'g'... (hoewelder veel geschreven worden)".

The next grammar to appear was that contained in Hexham's dictionary. As this
is for the most part a translation of Van Heule (1633), similar comments are
found, e.g. "In the Netherdutch words there falls some alteration of letters; as
'ch' is changed into 'g', or 'ge'...; as 'Heylich' and 'Heylige'". But again,
as with his rules for final '-d' (see chap.5), Hexham does not apply this spelling
to the entries in his dictionary (based on Mellema), writing instead "eeuwigh,
eeswige, dagh", but making a distinction between "wech, away; wegh way" which
Mellema did not (cf. chap.18).

Much the same is true of Beyer in 1661, being a brief précis of the same
work (Van Heule 1633), and expressing the same sentiments: "Wy achten ook dat men
in veel plaatsen 'ch' in plaatse van 'g' hoort te stellen; als 'dach' en niet
'dag'... om de meeste lichtigheid der uitspraak waer te nemen" (p.103). The
revised edition of Hexham by Manly in 1672 omits the paragraph on letter changes.
This may be a mere oversight, or it may have been edited out, if Manly considered
it out of date, as the alternation of '-t/de, -ch/ge, -c/cke' which it discusses
are all no longer current, making the paragraph invalid. Beyer's second edition
of 1681 however is unchanged.

Kok, in 1649, similar to Hexham, spells '-gh': "ghestadigh, dagh", though he
uses 'gh' also in initial position which Hexham did not. Unlike Hexham again he
keeps the 'gh' in the inflected forms "eenighe, zelfstandighe" etc. There is a
strong suggestion that Kok was influenced by the Twe-spraak (see chap.8).

The '-ch' spelling was by now rapidly becoming obsolete, though it is used by
some, for example Van Engelen c.1650, Jan de Witt in his letters c.1665, and very
often in Luyken's Duitse Lier of 1671. The printer of the latter actually seems
to be following a system of his own: he uses '-ch' after a short stressed vowel
"wech, zach, lach, zech, dach, mach" and before 't' "uchtent, licht, mocht, lecht,
ongenuchte, zuchten", and 'g' after a long vowel "toog, zoog, oog, boog, genoeg"
and in the suffix '-ig' "heylig, eeuwig"; this also involves 'gt' after long
vowel, as in "ploegt, maagt, daagt, vaagt, vreugden". 'ch' is also used in
"moochlyk, omoochelyke". This system cannot accurately be said to be based on
gelijkvormigheid; it may also be the basis for the apparently irregular usage
of several others.

Some light on the current confusion is cast by Hillenius (1664, p.5): "When 'ch'
cometh in the end of a word, 'gh' is now used in roome of it, or 'gh' and 'ch'
103.

are interchangeably made use of in the same words (by many), as in reading their wrytings you may observe. It is interesting that he makes no mention of '-g'.

In later editions, though the comment is retained, the spelling is modernised to 'g', sometimes with unfortunate results: the logical entry "lach, lough, ghelacht or ghelaght" of 1664 and 1677 becomes the peculiar "...gelagt or gelagt" of 1673 and 1686!

Both the '-gh' and the '-ch' spellings were becoming slightly less used now, though still fairly common ('-ch' less so), and, as will be seen, it was to be many years before '-gh' died out completely. Its function was not however always the same as in the earlier spelling systems (see also chap.8). Van der Weyden rejects what he considers to be the old-fashioned '-ch', condemning those who "bijna geen onderscheyd weten te maken ... tuschen 'ch' ende 'g', stellende 'dach' voor 'dag'" (he does not mention '-gh').

A further foundation stone for the 'g' spelling, now becoming very common, was laid in 1653 by Leupenius. In fact he does not specifically discuss this spelling, but rejects such spellings as "hant" for "hand", and in general adopts a very rigorous gelijkvormigheid spelling (see chap.17). The following year Van den Ende was more explicit in his rejection of older systems: "De overvloed van lettren heb ik geschoudt, zoo veel my mogelijk is geweest. ... Derhalven spelle ik bondig en kort: Aldus,...'Leech, Slag,...' Ende niet na ouder gewoonte ...

'Leech, Slach'". Mere economy is not his only motive, for he also follows the gelijkvormigheid formula: "dag ... draag ... weg' &c ende niet 'dach ... draach... wach', want men niet en behoord te schrijven 'dachen... drachen' &c maar 'dag-en, ... drag-en'"; the hyphenated forms are to show which part is the stem, and which the ending. The several '-ch' entries in the actual dictionary must be laid at the door of the printer.

Two eminent users of the older '-gh' spelling at this time are Cats and Vondel. The latter spells '-gh' in all his works, with the inflected form '-ge', but 'h' retained before suffixes (des berghs). These two writers were not alone in this usage, especially as their combined eminence, to which was added that of Hooft, made them serve as examples to many writers, e.g. Pers, Croon, Anslo. In the North such spellings are moderately conservative by this time, but were still the normal spelling in the South, e.g. in Poiters and De Swaen; Vondel may have
learnt this usage in the South, and Southern influence on Cats in Zeeland cannot be ruled out. Where most contemporary Northern grammars were now converted to '-g', Southerners were only just beginning to use such forms (for which a possible reason is mentioned below).

Bolognino, in 1657, claimed that the spelled words should "overeen-komen (met) den klanc oft geluydt van de gesprokene, darse de teekenen van zijn" - a quite progressive view. He abandons '-gh' in all positions: "In 't schryven van de sillaben salmen ... achterlaten de letteren di niet nodig en zyn, ende namentlyk de 'h', achter de 'g', als zynde noodeloos"; printing errors with '-gh' are not unknown in his book however. It is not impossible that Bolognino was influenced in this usage by Van den Ende, to whom he often refers, though his comments are more usually critical than laudatory.

Although Bolognino's arguments may have found some followers in the South, they certainly found no sympathy from Binnart when he revised his Biglotton, for the ultra-conservative Binnart keeps '-gh' in all words (as also in initial position, cf. chap. 3). His first edition (1635) has a slightly different usage (e.g. "dach"), so this is a conscious change undertaken in the revised version. Final '-gh' alternates with '-g' in Van Helderen's English grammar and dictionary of 1675, with a (slight) preference for '-g', and although Niervaert (1676) uses '-g', he includes in his syllable lists (p.7), for syllables containing 'h', the example "ha, agh". Significantly this is changed in the 1743 edition to "ha,ach". Most editions of this work however have an individual spelling, usually depending on both period and place of publication.

The next grammar to comment on this spelling was the Verhandeling of Nil Volentibus, c.1673. The compilers accept the now more or less standard '-g' spelling, and note that "bijna geen onderscheid te hooren is" between 'ch' and 'g' "inzonderheid op het einde der syllabae". For this reason it is permissible to rhyme "achl/zag, dag/belach, noch/bedrog" which they note in the works of Hooft (Geraert van Velsen I), Huygens (Korenbloemen I) and Vondel (Palamedes III) respectively.

Richardson, writing in his Anglo-Belgica of 1677, does not seem to accept the '-g' spelling (possibly influenced at least in part by Hillenius), - he knows only the alternation between '-ch' and '-gh': "'ch' & 'gh' are mutually used, especially
in the end of a word, as 'mach' or 'magh', may, 'waardich' or 'waardigh', worthy; where Note, That 'ch' is never pronounced as it is in English in the word 'which', or the like; but like 'gh' in 'ghost'; or like 'k". This last comment is of especial interest in that it may reflect a variant Northern pronunciation. It is often remarked that the Twe-spraack refers to 'g' as being of a "dicker geluyd dan ...'k"", and that Bredero uses "bruck, seck, vlack" for "brug, zeg, vlag", in the same way that Coster uses "'k seck" (see for example Weijnen §14) (cf. also Leupenius's use of "sik" mentioned above). Richardson would here seem to be supporting this pronunciation.

Conversely certain dialects, especially in the South, had a very soft final pronunciation for '-g', often influence by the retention of '-e' (cf. "brugge, ik zegge"etc.). This may in part explain the predominance of '-gh' spellings in the South, as against 'ch' in the North, though there is no direct proof of this. In the same context one may recall Plantijn's entry "haegh, hage" whereas most other words had '-ch', and the fact that Sexagius uses '-ch' in nouns and adjectives, but always '-g' in the present tense of verbs (see above). Of relevance also is Multatuli's later use of "wech, sech, lech" in "outertje Pieterse to give dialect colour; if the final pronunciation is normally /ch/, what difference can he be showing but the tendency to hardening, possibly in the manner suggested by Richardson, though apparently not going as far as /k/.

It is quite possible that some at least of the uses of '-g' or '-gh' in final position may reflect the state of the writer's dialect. On the other hand it would be fallacious to assume that all '-gh' spellers pronounced a final voiced consonant and that all '-ch' spellers used the (specifically Amsterdam) /-k/ pronunciation. Nonetheless a '-gh' in the South/ '-ch' in the North dichotomy is apparent, and may in part stem from such dialectal differences.

Much more radical than any of his predecessors, Winschooten in 1683 rejects 'ch' in all positions except in 'sch-' and loan words: "soo men 'leggen' moet uitspreeken met GG, waarom soude men schrijven 'ik lech', met een CH? Uit dit bewijs komt voort, en moet noodsakelijk volgen, dat men niet en moet schrijven 'ik draach', maar 'ik draag' om dat men seid 'draagen', niet 'ik saach', maar 'ik saag' om dat men seid 'saagen". He also rejects any use of 'gh'. Van Helder in the same year also has final '-g', and is just as radical in his
avoidance of 'ch' as was WInschooten: "voor al op 't einde der woorden behoortmen 'g' te schrijven, als 'dag, nagt', voor 'dach, nacht'". There is a similar comment in the Kort-Schrift Boek.

A late occurrence of '-ch' is to be found in 1684 (Beyer's mention of it in 1681 is mere retention from the 1st edition), in Ph. La Grue's Grammaire Flamande; he seems to be referring to a continuing contemporary use of '-ch' rather than a former habit. Speaking of letter changes he writes that "Tous les mots finissans en 'ch' ou 'gh', changent leur 'ch' ou 'gh' en 'gen', comme 'dach' ou 'dagh', jour, 'dagen'; 'slach' ou 'slagh', coup, 'slagen' &c. Mais on peut écrire tels mots avec un seul 'g' comme 'dag' pour 'dagh'"(p.87). It is worth noting that he, writing possibly mainly about Southern usage, regards '-g' as a minor usage ("on peut écrire..."). The '-gh' spelling also described by La Grue as being current can be found for example in the 1688 edition of Meijer's Woordenschat, though this is retained from the earlier editions. Van Attevelt also still knew a '-ch' spelling in 1682: "'g' en 'ch' komen op het eynde van een lettergreep in klank genoeg over een, maar nochtans moeten vele woorden med 'g', ende niit med 'ch' geschreven worden",- his own rule is gelijkvormigheid (e.g. jagen-jaag-jagt).

Starting from 1691, within 17 years there appeared five major new contributions to Dutch grammar and spelling, and at least four (relatively) minor works, and all three of the existing spellings mentioned above,- '-ch','-gh','-g', - are to be found amongst them. In 1691 when Sewel published his English and Dutch dictionary he included a section on Dutch spelling, in which he defends the rules of gelijkvormigheid. Or at least he does so for most cases, as he inadvertently omitted all reference to '-g/-ch', though he does discuss '-gt/-cht'. In the later editions he added a paragraph about the pronunciation of 'g', for the use of English readers, but still said nothing about '-g/-ch'. This omission, if intentional, can only mean that Sewel did not consider '-ch' a contemporary spelling, and his usage is quite consistently with '-g'. So too was that of Duikerius (1696), Van der Linden (1696), Kuyper (c.1700), and Van Hoogstraten, in his gender lists. The latter, though certainly a major work, does not deal extensively with spelling, though certain comments are included, and the usage in the lists is highly unsystematic.

In 1703 Nyloë also defends the '-g' spelling, which is a little strange as he
is a fierce proponent of the '-t' spelling (see chap.5): "Ik hebbe ook tot noch toe 'heiligh, rechtvaardigh, genadigh, waardigh, deught, vreught', neffens anderen met 'gh' geschreven, maar zie nu dat de 'h' hier niet nodig is, en dat men met de 'g' alleen volstaan kan"(p.13). The 2nd and 3rd edition (1707ff) omit the reference to his previous usage, merely stating that "In 'heilig, rechtvaardig, genadig, deugt, vreugt', kan de 'g' zonder 'h' wel volstaan"(p.42). He does not even consider a '-ch' spelling for these words, though he uses it in the undeclinable words such as "zich, doch" (Winschooten c.s. use '-g' even in these, where there is no question of gelijkvormigheid).

Such a spelling did however occur to Hilarides, who uses it not only in his Nieuwe Taalgronden of 1705, but also in his other works, such as his translations of Nepos and Phaedrus, even to the extent of changing the name of his main linguistic opponent to "Van Hoochstraaten" (in the polemic preceding the Phaedrus). Sporadic '-g' spellings are possibly due to the printer's unfamiliarity with the system, as there is no pattern to them, except that the suffix '-ig' is always spelt with 'g'. In derivatives however this reverts to 'ch' (different sound?), e.g. "grondig; meenichte, koddichste".

As mentioned above, the '-gh' spelling had all but died out in the North, being last defended by Kok in 1649, and Dafforne in 1627, though very many more had used it. But now, in 1706, it was to see a revival, but with a slightly different function (see also chap.8). This was in the grammar of Moonen. His fundamental system is to use 'gh' in final position only (never initially), to indicate the hard pronunciation of /ch/. But his rules and exceptions are very complex, and seemingly arbitrary:

"I. De Wortelwoorden in eene G eindigende, laeten achter zich geene H toe; als 'leg, zeg, zaeg, vraeg, reig, buig', en andere.
II. Zelfstandige Naemwoorden, na eenen langen klinker of eenen Medeklinker eene G hebbende, wraeken insglyks de H; gelyk 'Aegt, maegt, jeugt, deugt, hoogte, droogte, ruigte.' De Byvoeglyke woorden, als 'Graeg, traeg, vaeg, hoog, droog, ruig' en diergelyke, zoude ik van uitzonderen, en onderscheits halve met eene H in het einde schryven.
III. Zelfstandige en Byvoeglyke Naemwoorden, die na eenen enkelen klinker in NG eindigen, verwerpen de H; als 'Bang, en, jong, lang, sprong, heining,wooning'.
IV. Zelfstandige Naemwoorden, voor de G eenen enkelen klinker hebbende, neemen eene H achter die aan; als 'dagh, slagh, zogh, bedrogh, maght'. Ook 'bragt' van 'brengen'.
V. Alle andere Naemwoorden, het zy Zelfstandige, het zy Byvoeglyke, die in het Meervoudige getal na eenen enkelen klinker in eene G uitgaen, die in het Meervoudige verdubbelt wordt, wraeken de H achter de G; als 'Vlag, dag (pugio), log, vlug, rug, brug', en andere"(p.8).

All of this needs more than a cursory glance to digest, but in summary form it
rules: that adjectives with a long vowel (II), and nouns with a short vowel in the singular and long vowel in the plural (IV & V) take a final 'h', as does "braght". Everything else has '-g'. What exactly is the reasoning behind this? It cannot depend on the length of the vowel per se, as nouns take '-g' and adjectives '-gh' (II), and all verbs take '-g' (I). Nor is there any connection with the inflected forms, as all words listed have '-ge(n)'. The basic distinction seems to be the differentiation of substantive types; yet it is not at all clear why he should need to distinguish adjectives with a long vowel from nouns also with a long vowel (II), as there are few if any homonyms. IV and V give an 'h' to nouns (only) which lengthen their vowel in the plural, e.g. "dag-dagen", with "moght" calling upon "mogen" to legitimise the '-h'. This leaves "braght" with no related long-vowel form. All other words with a short vowel + /ch/ & 't' he spells with '-cht': "CH, scherper dan de G... wordt altyt... gebruikt (in)... 'Acht, zacht, recht!'"(p.5). He may retain the 'g' of "braght" because of the 'g' in "brengen", though he does not say this specifically, nor does this explain the '-h'. The only possibly explanation is analogy with "moght".

In fact Moonen is not very explicit on why he uses 'gh' at all: "De H wordt van zommiigen achter de G in het einde des woorts, daer zy van outs plagh geschreven te worden, verworpen onder het voorgeven van overtolligheit. Maar zy is noodigh en brengt den Woorden in de uitspraak hulp toe", but the only examples he gives are for the visual differentiation of homonyms. To be true he does ascribe a different pronunciation for 'g' to the words in rule V, - the "geluit dat ... van de Franschen door 'gue' wordt uitgedrukt". Accepting this as a reason for omitting 'h', - i.e. to show the different sound, does not explain the lack of 'h' in verb stems and nouns (I,II), which have a normal Dutch /g/. It must be assumed that he includes in II such nouns as "maag, vraag", though all the examples have '-gt'. It is worth noting that the spelling of Moonen's Vragen aan den Here J.v.Vondel, c.1671, does not agree with the rules later laid down in his grammar (e.g. "dogter, leeftoght"), so it must be assumed that he first formulated the rules when engaged on the compilation of that work.

The fifth of the major works mentioned above to appear at the turn of the century, was the Idea by Verwer, published anonymously in 1707. This work is principally concerned with language itself, and largely ignores questions of
spelling. When he discussed his views in Dutch (the idea is in Latin) in his Seerechten, p. 204, he commented merely that Vondel and Hooft had a good usage, which is a little strange as he does not emulate them, but abides by contemporary standard spellings with final '-g' and a limited use of '-cht'.

The three most influential of the grammars mentioned were Sewel, Nyloë and Moonen, all frequently reprinted, so it would be reasonable to expect to find the tenets of each applied by certain writers. Very many certainly followed Moonen, usually not very exactly, simply using his spelling as a basis for their own inclinations; Ludolf Smids, Poot and Zeeus show the most common deviation in that they use '-gh' for almost all words, ignoring completely Moonen's lists of exceptions. The much admired poet Joan de Haes abided more strictly to the rules.

Even more people followed the rules of Sewel (consciously or not), again more or less exactly, and though their usage was very often at variance with some of the rules, Sewel's '-g' (and '-d') spellings were almost fully accepted. The followers of Winschooten's "g'-everywhere" system also used final '-g', which thus added weight to the arguments in favour of abolishing final '-gh', as did the support of Nyloë, though the three were radically different in other usages.

It is rather surprising, bearing contemporary grammatical usage, to find published in 1710 a book with mostly '-ch' spellings, and a rather archaic spelling in general. This is De verborghen Wetenschappen van het Cloosterlijck Leven by the Southerner Van den Kerchove. '-gh' spellings do occur but are in the minority. This is a good example of the way in which a book may have a spelling out of step with contemporary usage, either because the printing took place long after the writing, or because it is a reissue of an earlier work. It must not necessarily be assumed that it represents a contemporary usage.

With hardly any exception it is now true that every grammarian was to follow the example of Winschooten, Sewel and Nyloë in proposing a simple '-g' in final position, though not all agreed with the former that words such as "tug, dog, zig" should also have '-g' (see for example Steven, chap. 18).

This is not to say that '-gh' died out quickly. Both Van Belle and Frans de Haes still think it necessary to argue against its use as part of the Moonen system in mid-century. In the South '-gh' was still widely used until late in the century, not particularly out of adherence to Moonen, but rather because it
was the traditional Southern spelling practice, though most grammars opposed it (Bincken, Snoeijmes etc.). Aerschot still has '-gh' throughout in 1766, and this is fairly typical, though somewhat late. By the 1760's the '-gh' spelling was certainly very uncommon in the North, so much so that when it was used, it merited a comment from Zeydelaar: "Vraag. Pleeg men eertijds ook 'gh' te gebruiken? Antwoord. Ja: en Hoogvliet doet 't nog, schrijvende 'magh, nogh' &c. doch deze spelling wordt, met reden, van weinige gevölgd". This is quite correct insofar that most editions of Hoogvliet's Abraham preserve the original spelling of 1727, when '-gh' was very common, but misleading in the claim that he "doet 't nog" since Hoogvliet was already dead! Holtrop's reference in 1783 to the fact that "Sommige gebruiken nog de H achter de G in Dagh, HEGH, VIAGH, WEGH" may be alluding only to the Southern usage, as too may Bolhuis in 1793.

In 1777 new thought was applied to the subject when Kluit expressed a wish for the reversion to the Middle Dutch more phonetic spelling with '-ch': "Men kent bij de Ouden dien gewaanden en verdichten regel niet, dat men schrijven moet 'dag, weg, beleg', met een 'g', omdat men zegt en schrijft 'dagen, wegen, belegen". Further on he proposes "dat de sluitletter CH voor G op dezelfde gronden regelmatig bouwt, als de S en F voor Z en V, en ook altijd gelijkredig is veranderd geworden". As with his other spelling proposals, he realises that they are rather Utopian, and abides by contemporary usage; he does admit however that a system involving the use of 'g' in all positions, though inferior to the system he proposes, is at least preferable to the current situation, and more acceptable to the public. Very similar thoughts had appeared in the Taal en Dichtkundige Bijdragen of 1760 (I,218), where it was pointed out that consistency would demand the spellings "wep, lant, graf, zach, huis". And like Kluit they finally opted for '-g' (cf.chap.7).

It may well have been this discourse of Kluit's which Siegenbeek had in mind when he proposed no change in the accepted spelling, adding "Wat nuttigheid toch kan de wederkeering tot het gebruik der Oudheid aanbrengen, daar, bij de tegenwoordige Schrijfwijze, de oorsprong der woorden, in stede van verduisterd, veel eer in klaader licht geplaatst wordt, en het onderscheid van klank tusschen de 'g' en 'ch' niet zoo in het oog loopend is, dat de plaatsing der eerste voor de laatste eenigen merkelychen aanstoot geeft?", he places the depiction of the
111.
word's origins in the spelling far above the accurate phonetic representation.
De Neckere disagreed with part of Siegenbeek's statement, in that, as far as
he could see, one could safely spell "'kuch, kugh, kug, sucht, sught, sugt'...
sonder dat het oor daer ontrent eenig gevoelyk verschil kan, of soude konnen
waernemen"(p.4). This is basically a good point, that the choice of letters used
depends merely on the system preferred by the writer, and does not imply any
difference in pronunciation. David (Belg.Museum 111,1849) disagreed with a part
of Siegenbeek's statement in a different way.

He was not altogether satisfied

with the inconsistencies of the gelijkvormigheid-based spelling; "De stem kan
inderdaad niet berusten op zachte medeklinkers als 'd' en 'g'; en daerom is het
dat nog heden geen neerduytsch woord eyndigen kan of mag op eene 'v'of op eene
'z'.

Maer de Ouden waren daerin veel consequenter dan wy; en uytgaende van dat

beginsel, schreven zy zeer getrouw 'wijngaert, werelt, geleert, hoeft'; en zoo
ook 'ic mach, lach, dach, noch, menech, dorstech', enz.".

The current '-g'

spelling (like that with '-d') is inconsistent if '-v' and '-z' are prohibited.
Much the same arguments as those used by Kluit 89 years earlier are to be
found in Carlebur's book on Siegenbeek, Bilderdijk and others in 1856.

This is

partly because he strongly disliked Siegenbeek's system; "Siegenbeek verbant met
miskeening van afleiding en uitspraak de 'ch' als sluitletter (n.b. it is one
letter)•.. niet in alle woorden, want dan hadde men eenen te eenvoudigen en te
makkelljk op te volgenen regel gekregen"(p.19).

It must not be thought, however,

that in his opposition to Siegenbeek he was supporting Bilderdijk, for he is just
as critical of similar inconsistencies in the letter's system, -"deze ongelijkheid
en willekeurigheid der beide hoofdstelsel is te berispeliker, wijl men allés tot
de volmaakste orde kan te rug brengen door - in navolging der oude en der
spreektale de 'ch' steeds als sluitletter, uitgezonderd in de lettersamenstellingen 'ng' en 'gg' te bezigen".

The 'gg' is to allow the forms "vlaggen" etc.

with 'g' at the end of a syllable.

But Carlebur's is a lone voice, and found

little active support (cf.chap.4).

In fact he did not adopt the final '-ch'

spelling himself, though he did use 'cht' in both nouns and verbs (see below).
Carlebur was to find a radical ally however ten years later in the person of
J.H.Halbertsma; "Toen ik het stelsel van Siegenbeek in handen kreeg, vond ik zulk
eene volkommene beginselloosheid, en die zoo diep geworteld in het gebruik, dat


ik alle herstel voor ten eenen maal onmogelijk hield". One spelling for which he wished to see a "herstel" was the final '-ch' (like Kluit and Carlebur). This he desired for all words regardless of grammatical category: "noch, berch, teruch, heilich, ik lech, ik zech" etc. In Taal en Letterbode III De Jager criticised his inconsistency in adopting '-ch' for '-g' but not '-t' for '-d', which is a valid objection. Halbertsma used this spelling of his in an article "De Friesche Kerk te Rome" in De Vrije Fries, 1866, but usually followed the standard Siegenbeek system, in deference to public opinion and "gebruik". Unfortunately for Carlebur and Halbertsma, everyone else did the same, and nothing more was heard of the '-ch' spelling for almost a century.

As mentioned in the previous section, it may be thought odd that, although both proposed radical alterations in the spelling system in favour of a more phonetic usage, neither Land nor J.te Winkel felt any need to abandon the accepted gelijkvormigheid pattern. Land thought it simply unnecessary, but Te Winkel considered it inferior: "De medeklinkers van het woordend scherp te schrijven, omdat zij daar wel dikwijls, maar toch niet altijd, scherp worden uitgesproken, zou als consequentie het invoeren eener sandhispling vereischen, en dat zou de spelling veelleer meelijdeker dan gemakkelijker maken, zoodat de tegenwoordige spelling naar analogie van de verbogen vormen daarboven te verkiezen blijft". This conclusion is doubtful, as no spelling reformer, however keen on phonetic spelling, had ever felt that the representation of sandhi assimilation between consecutive words was at all "vereischt", though it was a well-documented phenomenon, e.g. by Van Heule and Montanus especially. Indeed these had in fact used '-ch' spelling and neither had proposed a sandhi spelling, except Montanus in compound words only. Te Winkel seems to fail to distinguish between a phonetic law of Dutch, namely that final consonants are unvoiced, and the assimilation tendencies which in some circumstances retain/restore the voicing, and which are by no means the same in all dialects. Like almost all others who proposed this view he saw no need to apply the same argument to final '-f' and '-s' (see chap. 7 & 11), but restricted it to '-b, -d, -g'.

Isolated changes, such as Thijm's preference for "gezach" on the grounds that it had no plural (cf. his spellings "iemant, niemant"), are known, but the most well known reform movement of the period, the "sdpol" of Kollewijn, had no desire
to abandon the gelijkvormigheid rule, which is not (as Te Winkel implies) the same as analogy (see Introduction). Consequently the '-g' spelling did not come under attack from them, nor was its change even discussed in the Marchant reforms or the post-war "spellingwet" as embodied in the Woordenlijst of 1954.

Wille, in his opposition to Kollewijn, had felt that if the latter's Voorstellen were accepted, further moves, including pressure for '-ch' and '-cht' were inevitable. The first of this accurately foreseen renewed attack on '-g' came in 1956 from Kl Mick. As mentioned above he proposed a new letter for /ch/, basically a streamlined capital 'G'. This he used in all positions where /ch/ is heard, including in final position, giving the equivalents of "krampachtich, teruch, zach" etc., thus showing that he was a supporter of a phonetic spelling and rejected the gelijkvormigheid rules.

In the following year Rombouts also rejected these rules, proposing instead '-ch': "Zoals 'v' staat tot 'f', 'z' tot 's', 'b' tot 'p', 'd' tot 't', zo staat 'g' tot 'ch'". His application is identical to that of Halbertsma a century earlier, and of Montanus three centuries before, giving the forms "dach-dagen; hooch - hoge; zech, vliecht; vlachde, lechde; gezucht, gesignch" by analogy with "graf - graven; lief - lieve; geef, geest; leefde, laafde; gelaat, gelaafde" respectively. His only doubt was in the ending '-ech' (= '-ig'), "omdat dit tenminste uiteindelijk op een revolutie gaat lijken,...(maar) aanvaarden we die niet dan blijft een groot stuk in ons spellingsstelsel scheef zitten"(p.36). Thus he is forced to accept the consistent spelling as in "weinech".

This reform did not appeal to all, however. Wellekens, though adopting the letter 'x' for /ch/, used 'g' in "vligtbyg". Nor did the V.W.S. adopt it, despite pledging their support for the change from '-d, -b' to '-t, -p'. They still spell "mateg, zinng, mog" alongside "toch", as in the Woordenlijst. The Rapport and Eindvoorstellen likewise made no concession to the small plea of Rombouts, and it is perhaps surprising that he received no more support than he did.

The probable reason for this is the natural aversion to using a double letter ('ch') in final position in all words instead of the obviously simpler '-g'.

There is here more than a hint of confusion of "simplicity" and "shortness". The adoption of a new letter, or adaptation of an existing one to a new use is
probably too radical to gain widespread support or encouragement, no matter how logical and simple it would be, and no matter how much its rejection creates or preserves inconsistencies in the system formed by any eventual adoption of the '-t' and '-p' spellings.

The spellings '-chde' and '-iched'.

These two spellings, as in the words "voechde" and "eeuwicheit" are both related to the spellings discussed above, as in both cases the 'ch' occupies final position in a syllable, though not in a word.

When in Middle Dutch the normal final spelling was '-ch', the imperfect forms of the weak verbs whose stem ended in '-ch' correspondingly had '-chde'. Thus can be found in the Exercitium "eechde", and in Sexagius "zaachden, claachden, daachden, beweechde" (B5.v'). Later on they are to be found in other '-ch' spellers, e.g. Plemp's "dreichden", De Ruyter's "vraechde, volchde".

One of the very few grammarians to discuss such spellings was Montanus: "Inde Inlantsche (woorden) wort ... dicwils ... 'ch' voor 'g' gebruikt: als in ... 'ic vraechde, maechden'... voor ... 'vraegde, maegden'". Here it can be seen that this problem also applied to nouns ending in '-cht' whose 't' changed to 'd' in inflexion. Montanus abides by the then more normal form and changes both the 'ch' to 'g' and the 't' to 'd', whereas many earlier writers would change only the 't', and retain 'ch', as in the examples above. His reason for changing both is that both become voiced, and that '-chde' is therefore an inaccurate spelling. Van Heule did much the same ("deugdelic, deucht"), as did most others. The Bible translators adopt "Vreucht, vreugde" (see discussion on 'cht' below). There was not quite so much inclination to apply the same rule to nouns, as the 'ch' in such as "vreuchd" could not be associated with a form with final '-ch' as could "volchde" with "volch"; thus 'ch' tended to be retained more often before 'd' in nouns (vreuchde) than in imperfect tenses (volgde).

Two of the later proposers of a '-ch' spelling, Halbertsma and Rombouts, used the more conservative form and changed only the 't', leaving in Halbertsma such forms as "voechde, volchde, lechde" alongside "hij zecht, voecht" etc. (Carlebur used '-gd' in nouns and participles, "deugd, gezegd"). Rombouts, like Montanus, realised the unrepresentativeness of the '-chde' spelling, but nonetheless adopts
it by analogy with "leefde", though not without reservations, as he thinks that 'gde' would really be better: "We hebben schema I en II als norm genomen voor de andere drie, omdat de 's-z'- en de 'f-v'-regeling sinds lang zonder tegenspraak aanvaard en ingeburgerd zijn, en mede omdat we op die manier tot de absolute regel komen: aan het eind van een woord of stam wordt nooit 'v, z, d, b' of 'g' geschreven. Toch kunnen we ons niet ontveinzen, dat we zo in konflikt raken met de grondregel: schrijf wat er klinkt. Wij zeggen niet: leefde, vreagde, topde, zaagde, niet geleefde, gevraagde, overtopde, gezagde, maar: leeyde, vreeagde, toqde, zaagde, geleeyde, gevraagde, overtopde, gezagde. Schrijven we deze woorden op de laatste manier dan moet in de norm-schema's naast de reeds voorgestelde korrektie (gevraagd, geleeyt) nog een tweede worden aangebracht: leefde wordt leeyde, vreagde wordt vreeagde. Waarmee dan corresponderen: zegde, gezegde, schrobsd, geschrobsd enz., als ook deugdelijk (deucht), jeugdig (jeucht), maagden (maact), voogdij (voocht). De absolute regel: altijd 'p, ch, f, s, t' aan het eind, wordt dan beperkt met: als bij meervoud of verlenging een 'd'-klank volgt, wordt 'b, d, g, v, z' geschreven. Moet er een beslissing getroffen worden, dan zijn wij voor deze laatste regel ommiddelijk te vinden. Ze wordt echter in deze verhandeling niet doorgevoerd. Dat wij bij verdeling in lettergrepen krijgen: vreez-de, beeve-de, is geen ernstig bezwaar. Ook 'puzzel', 'mazzel' zullen we moeten afbreken: puz-zel, maz-zel; verg.: doo-ber, bed-ding, leg-gen" (p.37). Thus his "schema V" for 'g' and 'ch' contains the forms "vlachde, lechde, gezegde, gezacht". He could also have pointed out that having to change more than one letter in inflected forms would be unacceptable to many, though this can be countered by the fact that a large proportion of early writers found no difficulty in so doing.

The other spelling concerned here is that which occurs when an adjective ending in '-ch' receives the substantivising suffix '-heid'. This should result in a double 'h', which the vast majority of '-ch' spellers simplified. Thus Middle Dutch normally has the forms "traechait, heilicheit"; the Twe-spraack (a '-gh' speller!) has "naersticheyd, nieuwicheid", the Bible translators use "eeuwicheyt, heylicheyt", Huygens uses "tegenwoordicheyt", De Ruyter has "hoocheyt" etc., etc.. The compound suffix '-sch+heid' usually retains the double 'h', however, though simplified forms are not unknown (e.g. Zeeus uses
The same simplification would also take place when the same words were used
by '-gh' spellers, e.g. Roemer Visscher's "saligheydt", Hooft's "twijfelacht-
igheid" (Waerneminghen No.33), etc. The spelling '-igheid' often merely represents
the suffix added to a simple '-g', but that it did often result from a
simplification is shown by such other spellings as "ondraaghlijk" (Meijer). The
problem was not the same for '-gh' spellers, for whereas '-igheid' can be held to
represent the full sound, using 'g' for 'gh', '-icheid' does not do so unless the
'h' of '-heid' is assimilated with the 'ch'. This did occur in speech, but it
leaves a noticeable inconsistency to spell it in this way.

Only a handful of grammars discuss this spelling, and these usually did so
because they realised that if the basic word already had a final '-h', then adding
'-heid' must logically result in '-chheid', a form which they did not find. Van
der Schuere was the first to point out that '-igheyd' did not constitute a use of
'gh', when he wrote "dat de 'g' volgende haer kracht ende uytsprake ... in een
Sillabe haar nimmermeer met de 'h' en ver-eenigd; maar zoo de 'h' haar ergens
komen te volgen, dat maakt dan een verdeelinge van Sillaben, als in 'eeuwigheyd,
hooghertig". Dafforne considers "goed-ig-heyt" and "goed-igh-heyt" equally
acceptable syllable divisions, but rejects "goedicheyt" as impractical.

By far the most thorough on this spelling is Ampzing, who uses the forms with
'-chheid' as a reductio ad absurdum argument in favour of abandoning the old-
fashioned '-ch' spelling which causes them:
"De naemstammige woorden in 'heyd' eyndigende dwingen ons genoegzaem tot dese
spellinge, als 'naerstigheyd, voorsichtigheyd', want so wy de voorlaetste zilbe
met 'ch' op 't eynde tegens het klaer gevolg immers spellen willen, so moeten
wy twee 'h' by malkanderen schrijven: also de laatste zilbe daer mede ook moet
beginnen, als 'naerstichheyd, voorsichtichheyd'; hetwelk noyt gesien en is.
Hier tegens te willen seggen dat gemelde woorden niet in 'heyd', maar in 'eyd'
ytgaen, is (onder verbeteringe) maer eene ydele bemanteling of eene
overtuuyde dwalinge, ende eenen tastelijke misslag: want so mogen dan 'goedeyd,
stoffeyd, wijseyd' spellen. Dit geeft ons met eenen merkelijk te zien, dat wy
ook in alle de uytsgerechte naam-stammige woorden in 'heyd' ytgaande, de
voorlaetste zilbe met eene 'g' behoorden te eyndigen, ook daer geen gevolg van
de 'g' aan vast is: als 'slechtigheyd, dolligheyd, stoffigheyd', ende
diergelijke; want 'slechtichheyd' en spell geen 'slechtigheyd', maer
'slechtic-heyd': ende en kan daerom de rechte spellinge ende uytsprake, die hier
vereyscht word, niet voldoen" (p.35).

It is significant that Ampzing claims never to have seen a '-chheyd' spelling
("het welk noyt gesien en is"). Such forms did occur however, and one very
well known example is in the poem "Ghij Hailichheidjtjens" by Hooft; Plemp also
uses "hoochheid", though other examples seem elusive. Van Heule (1633) had accepted the traditional spelling: "woorden welke in ... 'icheyt'... eyndigen ... als ... 'Goedicheyt, Zooticheyt'"(p.138).

Montanus, the last writer to discuss these spellings, approaches the subject from his usual ruthlessly logical angle, - the word ends in '-ch', the suffix is '-heit', so the spelling must be '-chheit'. On p.29 he discusses the various misprints to be found in the book, e.g. "'ch, s, f, t, p' voor 'g, z, v, d, b'.

... Ooc hebje 'y' of 'ij, ss, ff, ck, cx, ch' voor 'l' en 'iij, s, f, c of k, cs of x, chh en kh'"; - the last two respectively in such words as "omstandichheit, beweechelijkheit".

With the demise of the spellings in '-ch' and '-gh' the problem disappears, as there was no longer any question of doubling, though as mentioned above, it was little of a problem before, as most writers simply did not consider a '-hh-' spelling. Only with the resurrection of the '-ch' spelling by Rombouts did the question reappear, and the latter, like Montanus, logically uses the forms "bijkomstchheden, onenechheit"(p.83,89). The simplification by Seeldraeyers of Rombouts's 'ch' to 'c' would restore the '-ch-' spelling to such words, but this time without any inconsistency.

'ch', 'gh', 'g' before 't'.

The treatment of /ch/ when followed by /t/ has not always been the same as that afforded to /ch/ in final position, though by their nature they have much in common. In both cases an etymological /g/ has become unvoiced according to a regular Dutch sound law, one demanding loss of voice at the end of a word, the other loss due to the lack of voice in the following consonant. This latter in effect means when followed by /t/ (sometimes spelt 'd' as in "jeugd"), as in Dutch the only consonant which can come after /g/ or /ch/ is /d/ or /t/ respectively, apart from inflected forms (hoogst, Haags), compounds (vraagbaak, hoogleraar) and the abnormal "oogst" (from Latin "Augustus"). Thus when a root /g/ came to be followed by a /t/ in derivatives (klagen, klagt) it would lose its voicing. And this is where the similarity to the treatment of final /ch/ appears, as many writers applied gelijkvormigheid to such spellings, giving alternating 'cht/gt' depending on what other words, if any, the word in question was felt to be related to.
Before the introduction of the gelijkvormigheid rule, it would be expected to find only the phonetic 'cht' spelling in all words, regardless of their kinship. This is in fact the case in Middle Dutch, with forms such as "dochter, hij zecht, vraecht, klacht, jeucht" being normal; occasional 'ct' spellings are noted in the early texts, e.g. "acterste, lictelic" (see first section above), - the latter to be found in the records of Brugge for 8th March 1264 (Obreen & V.Loey). Forms with 'gt' are also to be found, though infrequently, e.g. "regtere" (op cit.) and Hoebeke records that spellings with 'ght' are sometimes to be found after c.1400: "voeght, vruughten", which coincides with the rise of final 'gh' (see above).

The 'ght' spelling became more common along with '-gh', and thus "ghebraght" is found in Lambrecht's Nederlandsche Spellijnghe, and "macht zie maght" in his Naembouck, - he evidently knew both spellings, but preferred '-ght'. Plantijn shows a hint of gelijkvormigheid in that all nouns have '-cht' (macht, recht, licht), but the imperative of "liggen" is"light". With this in mind it is very conspicuous that Kilian had different thoughts on contemporary spelling habits. Most of his entries have '-cht' (acht, achte, achterdocht), but several have 'gh' (klaghte), and some have cross-references, e.g. "maght j. macht; tocht/toght", where 'cht' is the preferred spelling. These variations are all to be found in the 3rd edition (1599) onwards, including Van Hasselt's reprint (1777) and the Kilianus Auctus of 1642. Sexagius on the other hand has perfectly regular 'cht' Spellings, including the verb forms such as "licht".

The spellings of all these writers accord with their spelling in final position: Lambrecht '-gh', Plantijn '-ch', Kilian '-ch/-gh', Sexagius '-ch' (though cf. above for the latter's use of "ic liig"). This is also true of De Heuiter who uses his new 'h' spelling in "ahter, ahten, aht" etc.. Similar forms are not unknown from earlier times: Obreen & V.Loey include "verkohten" (p.373).

When Spiegel applied the gelijkvormigheid rules to final spellings, he did not do so for 'ch' before 't', at least in nouns. The noun spellings in the Twe-spraack (misprints apart) have '-cht', e.g. "kracht, scicht", whereas the present tense forms of verbs have 'ght': "volght, voeght, tuyght", just as was the case with Plantijn. It is probable that Spiegel was only thinking in terms of final 'gh', since he only thinks this spelling "pryslyck ende nodich in woorden die voort met 'gh' svoeght worden", which does not apply to 'cht' in
nouns, as is also shown by the examples he uses.

This usage represents more or less accurately the spelling habits for many years: 'ght' in verbs when the writer spelt the stem in '-gh', otherwise '-cht'. With the wider adoption of the gelijkvormigheid spelling for various consonants the situation changed somewhat. Where the final 't' was replaced by 'd', the 'ch' preceding it was often also changed to 'g'. Thus, for example, Van der Schuere uses "jeugd, deugd" instead of the older "jeucht, deucht". His rule is that wherever '-d' is used 'g' precedes it, be it in nouns (jeugd) or verbs (volgd, voegd, eyndigd), otherwise 'cht' (gewicht, gebracht). The only exception is in "legt" (p.35) and "zegt" (p.61, more usually "seyd"). All nouns, except those in '-gd' have '-cht', "kracht, recht" etc..

For a long time after Van der Schuere, usage continued to be predominantly '-cht' in all nouns, though verb forms were now usually spelt with '-gt' or '-ght', depending on the choice of the writer in accordance with his choice for final /ch/. Thus those who usually spelt /ch/ at the end as 'ch', e.g. in "dach", used "volcht", those who spelt "dagh" used "volght", and those few who spelt "dag", like Van der Schuere, used "volgt/volgd" (cf. chap.6).

The first grammarian to propose the extension of gelijkvormigheid to 'gt/cht' in nouns was De Hubert in 1624, who recommended the use of 'g' before 't' in verb forms other than the present tense, e.g. "gebracht". His reasoning is slightly different from Van der Schuere's, for whereas the latter argues from the inflected forms of the noun itself, "deugd" because of "deugden" - De Hubert also argues from related verbs: "De 'g' voor 'ch' gesteld beteekent, dat het woordeneken 'dueg', van 'duegen' komt, ende niet van 'duechen', 'twelk geen duiits en is ...
So spell ik 'mogt' met 'g', ende niet met 'ch', om dat het van 'mogen' komt: So worden ook alle de Mededeelende woorden oft Naem-woorden gespeld beilde naar haare eigenschappen ende wijt den gevolge, gelijk: 'gebracht' met eene 'g', om dat het van 'brengen' komt ... ende ('gedaagd') met eene 'g', om dat het komt van 'dagen'
Conversely he retains 'ch' for words with no related form with 'g' e.g. "verdacht".

Just as the final '-g' spelling proposed by Van der Schuere and De Hubert was very slow to find widespread acceptance, so did De Hubert's use of 'g' before 't'. Van Heule (1625) still spells "deucht, deugdelic; dacht, docht, bracht, brocht, mocht", as he also uses '-ch' forms. Dafforne's policy is to retain his final
'gh' before inflectional endings and suffixes: "draeght, graeghte, manighte", but otherwise use 'cht': "ghe-acht, ghemachtigunge, kracht" (like the Twe-spraack). Ampzing does not discuss these spellings fully, merely noting that 'h' "wil...gaerne achter de 'c' gesteld worden, als 'recht, slecht, licht', daerse met de 'c' te samen een geluyd slaet als onse 'g'". He also spells "magtig, mogt", presumably on the same basis as De Hubert. Both Ampzing and De Hubert have other spellings in common, and influence is very probable. De Heuiter's '-ht' spelling is mentioned by Van Heule and Ampzing: "Als G voor eene T of D komt, zo verandert de G veeltijts in H, want voor 'Ligt' zeggen wy 'liht', voor 'Bedaegt' zeyt-men 'Bedaht', also ooc 'Volht' voor 'Volgt' etc." (Van Heule 1633 only, 143). Neither actually adopts it. Apart from this comment the two editions of Van Heule have the same usage here, and he may also have been influenced in his praise of '-ht' by the occurrence of such forms as "maht" in the Old High German texts which he includes at the end of the book. Just as with final spellings, the Bible translators accepted either 'ch' or 'g(h)', allowing both "bracht" and "bragt", but apart from this word they do not discuss 'cht' spellings as such. "Krachte" and "vreucht" are raised in the Privatim Observata, and the many variants for these three words which are given must surely have been drawn from contemporary usage: "a 'brengen' in imperf. an 'bracht', 'bragt' an 'bragt', an 'brocht' vel 'broght'? an vero promiscue? An 'vreucht', an 'vreuchd', an 'vreugd', an 'vreugde' vel 'vreughde', 'vreughd', an vero promiscue?". They decide in the end that the most acceptable forms are "bracht, bragt" (either), "vreucht, vreugde". This same spelling '-cht/-gde' is advocated by Montanus (see section on '-chde' above), and he lists among the misprints "'g' voor 'ch'...'volgt' voor 'volcht'". His usage is thus 'ch' before 't', regardless of its function, in full accord with his phonetic spellings in other positions. Popular usage however was slowly coming round to the idea put forward by De Hubert, that 'cht' in nouns should be relinquished in favour of 'g(h)t' where appropriate. Thus Hooft uses "klaghte, moght, deught" in his Waernemingen, and Kok uses "maht". Many more continued more or less along the lines laid down by Dafterne and the Twe-spraack: e.g. Bontskoe "mochten, brachten; menighte, hooghhte", H exham's dictionary entries "gebrocht, gedacht, gesicht; geterght,
geëght, voleyndight", and Cats: "kluchtigh, mocht; gewaeght, hooghte". A few still used the old-fashioned way with '-cht' in all positions, such as De Ruyter's "volcht, braecht, drochste, lycht", and Revius's "deuchden, mocht".

But in 1653 a new proponent of the 'gt' spelling in nouns came forward in the person of Leupe&ius. As was so often the case with others, he did not actually discuss this spelling, but his usage is quite clear: not only the normal "seggt, beweegt, jeugd", but also "mogten, opsigt, jagt, gebragt" as against the forms "achten, kracht, dacht, wrocht". It is possible that there is influence here from De Hubert as their systems have other aspects in common (see especially chap.17).

From about 1645 Vondel had adopted a similar system, but using 'gh' instead of 'g', giving:"zacht, recht, jaght, naght, moght, vlught, broght, bezondight". Because of his wide readership Vondel's spelling was to have considerable following in the years to come, and much the same usage, in this respect at least, is to be found, for example, in the writings of Brune and Meijer (early editions). His usage may also have been partly responsible for the affection shown by Moonen towards '-gh' forms (though cf.chap.15).

In the 1670's the Verhandeling of Nil Volentibus Arduum threw its weight behind the 'gt' system first used by De Hubert and Ampzing, thus spelling "bragt, mogten, pligt, inzigt; kracht, verzocht, gedacht"—all to be found in the works of their main spokesman Pels. And after this date, whether or not due to the not inconsiderable influence of Nil Volentibus, these spellings become more and more accepted.

A new form of spelling made its appearance in grammars in the 1680's, and was to constitute a major threat for the basically gelijkvormigheid spelling of those mentioned above. This was the system used by Winschooten in 1683, though he does not discuss it. This system is much more simple than any of its rivals, -'ch' was rejected in all positions before 't' (and at the end of words), and 'gt' ('-g') substituted, even when there were no related forms containing 'g'. Not only are the standard 'gt' spellings (gebragt, volgd, geseght) to be found, but also such forms as "agten, regt, hij wagt, kragt, agter, sagt". In fact 'ch' is only used in loan words (Chirurgijn, Christus), and in 'sch-'. It was even avoided, as will be seen in the next chapter, in the words "lachen, lichaam", and a few, even more radical, would not allow even 'sch' (see chap.13). Such forms
had indeed occurred sporadically before, e.g. "agter, magtig, 's nagts" (and similarly "dog") in Hooft's Waernemingen, c.1633, and Broekhuizens's Gedichten of 1677 regularly uses them. Few have them as consistently as Winschooten, though these prior usages would explain why Winschooten did not discuss the system, - he may not have regarded it as original. It is used almost fully consistently in Van Helderen's English grammar and dictionary of 1675, and his Dutch works of 1683 (see above): "magtig, agter, gesigt, nigte, agtloos, zagt" etc., though he occasionally uses 'ght' (always in "aght"-3,- for differentiation see chap.18), but never '-cht'. Heugelenburg's poems of 1682 have exactly the same system as Winschooten did the year after.

This spelling pattern quickly gained a wide following, although, as with most spellings, it is impossible to say which if any grammars "caused" it, as opposed to merely reflecting its popularity. It is very tempting to ascribe the widespread popularity of this new system to the general confusion amongst common people as to which words needed 'cht' and which 'gt', in the same way as much confusion was later caused for those same words by the Siegenbeek system. So that whereas some may have used 'gt' forms in ignorance or uncertainty before, they could now do so with the backing of a grammar, and a simple formula like Winschooten's would be eagerly received. This seems to be the case, but in the absence of direct contemporary comment on the subject, the attribution of its popularity to public confusion must remain no more than an attractive hypothesis.

Two followers of the system were Gargon (1686) and Duykerius, the latter both in his Schouwburg of 1696 and in his Voorbeelzels of 1693 (e.g. "tragten, regt, nagt, lugt"). Neither of these, and few of those mentioned below, emulate every usage of Winschooten, merely having the same thoughts on 'gt' (and 'g'). Kuyper, at the turn of the century, uses "geslagt, opsigt, agterste" (though 'cht' forms also appear), and literary usage can be found in the works of Van Alkemade, Pars, and, sporadically, the Boekzaal.

All three current usages are recorded by La Grue in 1684, possibly indicating that 'gt' forms were already widespread: "Où le 't' se trouve apres le 'g', ou 'gh', ou 'ch', au singulier, il demeurre ausi au plurier comme 'maght', puissance, 'magten'; 'vlecht', tresse, 'vlechten'; 'schicht', flèche, 'schichten". He is discussing here final 't/d' but his side comments on "'g', ou 'gh', ou 'ch"
are very illuminating as to the variance of current usage, though it may be that the '-gt' cases he refers to are those which had existed since De Hubert, rather than to Winschooten's newer forms.

In 1691 however the older method received strength from the influential hands of Sewel, who consistently applies the gelijkvormigheid rules, so much broadened in their application as to be more approaching etymology-rules, giving the forms "gebracht, gedacht" etc. These forms, like those of Winschooten, were to have a wide application in the future years, based on his various grammars (in Dutch and English) and dictionaries, also aided by the natural adoption of his system in the Boekzaal whilst he was its editor (July 1702 - December 1705), which thus ensured a constant exposure of the literary public to such forms. The inconsistencies in the entries of the 1691 dictionary are to be explained as misprints and errors, e.g. the consecutive entries "Knecht, een Meester-Knegt, Knechten, Lans-Knechten, Lands-Knegten".

The system which Moonen evolved for final spellings (see above) was extended to cover the cases of nouns with 'g' followed by 't'. Verb forms had 'gt', as the "Woortelwoorden" had '-g' (rule I), derivatives of adjectives in '-gh' had '-gte' (II), nouns with a long vowel had '-gt' (II), those with a short vowel had '-ght', as did "bragt, gebracht" (IV), all words with no related word with a 'g' had 'cht': "acht, recht, klucht, dacht".

The year after Moonen, in 1707, Verwer presented his system, which seems to be a hybrid of Winschooten's and Sewel's formulas. He spells "bragte, gewigte; dochter, gedachtenisse, kluchtig, onachtseem" as would Sewel, yet "Digteren, regte, Uitregtenaer" as Winschooten, and the suffix '-agtig' also has 'gt' (p.27); although on p.28 he derives this suffix, now spelt '-achtig', from the verb "achten", this is exceptional, and, as it were, used for the sake of the argument.

For the duration of the next 150 years all spelling systems for 'gt/cht' can be said to have adopted the forms of one or other of this handful of grammars which appeared around the turn of the century; viz. 'cht/gt' depending on related forms (Sewel), 'cht/ght/gt' (Moonen), all 'gt' (Winschooten), mixed or more or less arbitrary (Verwer). It is therefore the most illuminating if future developments are treated as schools dependant on their respective spelling-masters, though it cannot be over-stressed that this does not imply that the
writers named were consciously following any particular grammar.

The school of Moonen is quickly dealt with; he found much support amongst influential writers for several decades, notably Hoogvliet, Joan de Haes (who occasionally drops the 'h' from 'ght'), and, differing somewhat more radically, Smids, who prefers 'cht' to 'ght' on the whole, e.g. "gebracht", Poot, who rarely uses '-ght', and Zeegers, who is more inclined towards 'gt', even where Moonen has 'cht'. All these are typified as belonging to the Moonen school by their use of final '-gh' (see previous section).

The later editions of Meijer (e.g. 1745) have a modernised spelling. In the 1669 and 1683 versions are to be found "toegeleght, moghten, vermoght, gebraght, gebezight" etc., which now lose the 'h' in favour of 'gt'. As the 'cht' and final '-gh' remain unaltered, this is now the same spelling as that used by Poot, i.e. the modified Moonen system.

Many Southern works also have this use of '-gh' and 'ght', but here it is probably more a matter of tradition than adherence to Moonen's tenets. Such texts often show the use of 'ght' in a great many positions and words usually spelt otherwise in the North. Aerschot, for example, with a typically conservative Southern spelling in 1766, has forms such as "light (ligghen), plaght, brenght, gevraeght, seght, besoght, maeght", as well as 'ch' forms such as "placht, macht, toevlucht, vruchtbaer, gesocht", and occasional forms such as "menichte".

Conspicuous by their absence are any grammars echoing the rules formulated by Moonen.

It is largely meaningless to speak of a "Verwer school", as this would constitute those spellers who use 'cht/gt' with no immediately obvious reason for their choice. This group does not include those writers whose spelling is chaotic, but those who remain consistent within their system, even though it is arbitrary. There is naturally little or no relationship between the respective systems of such users.

There are in fact very few in this category, the most eminent being Ten Kate. Although he has a marked preference for the 'gt' forms, such as "zagt, egter, agter, slechts", he consistently spells "kocht, docht" (from both "dunken" and "denken"), and "brocht, bracht, gebrocht" - this latter despite the 'g' in
"brengen" which caused many to write "brag(h)t". One of the few grammars to show such an arbitrary distinction was the Spel-boekje voor eerstbeginnenden, which lists "plegt, nagt, pligt, vlechten, slechte..." (not all Siegenbeek forms). Most Nut works followed a gelijkvormigheid 'gt/cht' system (see below).

Mention can be made here of O. van Haren's Willem I, which has throughout a 'gt' spelling, yet for almost every word with this 'gt' there can be found at least one instance of the same word with 'cht', e.g. "magt/macht, gedagt/gedacht, hij wagt/onverwacht, nagt/nacht, bragt/bracht". Such chaos is by no means rare in the mid 18th century, and is the natural result of the simultaneous use of at least two fundamentally different systems — those of Sewel and Winschooten.

During the 18th century one of the major schools, with respect to 'gt' was that propagated by Winschooten, being at least as common as the gelijkvormigheid system of Sewel. But there is a very intriguing split in the school, for whereas users of the system were common in both the Northern and Southern Netherlands throughout the century, with only a handful of exceptions all the grammars recommending its use emanate from the South, nearly all Northern works arguing for the rules of Sewel.

Only two of the relevant Northern grammars have any claim to being "important", - Van Belle and Zeydelaar. Earlier in the century it is used in the grammars of M.S. and De Vin (1711, 1716), and the same forms are to be found used irregularly in Hoogstraten's lists. It was mentioned above that Van Hoogstraten did not discuss spelling at length in his list, and that its usage is erratic, but this must not be taken to mean that he had no views on other spellings. In his editing of Hannot's Latin-Dutch dictionary in 1704 he makes the following comment, concerning "het klein onderscheit zyner spellinge en de myne. Hoedanige zyn veele woorden van eenigen met 'ch' of 'gh', en hier met een enkele 'g' geschreven als *agt, agter, geagt, gebracht, regt, zig' enz.". It is possible that since first publishing his lists he had formulated his views more clearly, or that he had more control over the spelling used.

An important comment on the current situation is contained in Halma's French-Dutch dictionary of 1729, discussing spelling changes vis à vis earlier editions: "'ch' van een medeklinker gevolgd, heeft men, na 't voorbeeld der beste
Schrijvers dezes tijds in 'g' veranderd, uitgenomen in het woord 'achter' met
desselfs t'zamen gesteldend. Yet he does not explain why "achter" should be
excluded! Martin's dictionary (e.g. 1730) also has only 'gt' spellings.

When in 1743 a new edition of Van Niervaert's Letterkonst appeared it showed
a major spelling change in the text as compared to the 1676 edition. Whereas the
earlier version has such spellings as "kracht, magh" the later edition has the
newer spelling which was then in use: "dogters, mogten, ambagten, slagt".

The first of the two "major" works mentioned (i.e. full scale grammars), that
of Van Belle in 1748, supports the basic 'gt' spelling, but with a strong use of
'cht' for the purposes of differentiation. His fundamental rule is: 'gt' whatever
the derivation, "Sommigen spellen 'ik zach, ik dacht', van de Werkwoorden 'zien,
denken' enz: met de CH, in plaats van de G, maar zonder nood: want wie zal iemant,
die zelf gelds genoeg hebbende zonder noodzaaklykheid, by eenen anderen daarom te
leen vraagt, niet voor dwaas houden? En moet men ze dan ook voor zodaanig niet
achten, die, aan de G genoeg hebbende, zonder nood nogtans de CH te leen
gebrauken; terwyl dezelve tóg in 't Neerduits aan het einde der woorden nooit
behoeft óf behoort gebruikt te worden, dan om daardoor eenigsins de onderscheidene
beteekenissen van sommige woorden te vertoonen: Nóg erger is 't wanneer men spelt
'hy bracht, men mocht, het deucht niet', van de Werkwoorden 'bringen, mogen,
deugen' enz: want dusdoende raakt men de eigenschap der woorden zoverre uit het
gezigt kwyt, dat nóch Vreemdeling nóch Neederlander, die de gronden onzer Taale
zoekt magtig te worden, dezelve eenigsins reegelmaatig kan nagaan" (p. 10). His
citing of derivation in support of "bragt" is superfluous, as he also advocates
'gt' in all cases!

In his second edition, 1755, there is a reference to Sewel's pronouncement
that final 'ch' sounded the same as 'g', for example in "Ach, Recht, Licht, Doch,
Lucht ... say ag, regt, ligt, dog, lugt" (dictionary). Van Belle disagrees with
this equating of the two, insofar as it may suggest that the two forms are
interchangeable: "CH kan ook dienen om een onderscheid te maken tussen ...'Licht'
(dat schynsel geof) en 'ligt' (dat gemaklyk óf niet zwaar is), 'Dóch' (een
tzaamvöegsel) en 'Dóg' (een hond). Maar geenszins voegte in 'ag, kragt, zagt,
regt (dat niet krom is) lugt".- apart from "kracht" the same examples as Sewel.

Sinkel has no objection to Halma's adoption of 'gt': "by (mag) vry de 'ch'
overal uytwerpen, daar ze niet nodig is, of 'er een 'g' voorzetten, als het
geluid die vereyst, dat is den halven arrebyd bespaard, door een letter, voor
twee te spellen". Sinkel's support of Halma's system is discussed, and
disapproved of, in Pieterson's Rhapsodia of 1776, where it is claimed that he
"de 'ch' schier heeft willen uitmonteren".

The only other important Northern grammar to recommend 'gt' is the Spelkonst
of Zeydelaar in 1769. He uses the same system as Van Belle,- 'gt' except for
homonym differentiation, e.g. "digt"(adjective),"een dichter". In the Vervolg of
1772 he writes the following on 'cht' spellers: "Dat men schrijvt 'kracht, macht,
schacht, schicht' gelijk DOFFORNE (sic) en anderen willen, kan men nóg toe
geven. Nauwkeurige én kiesche Taalkënners zijn 'er ondertusschen, die deese
woordjen ook met 'g' schrijven". Amongst these "nauwkeurige én kiesche
Taalkënners" he naturally, and modestly, includes himself.

In 1777 came the last appeal for 'gt' from Northern lips, though its proposer
did not in fact adopt it. This was Kluit, in his Vertoog, and, as mentioned in
the previous section, he would ideally have preferred the '-ch','-cht' spelling
in all cases. But, realising this to be unacceptable to most, he suggested that
an overal '-g/gt' spelling would be better than the current situation. He also,
like Winschooten, utterly rejects the use of 'ch(t)' for differentiation.
Although he was fully aware that the 'g' in both cases was pronounced unvoiced,
he thought it preferable to sacrifice exactitude in favour of simplicity. Only
'gt' is used in T.A.C.P.'s spelling lists, and, as late as 1799, the 'gt' system
was used in the grammar of Schwiers, for all words except "uichtend/oichtend". It
is possible that he inherited this usage from Zeydelaar, who he often emulates.

This '-g/gt' system formed a much greater part of the Northern spelling
practice than the number of grammars proposing it might suggest. At the beginning
of the century Van Alkemade and Pars (a friend of his) used 'gt' and this same
usage is carried on by the former's son-in-law Van der Schelling. It is also
used in the often reprinted spelling books of Heugelenburg, who only mentions
'ch' as a misuse for 'g', Van Rhyn, and the Nuttig en Noodig Speldboekje, though
they contain no discussion on the subject. Van Overschie (whose main spelling
oddities are discussed in chap.13,15), used only 'gt', but his minor literary
works could not have much influence. This is certainly not true however of three
of the major works of the later 18th century, one a literary best-seller, and the other two major works of reference.

The first of these, and probably the most influential was the monumental 21-volume Vaderlandsche Historie written by Wagenaar in 1749-59. Whether the spelling used is his own or his printers cannot be known for sure, but in it there is a conscious avoidance of 'cht' spellings. This does not go quite as far as Winschooten's usage, as the strictness of the rule is modified to allow for homonym differentiation, in the manner of Van Belle and Zeydelaar (though for different words). Thus he uses "licht" (noun), and the verb "toelichten", as distinct from "ligt, ligtelyk". This function seems to be restricted to "licht/ligt" however, as he makes no distinction between "digt/digters; agtste/agtten". All other words have 'gt': "egter, nagt, berigt,"etc. His only use of 'ch' apart from "licht/lichten" is in "toch, doch, noch" and foreign names such as "Childerik, Armorichen" (cf. "Klovis").

The major literary work which had a similar usage was the Kleine Gedigten of Van Alphen in 1778. He is stricter than Wagenaar, allowing 'ch' only in "ach, chocolade" and 'sch", not even for differentiation. At the end of the century another major work showed this spelling,— Chalmot's Biographisch Woordenboek, 1798. This is more in line with Wagenaar's system, and uses 'ch' in "doch, licht", but also in "achtung" as against "agt"(3). There are other, major, differences between their systems which rule out any consideration of wholesale copying: Chalmot does not use final '-sch', and employs a '-v' spelling in "zelvde, Graav" which is absent from the other. In each of these respects Chalmot's usage is identical to that used by Pars in his Index Batavicus of 1701, likewise a biographical dictionary, and it cannot be ruled out that Chalmot had used this predecessor of his, whose work he praises in the text, and possibly borrowed his spelling system, though there is no direct proof of this.

These three books, especially Wagenaar, together with the very influential dictionaries of Halma and Marin, probably account for the continued and widespread use of 'gt' spellings in the North, despite the lack of active support from contemporary grammars. One interesting sidelight of this is that it suggests that writers modelled their spelling practices on what they saw written in influential books, rather than on what they were told by a grammarian to be the
"correct" usage. This is supported by the fact that writers who follow a
 certain grammar in one usage, e.g. 'gt' instead of 'cht', may follow another in
 other respects, e.g. '-d/-t','s/-z-', vowels, etc.. Certainly the number of 'gt'
 spellers in the North cannot be attributed solely to any influence from any of
 Winschooten, Van Belle, Zeydelaar, or the numerous, though minor, spelling
 booklets and the grammars from the South. One work actually gives Wagenaar as
 the best example to follow,- the Eenigste Middel of 1769. Having allowed "licht",
 as in his system, this work then feels it advisable to also allow"gezicht"...
 ten gevallen van de Poëten ... om dat het natuurlijk is 'licht' en 'gezicht'
samen te doen rymen; en dat he Cog ook voldaan wil zyn".

The situation in the South is slightly different from that obtaining in the
 North. In the North the first grammar to advocate 'gt' did so rigorously, and
 without making exceptions. The system was later modified by some to allow for
 homonym differentiation. In the South it is the other way round. As mentioned
 earlier, the '-gh,ght' forms were traditional for Southern writers, and were not
 solely due to Moonen's use of similar forms. Towards the middle of the century
 this 'gh' was simplified by many, often under Northern influence, to 'g', giving
 'gt' spellings. The traditional differentiation patterns with 'cht/ght' were
 transferred en bloc to the 'gt' system, and only in later times were there moves
 to abolish such 'cht' forms(see chap.18).

One of the first Southern grammars to use 'gt' was Verpoorten's Woordenschat
 of 1742, who spells mostly with 'gt', but wishes to differentiate, e.g. "ligt
 (liggen), licht (lichten), licht (noun)",- a very common distinction (cf.Steven
 below). He states that he wishes to simplify 'gh' to 'g' in the manner of Van
 Hoogstraten, which is probably an allusion to the latter's comment in his Latin-
 Dutch dictionary (see above). One of the early works proposing a radical avoid-
 ance of 'ch' was the anonymous Snoeijmes (c.1760), where it forms part of the
 writer's attempts to ban the use of the letter 'c' in all positions. He keeps it
 only in the compound 'sch', changing all 'cht' spellings to 'gt'.

A work which appeared in 1774, Boterdael's Gemakkelyke Wyze, contained a
 similar spelling to that of Verpoorten (gebragt; licht/ligt). And like Verpoorten
 he also based this system on Northern usage, and (according to Smeyers)"(spreekt)
 zich radikaal voor de spelling van het Noorden uit". Ballieu's Spel- en
spraekkonst of 1772 was based largely on the Fondamenten of P.B(incken) of 1757, showing a wide use of 'gt', though frequent 'cht' and 'ch' in words with no related 'g' form (recht,noch,doch). His "Byvoegsel" of 1792 was influenced by Zeydelaar however, though he does not go as far with 'gt' as did Zeydelaar.

At least as radical as his predecessors was Janssens in 1775, for he uses only 'gt' with no attempt at differentiation, even for the various uses of "ligt". This is true also of his works written in English in 1792ff, under the anglicised name "Baldwin Janson", whilst he held the responsible post of "Professor of Languages to their serene Highnesses the Prince & Princess of Orange and the Duchess of York" (1803: "Professor of the Dutch, German & Flemish language to her Royal Highness the Duchess of York"); e.g. "gedigt...agtig (or by corruption) tagtig, or tachentig". In his English works he names the source of his spelling: "Ik heb Halma's spelling gevolgd, vanden jaare 1791, dewelke de'eenigste is, aanvaard by de beste hedendaagsche schrijveren". He does not detail which work of Halma's he means, but it is presumably an edition of his French-Dutch dictionary (though this uses differentiation spellings), or a later edition of Halma's Spraek-konst (3rd ed.1787). The latter is made more possible by the fact that Janssen's 1775 work, like Halma's, contains a French grammar in addition to the Dutch/Flemish. This first work of his was held in some esteem in the South,— J.FlWillems felt that Janssens and Steven "verdien(en) de meesteonderscheyding", though modern opinion is not so high,— Vos accuses it of "obenulligheid en waardeloosheid".

Winkelman's grammar of 1784 gives this usage as his own ('gt'), except for differentiation,— the normal system described above, but a new plea for the abolition of 'ch' appeared in 1785 in the anonymous Inleyding: "ons dient de 'ch' te vlugten, zoo veel bestendig is", with the result that only 'gt' is used. In this aspect the work is equally as radical as the earlier Snoeijmes. So too was the next Flemish grammar to discuss this spelling,— that of De Neckere in 1815. He wishes to avoid all 'ch' usage: "(de ouden) schreeven ook 'Bracht, Macht, Pleecht' etc. waer vooren wy ... met verkorting schryven 'Bragt, Magt, Pleegt'" (p.54). Gelijkvormigheid also supports this 'g(t)' system, giving the by now largely standard Southern forms "ogtend, sugten, agter". He retains 'ch' only in 'sch' and such words as "lachen". This is one spelling in which De Neckere
differs from Van Daele who uses the "recht, dicht gebragt" type of derivation-based spellings described below (Tydverdrijf 1/16).

In the same year as De Neckere's work a school grammar appeared in Antwerp which was to have much influence on later works; this was the Spraakkunst of Terbruggen. He in his turn had been influenced by Ballieu and Bincken, and consequently he is in favour of homonym differentiation within the 'gt' system: "De 'g' op het einde een lettergroep staande, het zy alleen, of van een 't' gevolgd, heeft den zelfden klank als 'ch'; welke twee letters in de oude Spraakkunsten doorgaans te vinden zyn: daer de nieuwe integendeel, om de kortheyd eene 'g' stellen in de woorden 'kragt, slegt, nigt, gedrogt, zagt' enz., ten waere men somtyds 'ch' gebruykte om het verschil tusschen sommige woorden te toonen". Terbruggen was also the founder member of a language discussion group in Antwerp "die thans aldaer nog uitspraak doet over punten van spelling en woordvoeging, onder den naam van een schoolonderwijzerengezelschap, ... (doch) is ook al met zoö veel nieuwigheden opgekomen, dat des eerstgenoemden spraekleer rain of meer onbruikbaer geworden schynt". This may have been the case at the time when Willems wrote this (in Belg.Museum, 18371), but before then several other works had emulated Terbruggen, one of the main ones being Visschers in his dictionary of c.1825: "Wat de spelwyze betreft, ik heb hierin het reaestendeel die van den taelkundigen J.A.TERBRUGGEN gevolgd. Hoewel de spel- en schryfwyze van den heer TERBRUGGEN al sommige mishaegt". Visschers then names other school books based on Terbruggen,— those by Zilgens, Delin, Myin, and Van den Oppy.

The other major Flemish grammar of this period, by Behaegel (1817), also uses mostly 'gt', though he has many more 'cht/gt' differentiational pairs than his contemporary 'gt' spellers. And this, apart from several minor (mostly school-) grammars emulating one or other of those mentioned above, was the last time that the widespread use of 'gt' was proposed, though it lived on in usage. De Simpel still knew of it in the mid 1820's: "De 'g' ... wordt dikwijls voor het ondeelbaar letterteeken 'ch' gebezigd, als 'digt, ligt, nog, gezigt' enz."— he may be referring to Visschers.

Before discussing the other major spelling alternative, that broadcast by Sewel, it may be mentioned here that some grammars could not decide which school they preferred. These are very few in number, and the main representative is
Jan Des Roches, who is also the most indifferent as to the final choice:

"Indien een grondwoord met 'ch' geschreven word, zullen alle woorden die van het zelve worden afgelayd, met 'ch' geschreven worden;" - this only affects such as "lachen: lacht", "van gelyken zal men de 'g' gebruyken indien het grondwoord de 'g' vereyscht. ... Men kan ook dikwils aan het meervoudig van een woord geaer worden, met wat letter, het eenvoudig daer van geschreven dient te zyn. ... Maer daer is een groot getal woorden als 'gezigt, gevrigt, zagt, zught, bogt, kragtig, klagt, gezogt', enz., welke onder geene van deese twee regels behooren. Ons bedunkens, en naer het voorbeeld der deftigste schryvers, mag men in zulke woorden zonder misslag, willekuurig of wel de 'ch' of wel de 'g' gebruyken".

The only other work to go as far as this in freedom of choice is the 1766 revision of Sewel's dictionary by Buys, who added to the former's notes: "G word in 't midden en aan het einde eener lettergreep dikwils voor CH verwisseld, en is myns bedunkens onverschillig",- except, that is, for homonym differentiation.

Both spellings are recorded by Kramer, and he is the only one to describe the variants in linguistic terms, rather than in terms of adherence to a certain grammarian's rules: "Wird sehr oft ein Buchstab oder eine Sylbe eines Worts in eine andere verwandelt, als: Agten, Magtig, Egter &c. ... an statt: Achten, Machtig, Echter.... Diese Figur wird Antithesis oder Antistoechon genannt, und hanget allein ab von der verscheidenen Schreibart, so jemand wählet, und der Stadt, so jemand bewohnet" (1774,p.22). This last comment is also unique to Kramer, in that it tells not only that the 'gt/cht' alternation varied according to the school followed, but also that the usage depended on the region of the writer; and not only the broader geographical region (e.g. North/South), but even down to the place of residence of the writer. Unfortunately he does not go into greater detail on this geographical distribution.

The entries in the vocabulary lists of this grammar, however, conform to no particular pattern (cf."nigt, nacht, zugt") and are often also at variance with the words used in the text, e.g. "slecht" & (p.5)"slecht", "nuchter" & (p.2) "rugter". And, possibly in line with his stated theory that the two are mere variants, on p.235 he gives the equivalent of the German suffix "=icht, =ig" as '-achtig, -agtig':- "Die hochdeutsche Endsylbe '=icht', lautet im holländischen
'-agtig, -achtig', als Adericht: 'Aderachtig, aderagtig'...". Earlier editions (e.g. 1755) give only '-achtig'.

The early editions of the Spel en leesboekje voor eerst beginnenden by the Nut have both spellings in their lists, e.g. the 1799 (3rd) edition: "nagt/nacht, hegt/hecht", otherwise only 'gt': "vegten, slegte, agter", which would thus seem to be its preferred usage. This is distinct from the inconsistent spelling of some of the Nut books (see above), as these are listed as alternatives. In the later editions (e.g. 1805) the Siegenbeek system was used.

In this period of uncertainty dictionaries often found themselves in an invidious position, for if they adopted one spelling at the expense of the other, they would alienate a large proportion of their potential readership, who would be unable to find the word they were seeking. Most of them overcame this problem by adopting a space-consuming system of cross-references. Thus Halma's Dutch & French dictionary of 1719 (and up to and including the 1781 edition) has such entries as "LICHT enz., zie Ligt", for him the 'gt' spelling is always the major entry (see above). Winkelman's dictionary, based on Halma, has similarly "nacht zie nagt" etc..

This tradition of cross-references was at least as old as Dutch lexicography, as for example the entries in Lambrecht's Naembouck quoted earlier. Sewel's dictionary has similar entries, e.g. "Klachte see Klagte; Macht see Magt", though many other entries have no such cross entries. The situation was slightly different for Sewel, as he accepted many 'cht' spellings (see below), and such cross-references as there are to 'gt' are for those words whose change from 'cht' to 'gt' he was justifying in his spelling rules. Those such as Winkelman's are more a reaction to contemporary variance. When the system for 'gt/cht' became stabilised by the introduction of Siegenbeek's spelling, such needless repetition was avoided.

Much more hardy and long-lived than any system mentioned above was that propagated (but not invented) by Sewel. This remained virtually unchanged in principle until the major changes introduced by De Vries and Te Winkel. The vast majority of Northern grammars followed this system, as did several Southern systems, but most of them varied in detail. The main point of controversy
covered the extent of application of etymology; for some worked with derivations not accepted by others, leading to conflict as to the effect (or lack of effect) on the spelling in question. Sewel's rule was basically: if and only if there is a related form with 'g' use 'gt', otherwise use 'cht', except for homonym differentiation: "G wil ik liever gebruiken in 't woordt 'Magt' als 'ch', als komende van 'Mag', welkers onbepaalde wyze is 'moogen', en daarom schryf ik 'mogt' en niet 'mocht'; om de zelfde reden schryf ik 'gewigtig' en niet 'gewichtig', zynde afkomstig van 't woord 'weegen'; en daarom wil ik ook liefst spellen 'Gebragt, gezigt, voorzigtig' vermits de 'g' in de woorden 'Brengen, ik zag, wy zagen' niet kan achtergelaaten worden" (1691 dictionary).

Nyloë agreed with this view, though introducing pronunciation factors: "'ch' heeft by na de zelve kracht met de 'g', doch 'g' is wel zo zagt als 'ch', en daarom zou men in zulke woorden als 'macht, ontsach' enz. 'ch' kunnen schrijven, in 'deugt, vreugt' en diergelyke 'g'. Maar dit onderscheit is zo groot niet" (1703,p.11). In the later editions he also acknowledges the existence of the Winschooten method: "men (schryft)...'kracht, zucht, licht, wacht, vrucht' enz. met 'ch', hoewel anderen die ook wel met een 'g' schryven". There were however difference between his and Sewel's system: he spells "gezach, ontsach", whereas the 1708 Sewel dictionary adds to the note given above "Hierom schryf ik ook 'gezag, ontzag'". Nyloë did not accept the relevance of the forms "zag, zagen" on the spelling of these words. Nor did he have any sympathy for the Moonen 'ght' system (see above).

Three more grammars of the early 18th century have usages which agree almost exactly with that recommended by Sewel: E.C.P.'s Ontwerp of 1712, Steven's Voorschriftenboek of 1714ff, and, naturally, Sewel's reworked version of La Grue's Grammaire Flamande in 1719 (and consequently also Cuno in 1741, see chap.2). There were minor variations between the usage of the first two and Sewel's system, but these are of little significance. Steven objected to the advance of the Winschooten system because it removed the differentialional spellings: "Zommige Taelkundige Vlaemingen, met vele Hollanders, willem de G alom hebben in de plaatse van CH. ... En schoon dit schryven niet gansch te verwerpen is, nogtans durven wy dit nog niet nae volgen, om de werring die 'er kan komen" (taken from the 1833 edition, with the approbation dated 1741, and
introduction dated 1714; all his comments are more in keeping with the early 18th century, rather than the 19th! The Grammaire pour apprendre... another Southern work, later defended this same system in 1757.

The next Northern grammar to use this system was De Haes's grammar of 1764, though as with many, he does not actually discuss his usage. Around the same time the Kunst grammar (1770), Van Belleghem & Waterschoot (Brugge 1773), and Pietersen (1776) used and defended the same system, showing that there was still a following in both parts of the Netherlands.

In 1776 Stijl's grammar expounded a little more fully on the subject: 'ch' was to be used in "kracht" but not in "magt" which was to have 'g' because of its derivation, despite the fact that the same sound was heard in both; "kracht" was allowed to keep its 'ch' because "de afleiding is zo duidelijk niet". In this last phrase he shows considerably more practicality than some of his successors, who often went to great lengths in their search for related forms. But it must be noted that Stijl too was subject to the same tendencies,- he does not reject "kragt" because there is no related form with 'g', but because he cannot think of one obvious enough. Holtrop's grammar of 1783 gives the same system of derivation/gelijkvormigheid spelling-rules (gelijkvormigheid was taken to such lengths, and interpreted so broadly, that the result was more exactly describable as etymological/derivational spellings).

Bolhuis, who had edited Stijl's work,- fortunately not by emending the text but by the addition of modificatory or explanatory footnotes,- agrees both with the letter's views and with the normal derivation rules, in his own grammar published by the Nut in 1793. The same view is expressed in other Nut works (though cf. above), e.g. Varick's Rudimenta of 1802, and the Spraakkunst of 184: "Zoo zou in 'dragt, klagt, magt' de 'ch' ... aan de uitspraak beter voldoen dan de 'g'; doch de afleiding der genoemde woorden van 'dragen, klagen, mogen' wil, dat men dezelve met eene 'g' schrijve" (p.112).

Most of these later Nut works are based not so much on their predecessors of the previous century, but on the example of Siegenbeek's new system, which put the official seal of approval on etymological 'gt' spellings, using "magt' van 'mogen', 'klagt' van 'klagen'" in the traditional way. Siegenbeek did however wish to draw the line: "alleen de duidelijkste en naaste afleiding (kan) ten
This modification precludes the spelling "agten, -agtig" which relied on Old English "agan" and Mesogothic "agen". Nonetheless he proposed "regt" because of a supposed connexion with "rijgen". And this is a good example of the shortcomings of the system: assuming all his derivations to be correct (which later knowledge has shown to be not always the case (e.g. "recht" is related to "rekken" rather than to "rijgen"), how many users of the system would be aware of this? How many even would be conscious of the more "obvious" derivations such as "plicht, plechtig, plegen", where divergences in meaning obscure the connexion to the uninitiated. Most ordinary users might recognise "klagt" from "klagen", but how many would connect, as they were supposed to, "kraft" from "krijgen" (again actually unrelated)? For the common man, that Siegenbeek could well appear to have drawn up a list of seemingly arbitrary variations in spelling which had to be learned and obeyed for fear of showing one's ignorance of the mother tongue, was probably the chief drawback of the system.

It is just such non-obvious derivations which Smits condemns in 1824, in his criticism of "de taalwet van geen grondletters te vervalschen":

"De Taalkundigen hebben het óók zo verre gebracht van de zachte grondletter niet te verwisselen in 'ch', dat men ze niet alleen in de geregelde afleidingen behoudé b.v. 'breng, bragt, gebracht', van 'brengen', 'gang, gangen' 'oorsprong, sprongen', 'ik mag, gij moogt, hij migt, magt, magtit' van 'mogen', maar óók zo ze slechts in mingeregelde afleidingen te vinden is, als 'ik plagt, pligtig, pligt, verpligtet' van 'plégén', 'dragt, eendragt, gedrogt, gedrogelijk' van 'dragen', 'wigt, gewigtig' van 'wegen', 'ik zag, zigt, gezigt, onzigt, gezag': om dat men de 'g' uit spreekt in 'wij zagen'. 'Regt, beregt, rigten, onderrigten, verrigten' afkomstig van 'ik riige, rege, geregen', waarvan óók 'regelen, regel' hunnen oorsprong hebben, 'vlugt, vlugtig' van 'vliegen', 'betigten' van 'betijgen', 'Digt (vast gesloten) digit (bij), digit (bij één)', van het verowderde wortelwoord 'ik dijge, dege, gedegen" (p.56).

Although some of his "mingeregelde afleidingen" are now considered correct, or even self-evident (e.g. "vliegen/vlugt"), Smits cannot be blamed for being unaware of later improvements in derivation procedures. And his tirade is certainly a good example of how lost many felt when confronted with Siegenbeek’s learned system, which indeed demanded more than a modicum of linguistic knowledge for a correct application.

It was not only such derivations that Smits criticised in the system, but also some of the patent inconsistencies: "sticht, stichtig, zwichten, kracht, krachten; hoe wel 'stijgen, stegen, zijgen, krijgen' voor de zachte 'g' pléjten".

It was almost inevitable that now armed with the knowledge that any related form
with 'g' demanded a 'gt' spelling, the less-learned would seek derivatives where no connexion existed, and call on many popular etymologies. This was the very weakness of the Siegenbeek 'gt/cht' system.

The first to highlight this fault, apart from the relatively minor writer Smits, was Bilderdijk, who attacked many points of his rival's system (they had been co-applicants for the same professorship, and Bilderdijk was unsuccessful). He draws on the fact that 'g' is always devoiced in speech before 't' (Spraakleer p.49), e.g. "mag, macht". In his Voorlezing (p.27), however, he defended 'gt' in verbs, "ik lag, gy lagt; - lachen, gy lacht" doon zonder dat men daarmee voorhad in het eerste de laffe flaauwheid van de 'g' (die voor geen Hollander als sluitletter eens woords uit te spreken of aan te horen is) te doen uitspreken"; i.e. the 'g' in final position and before 't' must be pronounced as /ch/.

In the South J.F.Willems had expressed similar thoughts in 1824: "Wy (zouden) de van ouds voor slotletters gediend hebbende 'ch' het liefst geschreven zien in 'macht, zacht, bocht, gezicht, plicht, zucht' en in de meeste andere zulke woorden, waarin de 't' de syllabe sluit, daer zulks, naer ons inzien, voor een vasten recht zou kunnen dienen, terwijl elke andere regelmaet moeilijk, en een veel uitzonderingen onderhevig is" (p.379). So even scholars like Willems found the system difficult!

It is at about this time that the so-called Belgian spelling-war began to reach its heights; and one of the major arguments in this concerned this 'gt/cht' spelling. Some favoured a form similar to that in the North, viz. the Siegenbeek system, others pressed for the continuation of the Southern tradition in using 'gt' wherever possible (see above). Eventually there was a decision by the Belgian spelling-commission (§4) in favour of "het gebruik der 'ch' voor de letter 't', overal waer de 'g' niet omsporndelijk is", thus a rejection of the widespread Behaegel/Des Roches system(s), and convergence with the Northern spelling practices, with all the inconsistencies and absurdities, and despite Willems's suggested logical modification in the system. This can only, in hindsight, be regarded as a retrograde step, for although spelling unity was of vital importance, the 'gt' system was superior to Siegenbeek's complicated rules and exceptions.
This commission spelling was then accepted by all in the South, including the many school grammars such as those of Renier and David (though see above for David's personal views on the system), ousting the very popular Des Roches system of the previous decades. These minor school grammars merely repeated the commission rules, just as those in the North adopted or repeated the standard Siegenbeek rules and pronouncements. The intricacies of the system were not without problems however: in 1845 Van den Bossche wrote that if "men voor het gebruik der 'ch' en 'g' (voor de letter 't') eenen vasten en uitvoerbaar regel kan vinden, daer zou ik geërne in toestemmen" (p.63). He envisages something along the lines of Siegenbeek's rules, but with derivations which were less obscure.

In fact there is evidence to support the view that the Siegenbeek system was an inconvenience not only for "normal" people, but also to scholars. Not only are there the statements by Willems and Van den Bossche given above, but also the fact that when De Vries and Te Winkel were busy preparing their (almost equally confusing) rules for a derivation-based split in single and double vowel spellings, the one thing on which they were quite firm was a rejection of the old 'gt/cht' alternation in nouns. In place of this they introduced a new system, similar to that mooted by Bilderdijk and Willems, which, although with no great historical precedent, is admirable both for its relative simplicity and for its naturalness, the latter especially facilitating its easy application by non-academics: "De geadspireerde keelklank gevolgd door een 't', die tot dezelfde lettergreep behoort, wordt, zonder op de afleiding te letten, overeenkomstig de uitspraak, met 'ch' geschreven, b.v. in 'acht, blecht, dracht, ...' enz. niettegenstaande een aantal der genoemde woorden van stammen met 'g' zijn gevormd, als 'dracht, jacht, klacht' enz. van 'dragen, jagen, klagen'.

"Daarentegen blijft de 'g' in de regelmatige vervoeging der werkwoorden wier stam op 'g' eindigt, en in de zelfst. nw. door achtervoeging van '-te' gevormd van bijvoegl. nw. op 'g'; b.v. 'draagt, jaagt, klaagt'... en in 'laagte, laagte, droogte',... waarin de 't' steeds tot de volgende lettergreep 'te' behoort". This must have been a relief to many, reading the words "zonder op de afleiding te letten"!

According to this rule "bracht, mocht, placht" also had 'cht', despite being
verb forms, as they had no related form +brach, +moch, +plach, cf "breng(t), moog(t), pleeg(t)"; "Evenzoo is de spelling 'Aagt' en 'aagtappel' regelmatig, deel de 't' in deze verkorte vormen slechts toevallig op de 'g' volgt, maar er in den onverminkten vorm 'Agatha' door een 'a' van gescheiden is".

Just how strongly they held these views is shown in the next paragraph: "Het opvolgen deze regels maakt een einde aan eene der lastigste onderscheidingen, die de gebruikelijke spelling met zich bracht, en aan de willekeur, die daarbij heerschte. Zoo schreef zij o.a. 'ligt' en 'regt' voor, ofschoon die woorden niet in verband staan met eenig woord, waarin een 'g' voorkomt. Daarentegen gaf zij aan 'geslacht, tucht, tuchtigen' de 'ch', hoewel deze woorden met 'slag' en 'toog, togen' samenhangen" (Woordenlijst 1866 §27, slightly amended from De Nederlandsche spelling by Te Winkel, 1859 §§329-333). Thus from now on all nouns were to have 'cht' whereas verbs had 'gt' (pleegt) or 'cht' (lacht) according to the spelling of the infinitive "plagen, lachen" - a rule which could be easily learnt and followed. It is actually in basis the same rule as that suggested by Van der Schuere and the usage of the Twe-spraack, except that these used 'gd' and 'ght' respectively in verbs (see above).

This rule remained unaltered through all the later reform movements. Kollewijn, Marchant and the 1954 Woordenlijst left the rules intact, though the latter overcompresses them, making "mocht, bracht, placht" exceptions to the "hij draagt"-rule, which they are not. In Te Winkel's book it is quite clearly stated that they should have 'cht' because the 't' is present in all persons of that tense, as distinct from such cases as "draag-t", where it is a suffix present in certain persons only. The 'cht' spelling is also left untouched in the reform proposals of the V.W.S.

Several reformers have pleaded for the introduction of a phonetically ruled spelling, giving 'cht' in all words including verbs, in the manner of Middle Dutch. But only one pleaded for the re-introduction of the more simple 'gt' spelling. This was Van Ginneken in 1932: "Ik geloof, dat de 'ch' voor de meeste schrijvers geen gezocht, ja zelfs een gemeden letterverbinding is. Pas De Vries en Te Winkel wisten ze in woorden als 'kragt: kracht, magt: macht' een beetje drukker in gebruik te brengen". Unless he is advocating a return to the confused
Siegenbeek system, he seems to wish the reintroduction of the 18th century 'gt' system. As stated above this is a much simpler system, but Van Ginneken does De Vries and Te Winkel a great injustice in suggesting that their system introduced an undesirable innovation into the 'gt' spelling system. Although he would ideally have liked to see such a spelling as he describes, he feels bound to admit that "hard nodig is deze verandering niet" (p.68).

The first to moot the reintroduction of the 'cht' spelling for all cases, is so early that it can almost equally well be considered a late product of the old school rather than the vanguard of the new, were it not for the writer's own words. It came from Kluit in 1777, where, as mentioned in the previous section, he proposes that 'ch/g' should be treated in the same way as 's/z' and 'f/v'. However he realised that such would be too radical, so that, as he felt some improvement to be urgently needed in the contemporary chaos, he suggested the over-all adoption of the 'g/gt' spelling, which was then current, as less unacceptable. He still felt that 'cht' was the more correct form however, as the 'g' was unvoiced by the following 't'.

The first truly radical in this respect was Carlebur in 1856, who, as mentioned above, was attracted to the idea of 'ch' in all final positions, though he only actually adopted it when followed by 't', in both nouns and verbs: "hij volch, zecht" alongside "jeugd, gezegd, gevolgd" for gelijkvormigheid. The other radical 'ch' speller of that time, Halbertsma in 1865, uses 'cht' in all positions: "menichte, hoochte, hij zecht".

As Land suggested using 'c' for /ch/, he presumably also uses 'ct' for /cht/, though as no suitable word occurs in his specimen text, this must be taken for granted. Although he did not think reform urgent, he was well aware of the inconsistency of De Vries and Te Winkel's 'cht/gt' spellings: "De geheele spellingquaestie is eigenlijk van onderschikt belang, en denkt haar bestaan alleen aan het ontoereikende der uit der vreemde overgenomen schrijftekens... Anders zouden wij nog veel meer moeten vragen; b.v. waarm de stelsel van den dag 'macht, recht, plicht' en toch niet 'gij moocht, hij zecht, hij licht (liggen) verkiesst?'«.

No more was heard of 'cht' spellings, apart from Van Ginneken, until the appearance of KLûck's new alphabet proposals in 1956. His system is perfectly
regular: the new sign for /ch/ always precedes the (modified) 't', and the (modified) 'g' always precedes the 'd', giving the equivalent of 'cht' in the new alphabet spellings of "ochtend, glimlachte, krampachtig" etc.

The last in the short line of new '-cht' spellers is Rombouts, who, like others, also proposed final 'ch' and the abandonment of the gelijkvormigheid rule (Land is the only exception here). This produces the forms "gezecht, gelecht, hij vliecht". Like Kluit however, Rombouts had reservations about this radical expansion in the use of 'ch', and for a time considered instead the outright discarding of 'ch' in favour of a Winschooten-type '-g/gt' spelling. But unlike Kluit he decided that consistency demanded 'ch', hence his 'cht' forms. Seeldraeyers emendation of Rombouts's 'ch' to 'c' would give "volet, gezet, geelct" for the examples given by the latter. No such reform was envisaged by the V.W.S.

The course of development of 'ch','g','gh' in final position and before 't', in their various combinations.

The original Middle Dutch spelling was with 'ch' in all positions where the unvoiced sound was heard, thus in final position and before 't' in both nouns and verbs. A sub-system of this developed early on, in which 'ch' and 'cht' was used for nouns, but verbs had 'ght', possibly influenced by the first person form of the verb having '-ghe'(/-ge/) in that particular dialect rather than '-ch' (/-ch/), cf. "ik zech, hij zecht; ik zegghe, hij zeght". The first of these (described below as system I), used in both North and South, lasted roughly until the early 17th century, though it was still known (e.g. by La Grue) at the end of that century. Later users preserved it (e.g. Hilarides), and even later attempts were made to revive it, at sporadic intervals right down to the present century.

The sub-system (II), also in use throughout the Netherlands, may be felt to embody the gelijkvormigheid rule in embryonic form; it too faded out at about the same time as I, though not always for the same reason. In system I the introduction of gelijkvormigheid substituted 'g' for 'ch' and 'gt' for 'cht' where appropriate, giving system VII, or sometimes substituting 'gh' giving system V (see below). System II with its already existing 'ght' in verbs, favoured the extension of the 'gh' to the first person forms, and thence to nouns by analogy.
It thus retained 'cht' in nouns, merging with system IV. As many of the early systems were co-existent it is not possible to be sure of any such progressions, especially as many writers were rarely consistent to any system, and a comparative chronology is at best tentative.

What is really a variant of II is where the 'ght' in verbs was simplified to 'gt' (system III); this is often difficult to distinguish from other systems where 'gt' is common, owing to not infrequent anomalous 'gt' and 'g' spellings in the writings of a 'gh'-speller, mostly to save space on the printed line.

A totally different method (IV) had its origins in the South in the 15th century, and its adoption by the North was largely the result of a conscious imitation rather than a mere expansion of usage. This system is where all final /ch/ is spelt 'gh' (regardless of other uses of 'gh', e.g. in initial position), giving also 'ght' in verbs. The nouns are still spelt with 'cht'. This is the first true gelijkvormigheid spelling, as yet only applied to final consonants. Its introduction to the North was by Spiegel, if his own words are to be taken literally, inspired by the Southern usage he had seen in the Boecius of 1485. Though for a long time co-current with I and II, it lasted slightly longer, and spellings according to this system probably merged around the mid 17th century with system V (−gh, −ght' in nouns & verbs according to gelijkvormigheid, otherwise 'cht', cf. above), due to the extension of the gelijkvormigheid rule to cover 'ght' in nouns. Such spellings in system V are known from the 16th century, but the first grammar to use them is in the mid 17th century, by which time it was the commonest spelling pattern, probably aided by the eminence of some users.

This spelling was radically modified by Moonen and became in effect a different system altogether (VI), though V continued in use, especially in less exalted texts, and also primarily in the South. Moonen's adaptation, as was described above, constituted the discarding of 'h' in '−gh(t)' in certain positions, e.g. at the end of certain grammatical categories. His spelling is (literally) in a class on its own, being a transition between V and VI proper.

System VI proper, i.e. excluding Moonen - uses final 'gh' in all words, disregarding the rules and exceptions as laid down by Moonen. It must be borne in mind that initial 'gh-' had died out many decades earlier (see chap. 8). Yet this must still be regarded as a derivative of Moonen's method, or at the very
least, the two must be regarded as very closely related. In all positions with /ch/ followed by 't', this system uses 'gt/ght' according to the rules of gelijkvormigheid and derivation.

When initial 'gh' began to be simplified to 'g-', some spellers also applied the same rule to '-gh' and 'ght', which thus became '-g' and 'gt', giving system VII. This has 'g' wherever gelijkvormigheid demands, including nouns in 'gt', otherwise using 'ch' (e.g. "zich, toch") and 'cht' ("achter"). This is parallel to V, differing only in the use of 'g' for 'gh'. It was first discussed in 1624, though it was in all probability in use before, and lasted until the beginning of the 13th century, when it tended to drift into system VIIa.

System VIIa rests on the works of Sewel, who amended VII to allow for a widespread homonym differentiation in the use of 'cht/gt'. Many in system VII had used '-ch/-g' for differentiation (nog/noch), but not 'gt/cht'. Sewel's system was used in both North and South, with various modifications and extensions of what constituted a valid derivation demanding the 'gt', until it was superseded by system IX. En route it incorporated system VIII (see below). Many grammarians were not always explicit as to their use of differentiation, and it is often difficult to tell from VIIa; nor do all texts include examples of possible differentiation spellings. Some go to the other extreme and allow so many derivational 'gt' spellings, and so many differentiation spellings that there remain only a handful of "real" 'cht' spellings (e.g. achter) and '-ch' spellings (zich, toch) to show that VIIa is being used and not Vlla!

Starting just before Sewel's VIIa, but definitely later than VII, was the very widespread system VIII, first defended by Wunschoten and Van Helderen in 1683, though in use earlier. This abolishes 'ch' from all positions where it could safely be dispensed with, leaving only 'sch-' and loan words with 'ch' (in its most extreme form 'ch' was even discarded from 'sch-', see chap.13; see also "laggen" chap.4). Undeclined words such as "tog, dog, zig" also took this 'g', though there was obviously no question of derivation. The forms of this system are known from the mid-17th century (see above), but were for a long time more or less restricted to the North.

This very radical, and very simple, system merged with system VII becoming closer and closer to systematic identity with it as it tended to adopt more and
more 'cht' and 'ch' spellings for homonym differentiation (e.g. "licht/ligt", nog/noch). System VIIIa, long current in the South, developed from the simplification of 'gh' to 'g', thus already including the many differentiation pairs which Winschooten ignored completely. It is also very possible that users of VIII borrowed the differentiation spellings of Sewel's VIIa (cf. chap. 13).

System VIIIa superseded VIII around the mid 18th century, but in the opening years of the 19th century it was in turn completely absorbed into VIIa with the introduction of the Siegenbeek system. It lingered on a little in the South, but the Belgian commission finally adopted the Northern style VIIa system.

Retaining '-g' in final position, including verbs but not applying the gelijkvormigheid rules to 'cht' in nouns, class IX forms a definite break with VIIa. Such spellings already occur in the 17th century, where 'ght' was simplified to 'gt' in verbs before the 'gt' spelling was adopted by nouns; so that it may be considered really a modified class IV. Soon after this date it was absorbed by VII with the extension of 'gt' to nouns. It was then not heard of again until the problematical Siegenbeek system was superseded by that of De Vries and Te Winkel; this system is still in use at the time of writing.

A very minor variation (X) using '-g, -ch' according to gelijkvormigheid, but 'cht' in nouns, participles (except "jeugd, deugd, gezegd" etc.), and verbs (e.g. zecht, pleecht), was used by Carlebur.

To these basic classes must be added a host of writers whose usage varied, often unsystematically, or because they wavered between one system and another. The systems outlined above tentatively cover all consistent patterns. There are also those who were indifferent as to which system was used, provided that it was used consistently (e.g. Des Roches), and in addition such reformers as wished to replace 'ch' by a new letter, or adapt an existing one to this use.

The relative efficiency of the various systems:

System I simple, consistent, phonetically accurate.

II consistent, less simple with regard to phonetic representation, since 'h' really superfluous (though cf. chap. 3).

III consistent, less phonetic than I.

IV the birth of the gelijkvormigheid system. Not immediately obvious to
less well educated users (less a problem with more universal education). The use of 'gh' in final position for inflected words makes the 'ght' of verbs easily understood and applied.

V The extension of 'ght' to nouns is really unnecessary, and confusing for many.

VI The use of 'gh' in final position is really superfluous, unless it is meant to indicate the lack of voicing (cf. chap.3). Otherwise the system is simple, but with the same faults as V.

VII As V, but using 'gt' in nouns instead of 'ght'. Similarly confusing and erratic as ideas on what constituted a related form varied radically from person to person. Such a system is more or less impossible to apply with consistency without guidance from an authoritative word-list. Many rulings somewhat arbitrary. The use of differentiation spellings, though sometimes not without some justification, was often carried to excess.

VIII A simple elegant system. As /ch/ and /g/ are never in phonemic contrast in Dutch in any position there is no real need for two letters. /ch/ is always found in final position and before /t/, /g/ is always used initially. Medially either may occur after a short vowel (lachen, vlaggen), after a long vowel /ch/ is restricted to "juichen, huichelen, loochenen, goochelen", and sometimes "bijvoegelijk, mogelijk". There are no words differing only in use of /ch/ or /g/, with the possible exception of "wichelen, wiggelen". It is also a well-documented phenomenon of modern Dutch that there is little actual phonetic difference between /ch/ and /g/ whatever the position (cf. Van den Berg in 'Foniek...': "Vooral aan het begin van het woord is het dikwijls moeilijk uit te maken of men met een stemhebbende dan wel stemloze consonant te doen heeft. ...Een zo geconditioneerd optreden van de stemloze en stemhebbende fricatief (- final /ch/, initial /g/) doet de vraag opkomen, of we wel met twee fonemen te maken hebben en of we niet liever moeten zeggen dat ze binnen het zelfde foneem vallen"). This redundancy of one of the two spellings was evidently not recognized by many grammarians, though equally clearly a very large proportion of 18th century writers instinctively knew that nothing at all was lost, nor anything misleadingly spelt, by the adoption
of what would now be called a "phonemic" spelling, viz. 'g/gt' in all positions. VIII has all the advantages of I, differing only in the use of 'g' for 'ch'; it has the further advantage of being shorter, but complications arise if the differing sounds of such as "liegen, lochenen" have to be accurately represented. Whether such a difference is really necessary is doubtful, and it may be pointed out that modern Afrikaans makes no distinction in spelling between "liggaam, ligging" etc., and uses 'g' throughout ("maag" etc.).

IX compared to the system it replaced (VIIa), very simple. Basically the same as IV. As long as a spelling alternation between 'ch/g' in the same way as 'f/v' and 's/z' is no part of the system, then a 'gt' spelling for verbs is preferable, since the forms "zecht, lecht" etc. would demand such an alternation. The exclusion of 'gt/cht' from nouns is well justified on practical grounds, and the choice of 'cht' in preference to 'gt' as the sole representative is justifiable on phonetic grounds, though as such a rule applies nowhere else (cf. "abt, houdt, reisde" etc.), 'gt' could just as well have been used, and with greater brevity.

X simple, regular, though the verb spellings form an exception to the gelijkvormigheid rules.

As stated under VIII there is no real need to spell 'ch' either in final position or before 't', as /g/ is never heard there (except in sandhi assimilation). This makes Klück's introduction of a new sign for /ch/ largely unnecessary, though his alphabet/spelling is based on phonetic rather than on phonemic principles, e.g. he also has separate letters for the allophones of /o:/ heard in "oom" and "oor". The lack of homonyms in '-ch/-g' in inflected words (there is no parallel to "rat-ratten/rad-raden") makes the adoption of a final '-ch' spelling superfluous, though giving an attractive parallel to 's/z' and 'f/v', where there are likewise no homonyms with differing consonants in inflected forms. Demands for such a reform largely ignore this lack of phonemic contrast, or regard it as of less importance than the parallel given with 's/z', 'f/v', and often 't/d' ("goet, hant" etc.), as is the case for example for Rombouts and Middle Dutch (both class I).
Summary:

users of other letters for /ch/: *h* De Heuiter (with sympathy from Ampzing and Van Heule).

*'c' Smits, Land, Seeldraeyers.

*'ch' Ten Kate.

*x* J. te Winkel, Wellekens.

suggesting the formation of a totally new letter: Leupenius, (Jeoffroy?), Van Ginneken, Klock.

The various systems as outlined above, subdivided by region (North/South) and whether the users are grammarians or literary figures. The latter is naturally not exhaustive. In some instances no "users" are noted, this does not mean that there were none, merely that none figured among those whose writings have been used. Dictionary entries count as "users" for the purpose of this analysis.

I. all '-ch'; all 'cht'

North, Grammars: Montanus; Bijdragen, Kluit, (Bijlerdijk), Land, Rombouts.


South, Grammars: Meurier.

Users: Middle Dutch, Boecius, Van der Werve, Kilian, Wellekens, Van den Kerchove.

II. all '-ch'; 'cht' nouns, 'ght' verbs

North, Grammars: Smyters (publ. Amsterdam, Smyters came from Antwerp).

Users: Voorreden 1568 (Coronhert).

South, Grammars: Van Engelen (no discussion)

Users: Plantijn

III. all '-ch', 'cht' nouns, 'gt' verbs

North, Grammars: Van Heule 1625 & 1633

Users: Coornhert

South, Sexagius

IV. '-gh' in gelijkvormigheid, 'ght' in verbs, 'cht' in all nouns

North, Grammars: Twe-spraak, Dafore, Bible

Users: Bredero, Hexham

South, Grammars: Lambrecht, Binnart

Users: Boecius (part ii), Van der Noot, Van Borssele

V. '-gh' & 'ght' in nouns for gelijkvormigheid, otherwise 'cht'; 'ght' verbs

North, Grammars: Kok, Niervaert 1676

Users: Hoof, Vondel, Meijer (early editions)

South, Kilian, Aerschot

VI. 'ght' in final position only; 'ght/cht' nouns, 'gt' verbs

North, Grammars: (Nooen)

Users: Smids, Poot, Zeeus, Hooyvilet, J.de Haes, Meijer (late ed.)

VII. '-g, gt' nouns for gelijkvormigheid, otherwise '-ch/cht'; 'gt' verbs

North, Grammars: De Hubert, Ampzing, Leupenius, Nil Volentibus, Van Helderen (later works), Nyloß, Kramer; Smits

Users: Rotgans

South, Steven, Van Bellghem & Waterschoot

(note some VII may be VIIIa)

VIIa. as VII with differentiation by means of 'cht/gt'

North, Grammars: Van Attevelt, Sewel, Pieterson, De Haes, Kunst, Stijl, G.W. Holtrop, Nut, Wester, Bolhuis, Siegenbeek; and many minor works between Siegenbeek and De Vries/Te Winkel, e.g. V.d.Pyl

Users: Huydecoper, Pater, most early 19th century writers

South, Grammars: Van Geesdalle, E.C.P., Steven, Bincken, Gram, pour apprendre, Willems, Van Daele, Renier, David, Henckel, Belgian Commission, and many subsequent minor grammars.

VIII. 'g, gt' in as many positions as possible; three degrees of extension:

- a) leaving 'sch-' and 'ch-

- b) leaving 'sch-' only (see "laggen" chap. 4)

- c) no 'ch' at all (see 'sg-, -sg' chap. 13)

North, Grammars: Van Helderen, Winschooten, Gargon, Dukkerius, Kuyper, De Vin, Heugelenburg (all works), Halma (1729ff), Niervaert 1743, Van Rhyn, Nuttig en Noodig Spbk., Kluit, T.A.C.P., V.Ginneken.

Users: Van der Linden, Van Alkenesde, Van der Schelling, Pars, Majer, Marin, Van Haren, Wolff & Deken, Van Alphen.
South, Grammars: Snoeijmes, Janssens, Inleyding
VIIIa, as VIII, but with 'cht' and 'ch' for differentiation
North, Grammars: M.S., Van Belle, Zeydelaar, Nieuw Ned.Slæbk., Schwiers
Users: Van Hoogstraten, Wagenaar, Chalmot
South, Grammars: Verpoorten, Eenigste Middel, Ballieu, Boterdael, Winkelman, De Neckere, Termbruggen, Behaegel, Visschers, and followers.
(note again some of VIII may really be VIIIa)
IX. '-g' according to gelijkvormigheid, 'gt' verbs, 'cht' all nouns
North, Grammars: Van der Schuere (gd'verbs), Van den Ende (Willems), Bilderdijk, De Vries/Te Winkel, Kollewijn, Marchant, Woordenlijst 1954, etc.
Users: Van Hoogstraten's List (irregular), Langendijk; all those in the post-Siegenbeek era
South, Grammars: minor (school) grammars after the acceptance of De Vries/Te Winkel's system adopted in 1864.
X. '-g' according to gelijkvormigheid, 'cht' all nouns, participles and verbs (except those in '-gd')
User: Carlebur.
Chapter 4: Intervocalic ‘ch’.

Problems inherent in the spelling variations for such as "lachen"
variations for "lichaam"
variations in loan words
variations after a long vowel or diphthong
varying usage of dictionaries

Problems inherent in the spelling of intervocalic ‘-ch-’

The group of words in which /ch/ occurs between vowels has long caused problems of spelling. Probably no other group has provided as many different spellings. The problem is basically a matter of whether 'ch' is considered to be a single inseparable compound letter, or two consonants representing one sound. Given the standard Dutch spelling system, a medial consonant should be doubled after a short vowel; thus analogy with "heb, heb-ben" should give "lach, lach-chen" if 'ch' is felt to be "one" consonant. Similarly after a long vowel in an open syllable no doubling of the vowel should occur, giving "loochen, gochelen" by analogy with "(ik loog) wij logen".

In most modern handbooks the spellings "lachen, gochelen" are given as anomalous, the first for having a short vowel in an open syllable, the second for having a double long vowel in an open syllable (see for example Woordenlijst 1954, p.xxcix & xl). These labels "anomalous" presuppose that 'ch' is one letter,-- in the words of the Woordenlijst (p.liii):"één tussenmedeklinker (ook 'ch') gaat naar het volgende woorddeel". If 'ch' is two letters, then these spellings appear quite regular: cf. "beste, beesten; lachen, loochenen". Yet taking 'ch' as two letters itself raises problems, as this would imply such syllable divisions as "lac-hen, looc-henen" which, though perfectly regular orthographically (cf. bes-te, bees-ten), destroy the 'ch' as a letter which represents a single sound. There are precedents for this,-- it is for example considered acceptable to split the digraph 'ng' in "zin-gen", even though this represents one sound just as much as does 'ch' ("Bij het afbreken geldt 'ng' voor twee medeklinkers", Woordenlijst p.liii Opmerking 2).

The problem is in essence a visual one. A division "zijn-gen" which would be required if 'ng' were treated as one letter is impossible because 'ng' does not occur in initial position in any words, and therefore "looks wrong".

"La-chen" on the other hand looks acceptable simply because 'ch' can occur initially. "Zing-en" is not acceptable because of the accepted rule that in the
presence of two or more medial consonants at least one must belong to the next syllable, thus dividing the consonant cluster, e.g. "bes-te", and thus "zin-gen", even though 'ng' is a single sound. The refusal to allow the same for "lac-hen" is inconsistent, and it is this that causes the difficulties and so-called anomalies. The 'ch' is treated as one consonant for the purposes of attaching it to the following syllable, but a concession is made to the fact that for the eye it appears to be two letters, which necessitates a doubling of the vowel in "loochenhen" in order to prevent an incorrect pronunciation. Such an "error" can only arise with the "false" belief that 'ch' is two consonants! Similarly no need is felt to double the 'ch' after a short vowel in order to prevent a further "incorrect" pronunciation in "lachen" etc. Here the eye is relied upon to treat 'ch' as two letters. The confused situation is best illustrated by two contemporary spellings of the 17th century: "hachelijk" and "haghel"; the former has a short vowel because 'ch' is two letters, the latter a long vowel because 'h' has only a diacritic function (see chap.8).

The inconsistencies arise therefore from defining 'ch' as one letter, yet treating it in all words where it occurs as if it were two consonants, through denying the spellings which are logically consequent upon such a definition. If 'ch' is really one letter, then the syllable division "la-chen" is correct as far as the 'ch' is concerned, but the vowel is misleadingly represented as being long; "loo-chenhen" is also correct but this time the vowel is unnecessarily doubled. If, on the other hand, 'ch' is two letters, then syllable division rules should allow a separation just as for 'ng', giving "lac-hen, loo-henen". A few grammars, e.g. Dixi in 1934, overcame this by claiming that 'ch' "als twee medeklinkers wordt beschouwd", but most decline to discuss whether they also accept the syllable division "lac-hen" implied by this.

Given the present situation, if "lachen, loochenhen" are correctly spelt, then 'ch' is being treated as two consonants, and should be recognised as such, and the division "lac-hen" permitted; if 'ch' goes with the following syllable it is being treated as one letter, and should be doubled where appropriate. The impediment to such treatment is that 'ch' clearly represents one sound, and therefore seems indivisible, yet the eye sees it as two letters. The logical consequence of regarding 'ch' as one letter is, as stated, a doubling after a
short vowel, but this is usually rejected, not for any linguistic reason, but on the aesthetic consideration that "lachchen" looks strange.

This has not always been the case however, and for about 200 years or more the need to double this single consonant was well established and accepted. This doubling did not always take the same form, since most users avoided the full 'chch' spelling, and the forms which did result are as varied as they are often unsystematic, usually bearing little relationship with other 'ch' spellings used by the same writer. Only a handful of words escaped the treatments listed below, those with a long vowel or dipthong (e.g. "loochenen, juichen") where there was no need to double, loan words (e.g. "echo, Bacchus") which usually keep their original spelling, and the word "lichaam". Each of these is dealt with separately after the discussion of 'ch' in such words as "lachen, bochel".

The only practicable method of handling these spellings is an arrangement of users in groups using the same spelling, here arranged alphabetically as if for the word "lachen". A strictly chronological scheme would be largely meaningless, as many variants were contemporary.

CC: Laccen

See Smits and Seeldraeyers, in the section on "lachchen" below.

CCH: Lacchen

This is a very old spelling, and dates from at least the 16th century, in all probability extending back into Middle Dutch, where it may have formed a parallel to the '-ggh-' spellings. It is to be found in a very restricted way in both Plantijn and Kilian, namely in the word "ecchele oft egel" and "ecchel/acchel" respectively. In Killanus Auctus this is changed to "eechel/acchel; -eechel-koolken". All other words in these two dictionaries have the simple '-ch-' spelling, and why there should be this exception is not clear. "Eechel" also constitutes the sole '-cch-' form in the dictionaries of Lambrecht and Rodriguez, and much later in the Siegenbeek system.

The form soon became extended to other words. Marnix uses it in "lacchen", which is also to be found in the Grillen of Van Beaumont, written in about 1595: "De wijl de gheen' die met my lacchen,/ Luy,ledich, over straet, gaen pracchen" (No.8). It is also used in Mellema's dictionary of 1587ff, but only
in "aschel, kichelen, kichen, kucchen", other words (e.g. "lachen") having 'ch-'. From the 1602 edition these examples too adopted 'ch-'. However the French-Dutch section still retains entries such as "rire: lacchen" in some editions (e.g. 1587, 1591). The editions of 1602, 1630, and 1636 have "rire: lachen" but that of 1640 (with no editor mentioned) reverts to "rire, lachen ... lacchen" as in the 1587 edition. The new editor D'Arsi in 1651 and 1663 has "rire: Lacchen" as in the 1591 edition, as does the 1682 edition revised by Th. La Grue, though the latter's 1694 edition has the more regular "rire: lachen".

It would seem that not the same attention was paid to the Dutch spellings in the French-Dutch section, and earlier editions were frequently used as basis without checking on later spelling developments. All the Dutch-French sections from 1602 onwards have only 'ch-'. A similar lack of concord between the two halves of bilingual dictionaries is found in several later works. Exactly the same spelling as that of the first edition of Mellema is to be found in Sasbout's Dutch-French dictionary of 1576, of which Mellema's work is the continuation, just as D'Arsi and La Grue are the continuations of Mellema.

During the early 17th century such spellings spread, and can be found in Roemer Visscher, - both the pirated edition of 1612 (No.99: "lacchen") and the authorised version, e.g. "tie schok" No.32 "Giccher sou geern verandern zijn naam" and other examples. An anonymous play bearing the title "Lacchelijke cluchte, Van een Boer die in een Calfs-vel benaeyt was" dates from around 1615. Other users of this time include Starter, in his Friesche Lusthof, 1621, e.g. in the "Inleyding tot Vreugd en Gezang" 11.9, Van Heemskerk in Batavische Arcadia, 1637 p.179, Boetius à Bolswert in Duyfkeuns en Willeynkens Pelgrimagie, 1627 p.155 (though here "lachen" is more common), and Pers on p.18 of Bacchus Wonder-wercken 1628, and in Bellerophon 1669. All these examples are of "lacchen", which is the commonest of the words to be found with such a spelling, mainly because it is the commonest of the words concerned, and therefore the one most likely to be found in any given text.

A major event in the spread of 'ch-' was its acceptance for the States Bible. Paragraph 9 of their resolutions on the letter 'C' recommends "'Lacchen', per duplex 'cc' et 'h'", referring to Marnix's usage as mentioned above. Such spellings can be found in Isaiah 23.11 and Habakkuk 1.10. With such support for
the spelling it is natural that many users, both writers and printers, though
not necessarily influenced directly, should adopt it for their own productions.
Such is the case in Huygens (who even spells "gelacch", cf. chap. 17), Bontekoe
(p. 62), and Van de Venne, e.g. in the "Voorbereydsel" p. 4: "Lacchen moet ick,
Lach-ha-hacchen;/ Om 't Werelts ydel Yet!/ Lacchen moet ick over 't Pracchen,/Steege Dwesheyt selden vliet."

In 1649 Kok's grammar became the first language work to use this form (p. 25),
and from 1654 *eijer* s Woordenschat followed suit, for example in "ridiculeux:
belschelijck", thus adding weight to the spread of the spelling amongst the
many who used his work.

Another to recommend the spelling "lacchen" was Leupenius in 1653. In the
section on doubling of consonants (p. 18) he writes that all single consonants can
be doubled "uitgesondert de 'c' en 'h', die door heures gelyken niet kennen
verdobbelt worden: de 'c' door een 'ch', als in 'lacchen': de 'h' door een 'c',
als in 'lucht, vrucht'". This is a strange comment as it is not normal to regard
'ch' as a doubling of 'c', nor 'ch' as a doubling of 'h'. There is moreover no
question of a need to double in "lucht, vrucht". It seems most likely that he is
trying to explain the form "lacchen" which he accepts as normal (e.g. he also
uses it on p. 72), rather than giving a rule for the doubling of the letter 'c',
and the meaning would thus be that the only time 'cc' is to be found is in such
words as "lacchen" where it is inevitably followed by an additional 'h'. Thus
'c' cannot be doubled by itself alone.

The form "lacchen" is used in the grammar of Laconis... in 1666 (p. 28), and
in the Latin-Dutch dictionary of Arnoldus Montanus. It continued to be fairly
common until the end of the century in both North and South, occurring (often
inconsistently) in the works of Six van Chandelier, Brune, Pointers, Jonctja, 
Westerbaen, Van den Bos (Dn Quixote translation), Zoet, Gargon, and no doubt
many others. In 1684 the form also appears in Ph. La Grue's Nouvelle Grammaire
Flamande (e.g. p. 3), though he does not discuss the spelling, and also uses the
more common "lachen" (e.g. p. 13, 128). For "pracchen" in Van den Ende see 'chch'.

In the 18th century the form is slightly less common, though it still numbers
several eminent writers among its followers. In the Boekzaal of Jan. 1707 the
form "hacchelyke* is to be found in the Index, though in the article concerned
the word is spelt "hachelyke". It is tempting to ascribe this '-cch-' in the index to the printer (Samuel Halm, son of Frans), as the editor, Van Gaveren, had his own fairly strict views on spelling regularity. It is very interesting to note that in 1716 De Vin mentions the 'cch' spellings as being the most common, though he personally rejects it in favour of '-gch-' (q.v.). He no doubt includes this spelling in his general apology for not complying with the spelling used in the Bible!

When the works of Dullaert were published by Van Hoogstraten in 1719, they included such spellings as these (e.g. in the poem to Egbert Kortenaar), and it is distinctly possible that this is a Van Hoogstraten-spelling, as when he edited Hannot's Latin dictionary in 1704 and 1719 (the same year as his Dullaert edition), he used '-cch-' in several words, e.g. "pocchen, raachel". The form can however just as easily be original to Dullaert, for, as mentioned above, this spelling was certainly current when he was alive in the previous century.

In 1722 Tuinman expressed his dislike of such spellings, preferring the simple 'ch' in "'lachen", dat qalyk 'lacchen' geschreven word". But the next year Ten Kate used just this form, though he regarded 'ch' as the primary spelling. It can be found for example on I.565 and II, under the stem "Lach". The same is true of Huydecoper, in whose Proeve the words "lacchen, pracchen" can be found in II,§919, and V,§616. His preferred form was '-gch-' (q.v.).

During the later 18th century,- from about 1730,- '-cch-' only really occurs as a relatively minor spelling, for example in the Spectator (along with other variants). In most works it appears only as an exception to a different main usage, as has just been noted for Ten Kate and Huydecoper. This suggests that there was a fairly substantial undercurrent of '-cch-'-spellers, in some cases apparently among the type-setters. Many dictionaries also record the spellings with '-cch-' for a few words, though often with little semblance of a systematic approach (see final section for such dictionary variation). It appears for example in Pomey's dictionary of 1739, and is mentioned as contemporary by Cramer.

By this date it is quite unusual to find '-cch-' recommended by a major grammar, indeed none had done so since Leupenius. But this is in fact the case with the Grammaire pour apprendre... of 1757, as does another Southern work, that of Janssens in 1775. The same usage is repeated in his Practical Dutch
Grammar of 1792, p.25: "lacchen, ik lacche,... gelacchen". Later on he changes this in favour of the new Siegenbeek "lagchen" system, for example in his dictionary of 1808. At the same time as his earlier work, Kluit (1777) was still using the '-cch-' forms in his Vertooq, so it would seem that they retained a certain amount of respectability. In this work he wrote that "(deouden) vragden niet, of men 'dagen, wegen, kregen' met een G, dan of men 'juichen, lacchen' met een CH, 'juich, lach', spelde". He also used "lacchen" in the added notes in his revision of Van Hoogstraten's list, but this merges with the latter's own usage. The Nieuw Ned. Speldeboek of 1772 also uses '-cch-' in its word lists, and it is still being used by Van Daele (e.g. No.2/2, see "lagchen") at the turn of the century. It may have been fairly common in the South, the Grammaire..., Janssens and Van Daele are all Southern works.

After the later 18th century the '-cch-' spelling is hardly encountered again, though several mention it in their discussion on such words, e.g. Thijm, De Jager and Carlebur; usually they merely state that it was common in the 17th century. De Jager actually felt that this would be the easiest and most logical form, though he respected contemporary usage and followed the Siegenbeek system.

The nearest the form came to reintroduction was in the hands of Rombouts in 1957. He is not at ease with the logical '-chch-' spelling, and the 'gch' form suggests itself to him, though "beter nog lijkt 'kacchel'". He did not in the end change the accepted practice of using '-ch-'.

**GGH: Gicghelen**

This occurs only rarely, and most often in words now spelt with '-gg-'. In Middle Dutch it formed a parallel to '-ggh-' in the same way as '-cg-' to '-gg-', e.g. "secghen, brucghe", though it also occurs in such as "goewillighe, portighe" (Obreen & Van Loey). The justification for counting it among these /ch/ spellings is its use by Winschooten in the words "gicghelen, gecicghel", since this is now spelt "gi(e)chelen". Thus it is possible that Winschooten intended the combination to represent /ch/, though its restriction to this word suggests that there may have been some onomatopoeic quality in the sound, thus differing from both /ch/ and /g/. There is some evidence that this combination in Middle Dutch does not always represent a pure /ch/: apart from its use in
"brucghe" which long kept a final /k/ in certain dialects, there is the more suggestive example of the town name "Hucghelghem" for "Huckelghem" recorded in South-West Brabant dialect by Van Loey.

This is by far the most common spelling, covering the whole history of Dutch spelling. It constituted the main (though not only) form in Middle Dutch, e.g. in the Boecius of 1485, the Exercitium, and in the dictionaries of Van der Werve, Plantijn and Kilian in the next century.

In 1581 De Heuiter accepted this standard spelling, though he did not think it ideal (see "lahen"), but the Twe-spraack found such a spelling quite acceptable and followed the example of the Boecius. Other users around this time include Coornhert, Valcoogh, Stevin, and Mellema, in most of its editions from 1587 to 1699 (see "lacchen").

The view which was to become the standard for many years to come put forward in 1612 by Van der Schuere: "Men zal ook weten, dat *c h* over al inde spellings aen-een-geknocht blijft, als oft maer een letter en waer: Het welke in 'lachen, pochen', ende vel meer ander wel blijkt" (p.54). By this he presumably means that it "wel blijkt" when syllable division is considered, where 'ch' "aen-een-geknocht blijft". If he meant that the form "lachen" itself shows 'ch' to be one letter, then that would be incorrect for the reasons stated in the introduction to this chapter, a single vowel would represent a long vowel if 'ch' were one letter longer than that which would be incorrect according to the reason stated in the text.

Dictionaries which use this spelling during this period include that for Dutch, Spanish and French by Rodriguez in 1639/40, Hexham for English in 1647/8, Van den Ende for French in 1654, and Binnart for Latin in 1659. Users in literary fields include Coster, Bredero and Luyken.
although some in between had used it without comment, e.g. La Grue in 1684.

(see also "lachen" with the spelling '-cch-' above), and Nyloff, who does not
use any words with intervocalic 'ch' in his Aanleiding, though "lichaam, lachen"
can be found in his published sermons, e.g. p.47. This '-ch-' spelling is also
adopted by those writers who (more or less) followed Moonen's system, such as
Saids, Poet, Hooyvliet, J. de Haes. In fact Moonen is only driven to discuss
this usage because he wishes to reject another alternative (see "lachchen").

In general it is noticeable that many grammars only feel obliged to discuss
a particular spelling when they themselves deviated from the norm in some way,
and felt a need to justify their spelling. Followers of the accepted spelling
often ignore the subject completely unless, as with Moonen here, they take a
sufficiently strong dislike to some contemporary alternative to think it worth
mentioning its inferiority.

This too was the case with E.C.P. in 1713: "Het woordt LACHEN kan op
veelderleye wijzen gespelt werden, als 'lachgen, lachchen, lagchen, laggen',
doch ik houde 't met 'lachhen', volgens den Regel dat men de weynigste letters
kiesen moet wanneer die genoeg zijn om den klank uyt te spreken". His objection
is thus not so much that the other forms offend against any theory of his, but
rather that it is common sense to use as few letters as possible; and the
shortest form here is "lachen", though he does not explain why this is preferable
to the equally short form "laggen".

As mentioned for "lacchen" such forms with '-cch-' do occur in Ten Kate's
Aenleiding, e.g. "LACCHEN, gelacchen" (1.568), but '-ch-' is possibly his
preferred practical usage, as on p.387 he writes that one should, "volgens den
gewoone slenter, en niet Criticè, ons NG, NK, CH en UW (als bij RING, DRANK,
LACH en DOUW), om haer dubbeldeedige gedaente, slechts als dubbele Consonanten in
dezen aenzie, en onder de enkele nu niet telle, om dat men niet gewoon is die in
Plur. te verdubbelen, want men zet gemeenlijk RINGEN, DRANKEN, LACHEN, DOUWEN,
ens.". The significant word here is "Criticè", he regards the common acceptance
of the letter as double to be false; for him these combinations are single
letters. Thus it is possible that he had considerable sympathy with those who
wished to double '-chch-' (q.v.), though abiding by the "gewoone slenter" of 'ch'.

Throughout the 18th century the "lachen" forms are probably the most common,
possibly because of the influence of Moonen (e.g. in Corleva's dictionary, 1741), but more likely because this was the simplest and most traditional form. This predominance is supported by the new edition of Sewel's dictionary in 1766, revised by Buys. In this he abandons Sewel's own spelling (lachgen), and in the introduction where Sewel had explained his preferences, adds: "doch dewyl nu genoegzaam alle Menschen 'lachen' schryven, heb ik die spelling door dit geheele Woordenboek gevolgt". This is actually inaccurate, - all such words after "richgel" retain the former 'chg' spelling, as do "kuchgen, gichgelen". The '-ch-' forms are also used in Kramer's works, though in the dictionary of 1719, as in the revisions by Von Moerbeek of both the grammar and the dictionary, alternatives are given: e.g. "lachen, lagchen, lachchen" in the dictionaries, and "met een lachgenden Mond" in the grammar (p.80) with "lachchen" also in the vocabulary list.

The use of simple '-ch-' continued to be very common until the turn of the century, being used i.a. by Des Roches, Pieterson, Stijl and Schwiers. In the early 19th century it was superceded by the Siegenbeek system (see "lagchen"), though it continued in the South, probably under the influence of Des Roches and the grammars in turn influenced by him. It is used by De Neckere (1815), Visschers (c.1825) and Willems.

The latter, in his Schryfwyze of 1824 disposes of the inconsistency of "lachen, loochenen" by arguing that since /ch/ only occurs in Dutch in a final position, it must belong on the end of the first syllable and not at the beginning of the second: "In'lachen, wichelaer, lichaem', enz schynt het ons op zyn best overtollig een 'g' voor de 'ch' te plaetsen; vermits de 'ch', als slotklank, zich altoos by de vorige letters aensluit, en men dus niet 'li-chaem, le-chen', maer 'lich-aem, lach-en' spellen moet" (p.380). Although this breaks a basic rule of Dutch syllable division as usually formulated, it nonetheless justifies the '-ch-' spelling. He was not the first to give the rule in this way moreover,- Moonen has a similar comment, and De Neckere also argues on these lines, giving Van Belleghem as his source. Willems may have taken it from any of these, or it may have been a common practice in the South.

The '-ch-' spelling continued to be common in the South throughout the Siegenbeek period, and it is the latter's choice of '-gch-' to which Willems is
referring in the comment given. De Simpel actually refers to '-ch-' as a typically Southern spelling in the late 1820's.

In the North the use of '-gch-', itself doubted by Siegenbeek - was being attacked by Bilderdijk, similarly on grounds of syllable division. Bilderdijk's views on this do not always coincide with those (now) generally accepted, for example he would not split two consonants which could come together in initial position, e.g. "vasten" is divided "va-sten". Much the same held for 'ch', which "tot de eerste zoo wel als de tweede Sylbe behoort". Thus for him the spellings with doubling such as "lagchen, lachchen" are simply unnecessary. The argument as put forward in his Spraakleer suggests that he is confusing a mere orthographic convenience and a rule of pronunciation. He claims that "winnen, willen, kommen" cannot be split "wil-len" etc. - "hier moet geen tweemaal 'nn, ll, mm' maar ééne lange uitgerekte konsont zîn", consequently "lach-en" is wrong, and so is "la-chen" as the 'ch' does not belong uniquely to either syllable.

In 1859 the De Vries/Te Winkel system reintroduced this '-ch-' spelling, though they realised that it was not the ideal form (see "lachchen"). It was for them a compromise form: "Van die ... gebruikelijke schrijfwijzen is die met de enkele 'ch' nog de minst onregelmatige". It is interesting to note that, in the midst of the rule of Siegenbeek's system, '-ch-' is still considered "gebruikelijk". This spelling has remained in use since that date, uncontested by any except Rombouts (see "lagchen").

CHCH: Lachchen

Were 'ch' accepted as a single letter, then, as discussed above, the spelling logically demanded in the inflexion of such as "lach, poch" would be "lachchen, pochchen" by analogy with "heb, rib: hebben, ribben" etc. Indeed '-chch-' would be demanded in all words where the sound follows a stressed short vowel, whether in inflexion or not, for example in "wichchelen". Such spellings have often occurred in Dutch, and cover a considerable period of time.

They are first found in Middle Dutch, for example in some of the glossaries discussed by De Man: "lachchen, crochchen"; "rochohe" (the fish) is also known with this spelling. It is however a distinctly minor usage, being less common
in these words than 'chgh-' (q.v.). What incited these early writers to use 'chgh-' is not clear as until then no theories had been put forward as to the dual/single nature of 'ch' in Dutch. Possibly they felt the sound in these words to be stronger than that found in final position. The spelling was never very common, and is not met again until the mid 17th century.

It was in 1635 that this usage was defended by Montanus. As he considered 'ch' to be "geen verschillende twee letteren, ... maar alleen een enkelde letter" it was, for him, logical to double it where necessary: "om dat ic nê't gebruic eigentlijck stel 'verre, vallen, mannen, stammen, vossen, moffen, platte, tappen, gladde, tobbe': zo zet ic ooc 'rochchen, dicke of dikke'" etc. (p.26). He was also tempted to retain this double 'chch' in the uninflected forms, e.g. "rochch", as described in chap. 17 (cf. also "singngen" described in chap.2).

The same line of reasoning seems to have been held by Pels, writing in 1677, for he uses such spellings as "hachchelyk" and "Het lachchen is den menschen eige" (B4r). Such spellings did not gain widespread approval, but can be found. Laurens Bake used 'chch-' in his Tiende Schêmpdicht van Juvenalis: "De lachcher schudde long en lever al zyn leeven. ... Hoe zou hy lachchen!", and "bochchel" (p.15). The date of this work is sometimes given as 1695 (the Boekzaal of July 1695 gives it as a new work!) but the edition used bears the date 1677, the same year as Pels's work. Probably the weight of Nil Volentibus was behind Pels's pronouncement, as it is their views which he puts forward in his Introduction. Bake had been a member of Nil Volentibus, though it is usually held that he left in 1671. It is not impossible however that his former association would encourage him to read their productions with some attention. The same spelling is found in this poem in the Mengelpoëzy of 1737.

This spelling of Bake's is of interest for another reason: In the introduction to his own works of 1721 Langendijk writes that he has "de spelkunst van den heere L Bake meest gevolgd, niet omdat ik anderen afkeur; maar dewijl myne zinnelykheid in 't begin daar op gevallen is, en de verschillende gevoelens der taalundigen my wederhouden om myne gewoonte te veranderen, tot dat my malkander overtuigt, en dus die konst op eenen eenparigen voet gebracht hebben". Apart from showing his impatience at contemporary wrangles, Langendijk here refers to a "spelkonst van den heere L. Bake". As no such work has ever been
recorded, it seems probable that he is referring to Bake's usage. Unfortunately
he does not elaborate which work of Bake's he used as his base, as nowhere, for
example does Langendijk use this '-chch-' spelling.

Until the turn of the century such spellings continue to occur, though very
sporadically. The edition of Van den Ende's Schatkamer edited by D'Arsi in 1681
uses only '-ch-' spellings in the main entries, but the writer's attention seems
to have lapsed in the secondary entries and in the French-Dutch section (see
also above). These lapses are interesting, for whereas the main entries probably
represent the compiler's preferred spelling, the variants give a clue to the
contemporary alternatives. Thus alongside "lachen" D'Arsi/Van den Ende lists
"gichelen, lachchen", and in the French section "rire: lachchen; Sous-rire,
Glimp-lachchen, Grénikken, Grim-lachchen". The words "prachchen, prachcher,
tichchel" and their compounds all have '-chch-' in the main entry. The original
dition of 1654 has no '-chch-' spellings, but does have "pracchen", though
whether the '-chch-' is due to D'Arsi is open to doubt as his own dictionary of
1651, 1663, has a few '-och-' forms but none with '-chch-'. It is also doubtful
whether Van den Ende would have appreciated any questionable spellings from the
Mellema/D'Arsi dictionary being used in his own, as he is highly critical of
Waesberghe's (the printer's) usage in the introduction to the 1654 edition.

In 1681, the same year as Van den Ende/D'Arsi, Bernagie's play "De
belachchelyke Jonker" was published (cf. "lachchen" on p.1), and in 1685 De la
Croix published his translation of Molière's "Les Precieuses ridicules" under
the title of "De belachchelijke hoofsche Juffers". Pluimer's Gedichten of 1692
also show this spelling, e.g. p.165, as does Oudaen's "Voorschaduwing" p.66. It
is possibly significant that Bernagie was a close friend of Pluimer, and that
Pluimer and La Croix, like Bake, were both members of Nil Volentibus at some time.

The Boekzaal does not normally have '-chch-' spellings, though they do occur
at times, e.g. May 1696 "Verhandeling van de Wichchelroede en deszelfs nutheid",
a form also found in May 1697 p.389, 413, 430 and 561. Probably more interesting
in the usage of this periodical is where a word with medial 'ch' has to be
divided at the end of a line. On several occasions the setters (or the editor
Rabus, or both) seemed unable to decide which syllable should take possession of
the 'ch' - a perennial problem - and compromised by having two - one at the end
of the first syllable, on the first line, and another on the next line at the beginning of the second syllable! For example -

"... schach-cherden ..." (January 1692, p.17)  "... lieb-chen ..." (July 1697, p.70).

Similar examples can be found in the issue for May 1697, p.423,426. In his Rabbelary... (p.227) Van der Linden throws scorn on some of these uses as part of his polemic with Rabus, though he does not point out that syllable division caused them. Rabus's normal usage, like Van der Linden's, was '-ch-', though the anonymous Lof-Reden op Piet Rab by some of Van der Linden's supporters uses "kochschalen" on p.27.

One of the few consistent users of this period was Hilarides. In his Phaedrus translation of 1695 (Introduction p.25) he writes: "Naadien het een rechtschaapen liefheber meer lusten moet, de handen aan het werk selfs te slaan, als onze taal met geduere rachen op de misbruikers, te willen verweeren ...".

Three pages earlier, whilst still defending (as here) his previous Nepos translation against that of Van Hoogstraten, he illustrates to what extent he takes this spelling, by writing: "Maar, om sijne slordighejt te ontdekken, nam ik voor, het onze te verdeedigen. Doch niet by verweerschrift, om dat die al dergaans, op kibbelaryjen uijtkomen: en ik sachchen voor my geen nood in" (p.22).

Such an extreme usage would appear to be unique to Hilarides.

These spellings must have been constantly occurring through the years, as both Sewel and Moonen mention them; both reject such a usage. Sewel prefers '-ch-' (q.v.), but Moonen prefers '-ch-':"ik lach-e, Prach-e, juich-e"; zonder dat de CH voor de aangevoegde E behoeve herhaelt te worden, gelyk hedendaegs in eene nieugesmeede spelling op een vreemde wyze geschiedt"(p.185). For him there is no problem, for his examples show that he regarded the 'ch' as belonging to the first syllable (cf. Willems above, under "lachen"). Poefaet rejects the '-chch-' forms as monsters caused by a mistaken belief that the root consonant could not leave the stem (which was the motivation of the Boekzaal spellings).

The first grammar to propose such spellings was that of Verwer in 1707. When discussing derivative noun-formation, he writes: "Substantiva omnia ex infinitivo abbreviata, per simplicem apocopen sunt nobis masculina, ut 'het loopen de loop',...

... ut 'wensch' a 'wenschen', 'vensche' a 'venschinge'... Per ratio est in
multis allis; ut 'afbrek/ afbreuke: tredt/ intrede: kant/kante: klem/ klemme: lach/lachche" (i.e. the first of each pair of nouns is masculine, the second feminine).

Several dictionaries from the early years of the 18th century record such spellings, though most often as a minor usage or secondary alternative. Halma (and Giron) and Kramer all give "lachchen" as a variant of "lachen", and the former also has "bochchel"; Marin in 1717 uses the spelling only in "bochchel, tichchel" and their compounds and derivatives, giving no reference to other '-chch-' forms such as "lachchen", whereas the Van Hoogstraten/Hannot dictionary of 1704 and 1719 contains "bochchel"- again the only example. The irregular usage of dictionaries in this respect is examined in a later section of this chapter. Kramer's German grammar regularly uses '-chch-' (e.g. p.4, 309ff).

As mentioned in the section on "lachen" above, E.C.P. knew of the '-chch-' spelling in 1713, and the same form can later be found in the text of Ten Kate, who regards it merely as a variant. He does not explicitly reject it, and indeed its inclusion as an alternative in vol. II where he gives the root word "LACH in ons LACHEN (of LACHCHEN), Lacchen in de Vuist", suggests that he felt all three spellings acceptable. Furthermore it can be seen from his comments on the single nature of 'ch' (see "lachen" above) that he might have favoured such a doubling.

Thus, for all its comparative scarcity, the '-chch-' spelling did continue in use during the first half of the 18th century. In 1748 and 1755 the forms received a boost from Van Belle's grammars. In the Wegwyzer he does not discuss the spelling as such, although it occurs on p.12, where he says that 'ch' can be found "in 'Lach, gelach,'(van 't Werkwoord 'Lachchen',)...". Similarly on p.98 when discussing rhyme-words he warns against choosing those with only limited scope: "Neem SPIEGEL eens, gy zit ten eerste vast, /Also daarop geen deeglyk Sluitwoord past./ Neem LACHCHEN, 't zou vooral niet beeter weezen:/ Want PRAGCHEN zelf is te oud, en 't stoot in 't lezen". He does not explain why '-gch-' is used in the second example. - That this was not an empty warning can be seen in the works of some poets, who occasionally got themselves into difficulties in this way; not all of them, however, could evade the issue as blatantly as Rusting, in his Volgoestige Werken (p.5): "Terstond daer op
onstent'er stilte,/ (Wat Drommel rijmt nu cock op ilte?/ Nu dat is even goet)
doos sprack Mercuur...

In his Schets of 1755 Van Belle is more explicit on his choice, and the paragraph concerned is clearly inspired by Sewel's comments. Where the latter wrote "(het) dunkt my dat (ch) beter past om een Lettergreep te sluiten, als te beginnen; om welke reden ik liever 'lachgen' als 'lachchen' wil spellen: en 'lighaam' als 'licaam' of 'lichchaam'", Van Belle (p.6) replies: "De CHE dient eigentlyk en allermeeest, om eene Lettergreep te beginnen, minst om ze te sluiten.

... Hierom schryf ik liever: 'Lagchen' dan 'Lachgen', maar allerliefst 'Lachchen'.

... 'Lichaam' is hierom ook beter dan 'Lighaam, Lichaam, Lichgaam' óf 'Lichchaam'". Thus his rejection, or rather reversal, of Sewel's theory results in an opposite spelling: Sewel will not allow 'ch' in first place in a syllable, and therefore spells "lach-gen", Van Belle will, and so spells "lach-chen".

Another grammar which recommends the 'chch-' spelling at this time is that of De Haes, though he does not argue along the same lines as Van Belle. On p.114 he writes: "Wat verders aenbelangt den Werkwoorden 'lachen, prachen' enz., aldus met eene enkele 'ch' te spellen, smaekt ons gansch niet; dewyl, wanneer men tusschen de 'ch' en den laetsten lettergreep 'en' geen koppelteeken zet, gelyk ook nergens gebruiklyk is, ieder, die onzer tael niet door en door kundig is, de 'ch' altoos by den laetsten lettergreep 'en' voegen, en die woorden derhalven uit zal spreken als of 'er stond 'la-chen, pra-chen'; vermits de aert onzer spellinge doorgaens medebrengt, dat men geen lettergreep, met eenen klinker beginnende, zal laten versteken blyven van eenen medeklinker, in dien 'er slechts by of ontrent, ik laet staen de naest gebuur van is: dit staat Monen, in deszelke Spraekkunste bladz.194, in de woorden 'legen, heben' ook volmondig toe: waerom hy zegt, dat men de 'g' en 'b' verdubbelen moet, en schryven 'legen' en 'hebben'. Het is wel waer dat 'er weinige Nederduitsche woorden met eenen 'ch' in hunnen eersten of tweeden lettergreep begonnen worden, doch daer syn'er echter, als 'Cherubyn, hachlyk'; derhalven achten wy ook, om deszelne reden, hier even te voren door Monen genoemt, volstrektlyk noodig, in de woorden 'lachchen' en 'prachchen' de 'ch' te verdubbelen". Here he takes a rule of Moonen's and applies it to "lachen", which Moonen did not do, for the reasons stated earlier. It is odd that De Haes gives "hachlyk" as a word whose second syllable begins with 'ch'; did he thus
divide it "ha-chlyk"? He presumably had in mind the longer form "hachelyk", though it would have been clearer if he had used this form in the example. In its contracted form he feels "dat 'hachlyk', aander de 'e' daer in te voegen, bestaen kan", - i.e. if the full form is used, 'ch' needs to be doubled, otherwise a single '-ch-' will suffice.

Like De Haes, Zeydelaar in 1769 was aware of the limitations of the "la-chen" spelling in accurately representing the sound. However he adopts the '-gch-' spelling, "niet 'lachen, prachen' of 'lachchen, prachchen' gelijk F. de HAES". He is not utterly opposed to this solution of the "la-chen" problem, however, "met de spelling 'lachchen' zou men dit gebrék vergoeden, maar mét de bèste Taalkêners, behoud ik liever de 'g'". Thus as was the case with 'gt' spellings (see chap.3) he considers that agreement with eminent writers' usage is more important than consistency within any particular system. Cramer echoes De Haes in giving '-chch-' as a contemporary alternative (see "laggen"), but the Kunst grammar rejects the latter's arguments (see "lagchen").

One of the few non-grammatical works of this period which uses these forms was published in 1771. This is the Verhandeling of D. Mestingh, and is more radical than most, including as it does such spellings as "ontsachchelyke, lichchaam" alongside the relatively normal "lachchen" (e.g. p.17,26). Others besides him must have continued to use these spellings, as contemporary dictionaries keep their references to them. Often however these are merely taken over from whatever older dictionary the new work is based on, but it would be uncharitable to assume that all lexicographers copied older works without any discrimination as to which spelling variants should be edited out as no longer current.

Von Moerbeek's revision of Kramer's dictionary in 1768 retains the reference to "lachchen" found in the first edition, and such a form is also included in the grammar of 1774 alongside the more regular form. Winkelman's French dictionary of 1783 and J. Holtrop's English dictionary of 1789 likewise give "lachchen"; the former, being based on Halma, also included the reference "Pochel zie Bochchel" to be found in the latter, though the main entry is simplified to "Bochel"! Holtrop is more influenced by Marin, whose dictionary (in co-operation with Zeydelaar) he had re-edited three years previously; but whereas Marin also lists
"Bochchel", Holtrop uses the '-gch-' form for that word (cf. the final section of this chapter). C.W. Holtrop (the son of John Holtrop) actually recommends the '-chch-' forms in his book De Nederduitsche Taalkunde... of 1733: "(CH) is een enkel lettermerk. ... Gelijk wij dan bijkans alle medeklinkers dubbelen; als blijkt in SCHUBBEN, HADDEN,... ZETTEN; zo dubbel ik ook de CH, als een enkele medeklinker in bij voorbeeld LACHCHEN, WICHCHEN, KACHCHEL, enz." (p.79), though such are not very common at the time.

With the introduction of the Siegenbeek system such spellings came to an end for most people, though it is not unusual to find grammars which say that '-chch-' would be better. In fact this is true of Siegenbeek himself. On p.133 he gives '-gch-' as his spelling, because it is the most acceptable, - the only reason he has against '-chch-', in the way De Haes used it, is that such a "dubbelvormig" letter is unsuitable for further doubling, despite the normal rules which operated on such as "heb, hebben; had, hadden" etc; had '-chch-' been a common form, he would willingly have adopted it.

Following in Siegenbeek's footsteps is the Nut Spraakkunst of 1814: "Wat betreft de wijze van verdubbeling der medeklinkers ... het zou zeker eigenaardiger (more consistent) en met de gewone regelmaat overeenkomstig zijn, dat men, met herhaling der 'ch', 'lachchen, lichchaam' schreef, dan het gebruik heeft, waarschijnlijk om de dubbelvormigheid der 'ch', gewild, dat men de 'g' tot verdubbeling van den klank vóór dezelve zoude plaatsen; en hierin behoort men aan hetzelve te wille te zijn" (p.110). Behaegel (I.418) too writes that "Van de dry schryfwyzen 'laCHen, laGCHen, laCHCHen' (in Des Roches, Siegenbeek, Winkelman respectively,- the latter only in his dictionary however, his grammar has '-ch-') kan 'laCHCHen', maer van enkele persoonen gebruykt zynde, tot het schryfgebruyk niet behoren".

But the spelling was not yet totally dead. In 1824 Smits published his unusual proposals, on p.25 of which he explains that there is no difference in pronunciation between final 'g' and 'ch', as in "'dog' en 'doch'; 'nog, noch', en zeker ook niet tusschen 'lagchen' en 'lachchen'; 'tigehel, tichchel'; 'rogchel, rochchel'; 'kugchen, kuchchen'", - not that anyone had ever suggested that there was any difference in sound between '-gch-' and '-chch-', though they had done so for final 'g/ch'. His main argument in favour of '-chch-' is on p.57: "dat
men de zachte 'g' wil indringen in 'ligchaam, Tigchel, rochchel' enz., alwaar 'ch' (of enkel 'c') grondletter is, kan door den buögel niet. De uitspraak vordert de scherpe 'ch', en de regelmaat vordert de dubbeling der grondletter in 'lachchen, prachchen, pochchen, kuchchen'. Like De Haes he logically permits a single 'ch' in "hachlyk, wichlen'... bij inkrimping voor 'hachchelijk, wichchelen". As he opposes the use of the combination 'ch' itself however, and wishes to replace it by the simple 'c', which he considers to have been originally pronounced /ch/, it is natural that he should extend this to cover the words in question here. He alludes to this in the passage above, but is more open in §36 (p.20): "Daar nu de 'h' als onnut, éénparig weggelaten wordt (in 'gh'),... verpligt ons de regelmaat van de 'h' insgelijks te verbannen achter de 'c', in 'lach, echt, sticht, rochchel, kuchchen' en in alle anderen, en de enkele 'c' in haar oorspronglijk geluid te doen gelden". This would result in the forms "roccel, kuccen" by analogy with "vlaggen" (cf. "tusseen" used above).

As mentioned above, Bilderdijk rejected the use of such forms as "lachchen" in his Spraakleer, since they did not agree with his views on the 'ch' and its distribution between syllables. When Kinker reviewed this work in De Recensent, 1827, he did not quite agree with Bilderdijk's views, and stated that he would always respect the usage of the majority,—at that time the Siegenbeek system. Thus unlike the theorist Bilderdijk he would consider using "lachchen" if it were usual, in the same way as Siegenbeek. De Jager too felt that '-chch-' was really the "regelmatigste".

A violent opponent of both Siegenbeek's '-ggh-' and Bilderdijk's '-ch-' was Garlebur. A doubling of 'ch' by means of a 'g' is as inconsistent, he claims, as "bidten, spodten, besefven, sizzen" (p.22), and a simple 'ch' is not adequate: "derhalve schrijve men noch 'ligchamen' of 'lagchen', noch 'lichamen' of 'lachen', maar 'lichchamen' en 'lachchen'". He is also critical of Kinker's adherence to majority usage: "Het zou er nog al ongelukkig uitsien, als we geene verjaarde verkeerde spelling zouden mogen verwerpen. Zouden we dan voor altijd de siegenbeeksche spel- en taalregels hebben? Dat verhoede de Hemel!". Garlebur's book was not of any great influence however, and was not well reviewed in De Gids of 1857 (II,730) by P. Foreestier (= Thijm): "Bij het opslaan en openen, of ... wilt ge liever — bij het openslaan en openen (van dit boek)...."
De Vries and Te Winkel, like so many before, felt that "de regelmatigheid zou dus eischen dat de 'ch' werd verdubbeld in 'lachchen, lichchaam, echcho' enz. (Maar) het gebruik verwerpt de regelmatige verdubbeling der 'ch'". They then decide that 'ch' is the best compromise (see "lachen" & "lagchen").

No other mention of '-chch-' occurred until in 1957 Rombouts found himself confronted by the usual dilemma: "In 'kachel, lachen, kuchen, pochel' enz. eist ons spellingsisteem een dubbele medeklinker. ... En hier nu blijkt weer allerduidelijkst de grote behoefte aan een afzonderlijke letter voor de scherpe 'g'. ... 'Kaggel' gaat niet (vergelijk: 'vlaggen, zeggen, muggen, rogge') en 'kachchel' "staat" niet". In the end he accepts the simple '-ch-', "al menen we op dit punt niets aan de bestaande toestand te moeten veranderen, wij zijn ons toch klaar bewust, dat hier iets scheef blijft zitten". Seeldraeyers, as mentioned elsewhere, took the step of simplifying Rombouts's 'ch' to 'c', thus avoiding the problem altogether, as this spelling can be subject to a perfectly regular doubling, in the same way as any other consonant (cf.Smit's comments).

CHG: Lachgen

Spellings with this combination occur primarily in the early 18th century, and there undoubtedly have their authority in Sewel's works. However he was not the first to employ this manner of spelling, for it occurs as early as in Middle Dutch, though not at all frequently. Verwijs/Verdam record "lachgen", though in the similar forms "cochge, hachgelen, rochge" the 'chg' is in place of a modern 'gg' rather than 'ch'. De Jager (Archief III) mentions "lachgen" in the Middle Dutch Lancelot, and "achgelen" in the Spiegel Historiael; Thijm in the Algemeen Letterlijevend Maandschrift (1846, p.927) states that of occurrences of the word "lachen" in Lancelot approximately one tenth have '-chg-'. He also records from the same text the forms "enichge, helichge, sechgene". These latter forms, and probably "lachgen" too, can be explained as having resulted from the basic phonetic spellings "enich, sech, lach" etc., with the addition of 'g' to show that the /ch/ became voiced in inflexion. This is parallel to what took place with other consonants, e.g. "hooftden, zelfve", which are clearly analogous to "enichge".

In the 17th century such forms still occur, being used for example by De
Ruyter: "crechgen, eenychge, regenachtychge, te ruychge, Vlamburchgerhooft" (= Flamborough Head in Yorkshire). He too is prone to ' -td-' and ' -fv-' forms, but he also uses ' -chg-' in words which are not the inflected forms of stems ending in ' -ch', such as "schechge (= schegge), Walchgeren". This is probably an analogical extension of the "eenychge" spelling type.

Another user, but only in words like "lachgen" (i.e. not "eenichge" etc.), was De Vynck in his Wekelyck Vermaeck: "Ic lachge dat ic krake" (vol.2, 1645, p.39), the use of "ic" suggests that he is perpetuating the forms of an older orthographic school, as was De Ruyter. It is probable that other conservative spellers also used such forms in the early 17th century, and they can still be found in the later years: Rintjus uses "ontzachgelike" in the introduction to Klioos Kraam vol.II (in his own spelling system), Luyken uses similar forms in his Duitse Lier of 1671 ("lachgende" p.23), but whereas Luyken also uses the older "zech" spelling type, Rintjus does not. The first instance of this usage noted in a grammatical work is "lachgen, uytlachgen" in Van Helderens Dutch-English dictionary of 1675. His English grammar of the same year uses "laghen", and his Dutch grammar has "laggen" (see below), so it cannot be stated for certain which form he actually prefers.

Not until 1691 did this spelling achieve the status of being positively recommended by a grammar, and this time there is no question of mere conservatism on the part of the writer. For in his dictionary of that year Sewel put forward very cogent reasons for following this spelling pattern. His starting point was the fact that in Dutch /ch/ only occurs at the end of a word, which implies that 'ch' should not appear in initial position. As the medial consonant of "lachen" should, according to the rules, be part of the second syllable, it must be something other than 'ch', namely 'g'. For these reasons he writes of 'ch': "Ik houdze scherper als de G; echter dunkt r a y  dat ze beter past om een Lettergreep te sluyten als te beginnen; om welke reden ik liever 'lachgen' als 'lachchen' wil spellen" (cf. Van Belle's counter argument in favour of "lachchen"). The ' -chg-' is thus a natural and logical consequence of his premises.

In the years following the appearance of this work, supported by his Spraakkonst of 1703, Sewel's recommended spelling is to be found a little more frequently, though it never achieved a widespread adoption, and can seldom be
attributed directly to Sewel's influence. It can be found for example in Nicolas
Heinsius's Vermakelyken Avonturier of 1695 for the word "buchgel" (I.271), which
Sewel spells "bochgel". The '-chg-' forms were also known to E.C.P. in 1713,
but he rejects them.

When Sewel rewrote Ph. La Grue's grammar in 1719, he discarded the original
'ch/coh' spelling (see above), and substituted his own '-chg-'. This was in
turn taken over by Cuno when he translated this work into German in 1741, e.g.
"gelachgen, lachgen" (p.242, 250), though he also has "lachen" (p.226). Given
the relationship between the Sewel works, the revised edition of La Grue, and
Cuno, it is hardly surprising that they all recommend '-chg-', but they are in
fact the only works to do so (later editions of Sewel/La Grue vary, see "lachgen").

Some use of this spelling continued, for, as noted above, Van Belle still
felt it necessary to argue against it in 1755. Nor must this be thought to be
merely referring to usage in older works, for in an answer to a "prijsvraag" set
by the Haarlem Society, on the question of education in the mother tongue,
S. Formey, the Secretary of the Berlin Academy, included the following sentence:
"Men heeft ellendige A.B.Boeken, waar in men eenige lorape en belachgelijke
figuurtjes vindt". This was in 1766. Similarly in 1772 Wolff and Dekens De
Menuet en de Dominees Pruik includes "lachgend". In 1778 Chomel's Algemeen
huishoudelijk ... woordenboek uses "kachgel" (e.g. p.1390). This is in the
translation by Chalmot, and is almost certainly in the latter's own spelling, as
"belachgelijk" occurs in his own Biographisch Woordenboek of 1798.

Kramer's grammar of 1774 still has the erratic usage of the earlier editions
(e.g. 1755), including the sporadic '-chg-' forms: "Mit lachenden Munde": met
een lachgenden Mond. ... Iets doen, zeggen, al bortende, al lachgende, al
spreekende" (p.30), and in the vocabulary: "Kachgel (1755:Kachel), Wichgelen,
Hachgelyk", all of which late uses are despite the fact that the Buys edition of
Sewel's dictionary in 1766 had abandoned '-chg-' in favour of '-ch-'. In Kramer's
dictionary of 1719, there is the exceptional form "Wichgelen", being apparently
the only '-ch-' spelling in the Dutch-German section, though the German-Dutch
half gives "lachgen" as a variant of "lachen". It is possible that Kramer was
here influenced by Sewel. The '-chg-' forms are still given as contemporary (?)
variants by Cramer at the end of the century (see "laggen").
Right at the end of the century there appeared a new dictionary with '-chg-' spellings. This was Wilcocke's Dutch-English dictionary of 1793, which the compiler considered to be a replacement for the now unobtainable Sewel. On the title page stands that the work is "compiled chiefly from the Quarto dictionary of WILLIAM SEWEL",—probably the 1766 edition, though the format was quarto from the 1726 edition onwards. This explains his choice of '-chg-': he had them direct from Sewel. However, as has already been noted, the Buys edition of Sewel actually used '-ch-' (in theory at least), so Wilcocke must have also used the earlier editions. He states in fact in the introduction that he considers the 1766 version far too bulky, and containing too many unnecessary phrases. Like the Buys edition of Sewel, Wilcocke actually mixes '-ch-' and '-chg-', though not for the same words: he has '-chg-' in "gichgelen, kachgel, kuchgen, lachgen, pochgel, pochgen, prachgen, richgel, schachgeren, tichgel, wichgelen" of which Buys uses '-chg-' in all but "kachel, lachen, pochel, prachen". Wilcocke uses Buys's '-ch-' in "Bochel, rochelen" and after a long vowel, but prefers the spelling "lighaam" of the earlier Sewel editions. The same spelling is found in his pocket dictionary of 1811,—after Siegenbeek! From the same printer (Boosey) comes Hasendonck’s grammar of 1814, which also contains "lachgen, loech, gelachen" (sic), and influence from Wilcocke on this work cannot be ruled out (see also "lagchgen" below).

This is the last time that '-chg-' appears in daily use,—i.e. outside reviews of earlier spelling practices such as those by Thijm and De Jager mentioned above. But in Archief IV De Jager refers to a contemporary use by Van Lennep in his "Post van den Helicon I". The words here in question are "gelachgen, liefdelachgje", but as Van Lennep normally uses the contemporary '-gch-', it is possible that these are examples from the letter-setter's hand rather than from the pen of the writer. In either case the words point to a very limited continuation of such spellings long after the introduction of the Siegenbeek system. The possibility of it being a casual misprint can be ruled out as the spelling affects more than one word.

CHGH: Lachghen

This form arose in Middle Dutch under the same circumstances as those which gave rise to the '-chg-' forms listed above; the only difference is that here the
user preferred 'gh' to 'g' before 'e'. De Man records "rochghen" in the glossary mentioned above (re "lachchen"); Verwijs/Verdam include "lachghen" from the prose version of Reynaert, and also "rochghen"; Hoebek lists "Berchghem" for the place name "Berchem" in the Oudenaarde records; Van Loey (Spbrk) mentions "nachghelen" for "nagelen"; Obreen/Van Loey give "enichghe, lichghen" in the records reprinted by them, for example in those for Brugge dated 28 April 1269: "Den here Michiel prochghiaen ...". De Jager also mentions "lachghen" in the Spiegel Historiael (I.399). The use of '-chgh-' in "nachghelen" together with "lachghen" mentioned in the previous section are interesting in that they might suggest that the preceding vowel was short.

All these examples are from fairly early Middle Dutch, but such spellings are by no means restricted to older texts. For example they are still to be found in Everaert's works (1435-1556), e.g. "rochghes". This is also the spelling form used consistently by Lambrecht in his Naembouck, containing such words as "lachghen, prachgher, cuchghen, beguuchghelen", though the latter example is after a long vowel. His spelling "rochghelen" is (fortunately) certainly a misprint.

CHH: Lachhen

This very rare spelling has been encountered only once in a literary work, in Hilarides's Phaedri Fabulae of 1695. Here on p.25 is to be found the sentence: "Echter ontrent den man zelfs, sooze hem noch eenige muttingheyt aanbrenget (dat meanig maal seer hachhelijk is, en schaars)...". It must be conceded that this is almost certainly a misprint for the usual Hilarides '-chch-', - cf. the word "rachchen" on the same page.

But this does not mean that such a combination never occurred legitimately. There is in fact a(single?) grammar which uses such spellings; this is the 1762 edition of Sewel's revised version of Ph. La Grue's grammar - "op nieuws verbeterd en merkelijk vermeerderd door een verstandig Spraakkonstenaar, en daarenboven naagezien door Willem Sewel", - the first revision referred to was that of the 1688/1701 versions. In the paradigms for weak verbs on p.211 can be found listed "ik lach, ik lachte & loeg, gelacht & gelachhen, lachhen". That this is not a solitary misprint is shown by its here occurring twice, in the
participle and in the infinitive. In addition it also occurs when the same verb is entered in the list of strong verbs on p.220: "ik lach, ik loog, gelachhen, lachhen", and later on in the Samenspraaken on p.258: "'t Lachhen is de menschen oogen", together with the same as the catch word for this phrase at the bottom of p.257. This is much too consistent to be a misprint, yet the form has not been encountered as an intentional spelling outside this work. Of the earlier editions of this work, 1719 has the Sewel spelling "gelachgen, lachgen" on p.211,221, and 1728 has "gelachgen, lachgen" on p.221 but '-ch-' on p.209.

GCH: Lagchen

When Siegenbeek introduced this spelling he did not claim to have invented it, but regarded it merely as the least irregular of existing alternatives. Yet many did indeed attribute its formulation solely to him, and it is not infrequent in the 19th century to find writers on spelling either having to point out that such forms had existed earlier, or discovering this fact for themselves: De Jager knew that the '-gch-' became common in the mid 18th century, yet is still surprised to find it used by De Vin in 1716: "Opmerkelijk is het, bij hem, bijna honderd jaar vóór Siegenbeek, de spelling van 'lagchen' en 'breijen' te hooren voorstaan" (see below).

But De Vin was by no means the first to use this form, for once more such spellings can be found in Middle Dutch and early 17th century texts, though they are not overcommon. Verwijs/Verdam record "lagchende" in Parthonopeus Van Bloys, and later in 1635 Van de Venne uses the lines: "Straalt je oogen op den Aap,/ Die soo tuymelt, springt en kogchelt,/ Die sijn kaale-gatje bogchelt,/ Mit een averechtse draay...", though the same work contains 'cch' in addition (q.v.). An anomalous use can also be found in Pels's introduction of 1677, where he uses '-chch-', but on p.7 writes "'kleedden, visschen'/ Wordt wel, en voegchelyk berynd met 'leden, missen'".

Not until 1684 did '-gch-' achieve recognition by a grammarian, when Winschooten granted it a limited application in his dictionary. But even here it is only for the words "bogchel, belagching, belagchelijk, belagchen", all other compounds of "lachen" are spelt with '-ggh-', as are all '-ch-' words appearing later in alphabetical order than "belagchen". This may well have been
an unintentional spelling then, the type-setter realising his error after
"belagchen" and adopting Winschooten's preferred '-ggh-' instead. "Lagchen" can
be found in Duikerius's Voorbeeldzels of 1693 (p.449), and in the travel-tales
of De Bruyn in 1698 (p.125). Both of these use '-gch-' in words other than
those in which it is found in Winschooten, thus ruling out direct influence. It
can be found also in Ten Kate's Klankkonde of 1699: "de medeklinker 'ch' die in't
woord 'lagchen' komt", though this form does not figure in his Aenleiding.

By the turn of the century the form was becoming fairly widespread, being
found for example used by Van Geesdalle (1700, p.191,192) and in the Grammaire
plus exacte of 1701 (p.96, 108) in the word "lagchen". This is also given by
Halma in his French dictionary as a variant form for many words: "lagchen,
kagchel, bogchel" etc; all refer to a main entry with a different spelling. M.S.
uses '-gch-' in 1711, as too does Heugelenburg in 1714. E.C.P. knew of it in the
South in 1713, and it is used in the same year by Bouvaert, though he does not
discuss it in the limited section covering grammar in his book on poetics.

The first grammar to positively argue for its adoption was De Vin in 1716, and
in this respect De Jager's comment quoted above is certainly justified. De Vin
feels that contemporary usage is inaccurate, and it is important to note which
form he gives for this: "De woorden die men dan uitspreekt, als 'lagchen, kachel,
pochen' etc., die worden gemeenelik geschreven met twee 'cc' aldus: 'lacchen,
kacchel, pocchen' etc., dog t' omregte; want, indien de 'c' de kracht heeft van
een 'k' in de eerste zilabe, als blijkt in het woord van 'Isaac', zoo zoude
volgens dien de eerste zilabe van 't woord 'lagchen', 'lak' wezen, en zoo mede
met alle dusdanige woorden: ik gebruike een 'g' in de plaatse van 'c' in de
eerste lettergreep". It is debatable whether the first sentence implies a
difference of pronunciation between "lagchen" and "kachel", for he makes no
further distinction between the two in the following argument. It must be added,
however, that '-gch-' was never consistently adopted for all '-ch-' words after
a short stressed vowel until Siegenbeek!

One writer who was well aware of the continued history of '-gch-' since
Middle Dutch was Tuinman in 1722. For this reason he regards 'gch' not as a new
spelling, but as a perpetuation of an old one: "De ouden schreven 'diefven,
briefven,... sechghen, mainsoghen', 'tgeen den grond schynt te laggen tot
'mensgen ... sorchelyck, droght af'... Deze overtollige en vanvoegelyke letterballast, die de woorden tot wanschepzels misvormde, is nu te recht buiten boorde geworpen; hoewel men nog wel behoud 'lagchen' voor 'lachen'; note his use of "behoud", he does not regard it as an innovation. This spelling, though not his ideal, is quite acceptable to him, and was becoming ever more common.

It is used, haphazardly, by Huydecoper, along with "lacchen, lachen", but as all entries in the index and most instances in the text have '-gch-' this was probably his (or his printer's) preferred spelling. He does not discuss the spelling, and when quoting, he retains the usage of that writer, for example when quoting from Sewel he retains his "lachgen" forms, and when from Ten Kate retains "lacchen" (Book II.v/919). Such forms as "lagchend, gelagchen, pogcher" appear in the Spectator, though this work also used '-cch-' widely, and it is also used in Gelliers' Trap der Jeugd. In The 1745 edition, and possibly earlier editions too, of Meijer's Woordenschat, although adopting the 'gt, -gh' system inspired by Moonen in favour at that time, did not adopt his argument for "lachen" and uses '-gch-' (e.g. p.2 of the introduction). Many of the entries however retained the '-cch-' spelling of the first editions, for example "ridiculeux, belacchelijk". Van der Schelling's Aloude Vrijheid in 1746 used '-gch-', and no doubt a large number of other books of this period did likewise. As mentioned under '-cch-' Van Belle was by no means opposed to the spelling of such words with '-gch-', though he preferred the '-cch-' forms himself.

Two words which very often had '-gch-' were "pragchen" and "wigchelaar", even amongst those who used other systems for other words. Van Belle, as can be seen in the quotation above, spells "pragchen" alongside "lachchen". Only these two words have '-gch-' in Des Roches dictionary where they are not misprints, since all their derivatives and compounds also have '-gch-' ("bogchel" is also included, but only as a variant). All the later editions of Marin and Halma (including Winkelman and Holtrop) list "wigchelaer, wigchelen", though they also have a few other '-cch-' forms. In addition it may not be coincidence that "wichgelen" is the only deviant spelling in Kramer's dictionary, though this time with '-cch-'. Why these two words should be singled out for a different spelling, if it is deliberate, is not obvious.

The next argument for the adoption of '-gch-' came from Schutz (published
176.

1731-6, but written in the 1750's): "Deze twee Letters CH ... komen te pas in
dezo woorden:...'Bogchel, Pogchel, huigchelen, huigchelaar, kogchel, kugchen,
rogchelen, lagchen, ligchaam, ontzagchelyk, wigchelen, wigchelaar'. Deze
spelling 'gch' stemt met de uitspraak dezer woorden der best over een", - in what
way he does not explain (Brender à Brandis's "Kabinet" vol.VI,p.300).

From now on these spellings become more and more common. All editions of
Bincken use them, and the undated edition of Hakvoord's Onderwijs (pub.Meijer
Amsterdam) differs in this respect from earlier editions, which have '-ch-'.
The contemporary periodical De Denker derives "ik lagte" from "lagchen", which
may be compared with the similar form "gelagt" used in the Spectator (6,213);
these spellings are based on the syllable division "lag-chen". Some editions of
Marin's Dictionnaire Portatif, e.g. in the revision by Zeydelaar in 1773 und 1787,
actually list "belagt. part. van Belagchen". Marin's Nouvelle Méthode of 1767
has "lagchen"(p.112), whereas the edition of 1751 had "lachen", and his
dictionary of 1768 has the similar forms "kagchel, wigchelaar". Indeed this
latter work is almost unique in retaining the 'gch' in the uninflected forms:
"LAGGH of LACH, KUCH zie KUGGH". Halma has a few, exceptional, entries with this
in his dictionary, though only in the French-Dutch section: "Ris: lagch" (early
editions only, e.g.1719). J.Holtrop, who was influenced by Marin (he also
revised the latter's dictionary), has a cross-reference "lagch enz. zie lach".

Des Roches dictionary only includes '-gch-' for the few words mentioned
above, and it is possibly significant that none of these are included in the
reverse entries in the French-Dutch section. In 1769 the spelling received
further strength in the grammar of Zeydelaar: "met de beste Taalkenners behoud'
ik liever de 'g' (in 'lagchen')". He is however more logical than Marin and
others in dropping the 'g' in the shorter forms: when he is discussing apocope
he gives the examples "ik lach' of lagchey ik prach' of pragche" and similarly
"belachlyk". In the same year Van der Palm also supports "lagchen" etc., and
Cramer gives it as his preferred form (see "laggen").

Again the following year more support arose when the Leiden society Kunst
wordt door Arbeid verkregen" recommended this form in its Nederduitsche
Spraakkonst. Although this recommendation by an influential society would carry
much weight, it is not clear how much active furtherance of the spelling is due
to it, as this society was less doctrinaire than others, and allowed each member to use whatever spelling seemed best to him. In addition the grammar was not circulated in public, being printed for members only, who were expressly instructed that it could be shown "aan niemand, geen lid zijnde, tot was prijs het ook moge zijn"! They claim that they previously used '-ch-' but had been persuaded of the superiority of '-gch-' by Zeydelaar.

Literary users of the last quarter of the 18th century include Van Alphen ("lagchen", 1778), and Wolff and Dekan ("Boosaartige belagchers" in Cornelia Windschut, 1793). Some also retained final '-gch' in the manner of Karin's dictionary, for example Pater has "lagcht" in 1774, and Asschenbergh "belagcht" in 1793, e.g. in the poem "Hovardy". Dictionaries too included the normal 'gch' spellings: Winkelman (1783) felt them to be secondary, - "Bogchel zie Bochel, Pogchen zie Pochen", though he did not give 'gch' alternatives for all such words, there being no entries for "kagchel, rigchel" with 'gch', whereas "wigchelaar" has 'gch' only. J. Holtrop's English dictionary of 1789 gives both "lagchen" and "lachchen" as secondary spellings for "lachen", though "bochel" refers the reader to a main entry "bogchel". The minor grammatical writings of T.A.C.P. and E.S.d.G. use '-gch-', the latter also using "juigchen, gelagch" (cf. Schütz in the same issue of Brender à Brandis's Kabinet!).

The situation by the turn of the century was thus one of frequent '-gch-', though still largely '-ch-', with other forms uncommon. The next major figure in Dutch spelling history was Siegenbeek, who formulated his spelling in 1805. Out of all the forms then current, and most common in the later years of the previous century, Siegenbeek opted for '-gch-' in preference to '-ch-': "Deze laatste schrijfwijze voldoet niet aan den klank des woords, als waardoor men 'la-chen, li-chaam, pra-chen' verkrijgt, overeenkomstig onze gewoonte, om, bij verlenging der woorden met 'en', den medeklinker der voorgaande lettergreep tot de laatste te brengen, als 'la-ken, ma-ken'. Men moet dus, om den korten en gebrokenen klank der wortelklinkers in de gemelde woorden door de spelling aan te wijzen, met verdubbeling der medeklinkers 'lagchen, ligchamen' enz. schrijven, even als men 'bidden, spotten, leggen' schrijft. Doch in 'lach, gelach, geprach' is die verdubbeling even ongepast, als in 'ik bid, gespot' enz., waarvoor niemand 'ik bidd, gespott' enz. zal schryven. (cf Marin & Pater above) Dat men de 'ch' in
'lagchen' enz. niet verdubbelt, maar de 'g' vóór dezelve stelt, schijnt aan geen reden te zijn toe te schrijven, dan omdat men de 'ch', als dubbelvormige letter, ter verdubbeling minder geschikt geoordeeld heeft. Zonder de genoegzaamheid van die reden te toetsen, merken wij alleen aan, dat het raadzaamst is, in dezen aan het gebruik toe te geven" (p.183). With official backing to what was in effect a compromise spelling based more on "gebruik" than on a desire for regularity, the '-gch-' spellings became standard, and were naturally used by all grammars of the next decades, except those few noted in other sections which opposed the whole Siegenbeek system (e.g. Carlebur).

Thus all the Nut grammars have '-gch-', as do the later editions of some earlier works, such as Holtrop's English dictionary of 1823, Janssen's dictionary of 1803, Wester's Onderwijs (1797 has "lachen"), and a very late "fifth" edition of Sewel's Compendious Guide in 1814, completely rewritten in fact "door een predikant van eene der Engelsche gemeenten in de Nederlanden"; it bears little resemblance to the original. Grammars for foreign readers adopted the new standard spelling, e.g. Van der Pyl, Hasendonck, Ahn, Heiderscheidt, and it was also used by some grammars in the South, although, as noted above, it did not yet supersede the '-ch-' system.

Those who did use '-gch-' in the South include Behaegel: "De letter C (wordt) ... gevolgd van H, als in 'loochenen, juichen, Kagchel, Kugchen, Rogchel, Tigchel, Wigchelaer'". Van Daele uses "lacchen" but is drawn towards the Siegenbeek form: "de 'g' van 'loegen' moet ievers van daen kómen"(No.3/16). Willems preferred the Flemish '-eh-' form, but De Simpel agreed with Siegenbeek and used '-gch-'. Visschers gives both forms in his dictionary, but in the French-Dutch section uses only '-ch-', e.g. "lachen, lagchen rire; rire ... lachen", thus indicating his actual preference.

Van den Bossche voices Southern opposition in his Verhandeling, and his points seem to contain some validity: "schryft men 'ik lach', waer is den regel dat men de 'g' mag achterlaeten! Schryft men 'ik lagch', men zondigt tegen het algemeyn gebruyk, en daer by nog tegen den regel. ... Zal men eyndelyk 'ik lag' schryven? men zondigt alwederom tegen het algemeyn gebruyk". The only existing rule is that the second of any doubled consonant in the infinitive is dropped in the stem (straffen, ik straf), there is no rule which permits the dropping of
the (ante-)penultimate letter in "lagch-"; "lagch" itself is against the rules prohibiting a final double consonant; the form resulting from regular application of the rules is "ik lag" from "lag-chen", but this would be indistinguishable from part of "liggen". It was this latter strict interpretation of the rules which caused the spellings "ik lagte, gelagt" mentioned above.

Even in the North this aspect of Siegenbeek's system did not pass unopposed. In 1824 Smits argued against it (see "lachchen"), and Bilderdijk voiced his criticisms in his Spraakleer (see "lachen"). De Jager on the other hand felt '-gch-' to be quite acceptable, and though not ideal, in any event better than a simple '-ch-'. He rejected the old rule which said that "'g', een zachte keelklank zijnde, kon (maar men meende) zich in de uitspraak onmogelijk met de scherpe 'ch' verbinden". He feels that this argument is of little value, and although he accepts that '-chch-' would be "regelmatigste" he abides by '-gch-', since no other "tweeledig teeken" was completely doubled; i.e. since one never wrote "dingngen, vischschen", no more should one expect to find "lachchen".

Further he claims that a 'g' in final position is pronounced unvoiced, so that "lag-chen" is really the same as "lach-chen". But this argument, deriving as it does from Siegenbeek's comments given above, is weak, and seems to be attempting to justify an already accepted usage, rather than arguing a case, as is shown by Carlebur in his criticism of such supposed parallels: "Hoe fraai geredeneerd! Men moet 'lagchen, ligchamen' schrijven, even als men 'bidden, spotten, leggen' schrijft. Risum teneatis, amici! in 'lagchen, ligchamen' heeft volgens Siegenbeek de zelfde wijze van verdubbeling der medeklinkers als in 'bidden, spotten, leggen' plaats! Volgens ons niet: volgens ons staat zijn 'gch' als lettervereeniging gelijk aan 'dt, vfr, zs', en eene zich gelijk blijvende siegenbekiaan moet dus niet 'bidden, spotten, beseffen, sissen', maar 'bidten, spodten, besevfen, sizens' schrijven". This, apart from the inconsistency of using 'dt' for both 'dd' and 'tt', is logical; but then few systems have ever been impeccably consistent, and Siegenbeek's is no exception. Bomhoff accepts Siegenbeek's authority, but is attracted to '-chch-': when discussing double consonants (1854, p.22) he uses "echchel" and pleads that "men wrake voor het oogenblik deeze spelling niet, om des doel's willen", and he also points out that Siegenbeek is inconsistent in using "echel" instead of "egchel".
At a literary congress in Amsterdam De Jager gave the names of literary figures who were not opposed to a doubling of the 'ch', i.e. they supported 'gch'. These were Kinker, Loots, Van Hall, Staring, Tollens, Bogaers and Ter Haar. How much their acceptance of 'gch' was the result of deliberation on the questions involved, and how much was due to conservatism is impossible to state, but it must be noted that poets and prosaists have usually risen up in arms against any attempt at spelling reform as being a debasement of the language; they have rarely been among the foremost in differentiating spelling habits from language use, and it is possible that the same phenomenon occurred among those mentioned by De Jager.

Despite this literary support for 'gch', De Vries and Te Winkel abolished it in favour of the simpler (though as they well knew, less consistent) 'ch' (q.v.). They felt that 'chch' would be best, but "heeft nooit ingang gevonden" (rather an exaggeration), and 'ch' was thus more acceptable; in any event 'gch' was undesirable. Thus 'gch' disappeared with the introduction of the De Vries/Te Winkel system, though the move was not welcomed by all. De Jager not only publishing various articles and pamphlets against the spelling of the W.N.T., but also refused to adapt his Woordenlijst in the 3rd edition, which consequently bears the following comment: "Dr. De Jager ... nu aangezocht om een derden druk van zijn boekske te bewerken, gewijzigd naar de spelling van het Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal, verklaarde daartoe niet te kunnen besluiten, daar hij tegen de spelling van genoemd Woordenboek een menigte bezwaren had". The editorship then passed into the capable hands of J.H. van Dale, under whose name it was to grow somewhat in compass and repute.

One more tentative suggestion of 'gch' was to appear. This came from Rombouts in 1957, though he is not entirely happy with it as a solution to the perennial problem: "'kaggel' gaat niet,...'kachchel' "staat" niet. Reeds Siegenbeek gaf een oplossing, een noodoplossing: 'kagchel'. Het zou heus niet zo oudervets zijn die over te nemen, en dus te schrijven: 'lagchen, hagchelijk', zoals de eigennaam 'Ugchelen' gespeld wordt. Beter nog lijkt 'kacchel'." In the end he did not find any of the forms suggested fully acceptable for one reason or another, and reluctantly abides by the contemporary 'ch' (see "lachen").

GGHG: Lagchgen. This literally exceptional spelling has been encountered in
only one book, Van Hasendonck's Grammar of the Dutch language, in the 1823 edition. On p.91 in the verb paradigms he lists: "lagchgen, loeg, gelagchen", which is undoubtedly a misprint, though not entirely fortuitous, and with an interesting cause. The 1814 edition, as noted earlier, has "lachgen, loech, gelachen", being probably influenced by the use of '-chg-' in Wilcooke's dictionary. It would seem that in this later edition the intention was to adopt a Siegenbeek spelling, by the insertion of a 'g' before the 'ch' of "gelachen". Unfortunately the type setter did not notice the "extra" 'g' in the infinitive, and as '-chg-' was only used in the infinitive in the first edition, not in the participle, this is thus also true of '-gchg-' in the second edition. Both editions, incidentally, have "ligchaam".

GG: Laggen

The use of '-gg-' is normal and regular in words such as "zeggen, vlaggen", and these words are quite distinct from those under discussion here. It is equally common in many words where there is no question of gelijkvormigheid, but rather a hint of onomatopoeia, for example in "gaggelen, wiggelen, biggelen". These too are not concerned here, as they have never had a '-ch-' spelling proposed for them.

It is possible that for some writers spellings such as those just mentioned influenced the spelling of words which normally have '-ch-', for a '-gg-' form is occasionally found in such words. In Middle Dutch the often varied word "rochche" can be, and usually is, spelt "rogge"; but as it also had '-chch-' and '-chgh-' alternatives, it is of relevance here, especially as a similar form occurs for "lichaam" (see below).

The first instances of '-gg-' for '-ch-' appear in the late 17th century, and are very probably due to the widespread rejection of 'ch' by such grammarians as Winschooten, Duikerius and Van Helderien. Non-availability of 'ch' necessitated the use of 'gh' with some writers, 'ggh' with others (Winschooten), and for a very small number '-gg-'. This latter was usually avoided as it could cause confusion with such words as "leggen, zeggen", though as mentioned earlier there are in fact no words which can be confused by the use of 'ch' instead of 'gg', or vice versa, with the possible exception of "wiggelen" to wiggle, and "wichelen"
One of the very few grammars to actually defend this usage, and by far the earliest, is Van Helderen in 1683 (in 1675 he used '-gh-' q.v.). In his Spelkonst he gives reasons for the radical avoidance of 'c(h)’: "C behoort men in Neerduits niet te schrijven dan tusschen een 's' en een 'h' aan het begin der sillaben. ... Voor 'ch' tusschen twee klinkers behoort men twee 'gg' te schrijven als 'laggen, liggaam', voor 'lachen, lichaam'" (p.5). The Kort-Schrift Boek of the same year has a similar comment on p.14. Duikerius, in a similar vein in 1696, uses "belaggelijkst" (p.30), but does not discuss it.

The first dictionary to include this spelling is Van Hoogstraten’s edition of Hannot in 1704, in which "kuggen" is listed. In the same book there is also a cross reference to "lachen" from the minor variants "lagchen, laggen". Both entries are included in Giron’s Italian dictionary of 1710, which is based on this work. A further reference to such usage is made by E.C.P.: "Het woord LACHEN kan op veelderleye wijze gespelt werden, als 'lachgen, lachchen, lagchen, laggen... ’" (see "lachen"). The author may have known such spellings, or he may have seen them in Van Hoogstraten’s dictionary, which he would probably have known as the principal Dutch-Latin dictionary of the time, and he, being involved with Latin in his occupation (E.C.P. = Egidius Candidus Pastor = Aegidius de Witte Priester), could well have used it. It is not known if the inclusion of the form "laggen" in the dictionary is due to Van Hoogstraten, or if it was in the original proofs of Hannot. If the latter is the case, then the form may have been fairly common before the end of the previous century. Such 18th century forms as "ik lagte" are more probably due to "lag-chen" than "lag-gen" (see above).

It was especially the words with no related form with final ‘-ch’ which were prone to such spellings. For example "haggelyke" can be found in the Spectator (II,4), and also in Van Alkemade’s Heldendaden (p.4). In the "Handvesten van Amsterdam" (1743-78) and in the "Keuren van Haerlem" (1752) can be found "kaggels" (recorded by W.N.T.), and "boggel" can be found in Wolff & Dekon’s Willem Leevend (I.195). "Tiggelsteen" was in use as early as 1675 in Van Helderen. The occurrence of such words, where there is no related form with final ‘-ch’, is not so significant as "laggen" and such like.
These are the only examples to have been located outside grammars. The last example is possibly quite common, and merits a mention in W.N.T.: "Bochel, Buchel, Boechel, en, minder juist gespeld BOGGEL". It is possible that this lack of associated words with '-ch' encouraged an analogy with such words as "leggen, zeggen", especially in such dialects as make little difference in sound between /ch/ and /g/.

The '-gg-' spelling must have been more common than the paucity of examples noted here might suggest. Cramer (1777) gives it as one of many contemporary variants: "Men ziet in dezen opzichte een onderscheidene spelling in sommige woorden: by voorbeeld 'Lagchen Kagchel' vond ik ook gespeld 'Laggen Kaggel' of 'Lachen Kachel' of ook 'Lachen, Kacchel' anders 'lachchen, kachchel' en 'lachgen, cachgel', keure, voor my, het eerste, als 'Kagchel' enz." (p.37).

At almost exactly the same time the form is being proposed by Janssens (1775). Discussing the difference between 'ch' and 'g' he decides that the normal use for differentiation is unnecessary, but that "het woord 'laggen' (behoort) enige hardigheid; maer zoö veel niet, om, in de plaats van 'gen', 'chen' te stellen". He evidently considers "laggen" an already existing form, and uses it himself, e.g. "belaggelykste" on p.28, and "laggen" on the folding tables of verbs (for "rire") in the French grammar section of the book.

One of the latest mentions of such a spelling is by Rombouts, who rejected it as a possible answer to the "lach(ch)en" dilemma: he felt that "'kaggel' gaat niet, vergelijk: 'vlaggen, zeggen, muggen, rogge'". Thus the difference in sound between "kachel" and "vlaggen" rules out the possibility of using '-gg-' in the former. As mentioned above, however, this difference is not phonemic, and there is little against the forms "kaggel, laggen" etc. (which are a normal feature of modern Afrikaans spelling). Such a spelling would possibly find little support in Hollani, and Harry Mulisch, for example, lists "laggen" along with "kragt, sgaven, srijven" as possible progressive "verwoestingen" (p.50).

GGH: Lagghen

This spelling also developed around the end of the 17th century, and for the same reasons as caused '-gg-' and '-gh-' to be used (q.v.). In 1722 Tuinman considered this a practical spelling: "Wy hebben dit 'ch' dus in 'loochen, prechen, lachen,' enz.. Men kan dat wel anders schryven, door 'looghenen,
pragghen, lagghen' en dan diende de 'g' verdubbelt te zyn, op dat men geen
'loogenen, pragen, lagen' leze; maar 't geluid dat men door die 'gh', en zelf
'ch' uitdrukt, is noch eenigzins anders (dan 'g'), en men moest zich met 'ch'
behelpen, uit gebrek van de eigentlyke klinkletter". Thus 'ch' was better as it
avoided any confusion with 'g'.

The '-ggh-' spelling was normal in older systems for the simple '-gg-', as
in "segghen" etc., but its introduction into words which normally have '-ch-
may well be largely due to Winschooten. Since this is the only position in which
he uses the combination 'gh', it was probably meant to represent a sound
different from /g/, i.e. /ch/. In his dictionary are the examples "lagghen,
tigghel, kugghen, rogghelen, wigghelen" and their compounds, plus "progghis".
He uses "kugging" once, probably to save space on the line, and the onomatopoeic
words have '-gh-' (cf. "lagghen" above). The only inconsistency in his system
is 'gh' in "bogghel" and the derivatives of "belagghen", which, as "lagghen"
has '-ggh-', is probably on oversight on the part of the setter.

Some writers also used this '-ggh-' form in the onomatopoeic words, unlike
Winschooten, e.g. Valentijn in his Ovid translation of 1697 has "Schater niet
lang agter een, maar gigghel iets soets en vrijsteragtig",- note that his 'g(t)
spellings agree with Winschooten's rules. A similar usage for a word which is
not based on one ending in '-ch'is "Wigghelen",-to divine water etc. This is
included as a secondary entry in Van Hoogstraten/Hannot 1704: "Wigghelen zie
wichelen", and the same entry is thus to be found in Giron: "Wigghelen v.
Wichelen". Both spell "wigghelen" (to waggle) with '-gg-', as was normal, and
the preference for '-ch-' was probably an attempt to avoid homography.

The spelling with '-ggh-' seems to have been in only a little more
widespread use than the '-gg-' spelling mentioned above.

CH: Laghen

The use of 'gh' for intervocalic /ch/ was very common in the 18th century,
but only in the word "lighaam". Outside this word the spelling is very rare, and
probably due where it does occur to analogy with "lighaam". Most users would
avoid it in order to forestall a pronunciation with a long vowel by those who
were accustomed to reading the old-fashioned 'gh' as a single 'g' (e.g. maghel,
haghel). Its use in the words here relevant is unconnected with such an out of date usage.

Winschooten uses the simple 'gh' only in "lighaam", but others did extend its application. Van der Linden preferred this form in his Rabbelary (e.g. p24), and Pars used it in his Index Batavicus of 1701, for example in his (infamous review of Montanus: "Kan van laghen niet meer uittekenen" (p.354). Hakvoord uses it in his Schrijfkonst (e.g. 1746, p.35) possibly extended from the earlier editions: he does not discuss it. This spelling is not mentioned by any contemporary dictionary, nor does it figure in the lists of variants given by such as E.C.P., Van Hoogstraten/Hannot, or Cramer. In this light the spelling cannot have been very common at all.

It is possible to find hints of such a spelling before Winschooten's time, though these are elusive. Several grammarians reject the use of '-gh-' in "lachen", e.g. the Twe-spraack (see "lagghen"), and Nil Volentibus, both of them on the grounds that it was inadequate. Speaking of the similarity between 'ch' and 'g', the latter feel that "in het begin der lettergreepen blijkt het zeer klaer, als 'heiliche' en 'heilighe', 'lachen' en 'laghen', 'zwijchen' en 'zwijghen', 'ploechen' en 'ploeghen', 'lasche' en 'laeghe'". This might be taken to mean that Nil Volentibus knew such spellings as "laghen" in 1673, though this does not automatically follow from the statement (cf. the situation with '-v' forms, chapter 7).

In fact in Klenk's Voyagie of 1677, almost contemporary with Nil Volentibus's Verhandeling, just such a spelling does occur: "kaghel" on p.63, and there might even be a suggestion of a similar form in Hooft's use of "haghlyke" in the Ned. Historiën p.44, though this may be an independent phenomenon based on Hooft's use of final '-gh'. The word itself was often spelt with '-gg-' (see above), so that a form "haghlyke" does not imply a use of the "gh-for-ch system".

Much more significant is the more or less regular use of "laghen" in Van Helderens's English grammar of 1675. His dictionary of the same year has "lachgen".

**GHGH: Lagghen**

This spelling has only been suggested once, and was immediately rejected. This is in the Twe-spraack p.44: "de 'gh' is te dick ende zwaar van gheluid in 'lachen', ridere te bezighen, 6ick zoumen t'selve woord van 'laghen' niet
When De Heuiter proposed replacing 'ch' by 'h' in 1581, this naturally also applied to its use medially: ''lachen, prachen'... daer mochtens beter ware 'c' ahtergelaten; en aldus gespelt: 'lah-en, kih-en, troh-en, prah-en', met meer ander''. In practice however he abided by '-ch-' as he felt such a spelling to be too radical. It is noteworthy that he attaches 'h/ch' to the first syllable. For the only other suggestion of such a type of spelling see "líhhaam" below.

Use of '-ch-' and variants in the word "lichaaam"

The word "lichaaam" is separate from the words treated above in two ways. Firstly the 'ch' contained within it has developed from /k/ + /h/, cf. Old Saxon "likhamo", whereas in words such as "lachen" this is not so, cf. Old Saxon "hlahhian". Secondly because until Siegenbeek the word has usually not been subject to the same spelling as that meted to "lachen" etc., except where '-ch-' was used for all such words. Whether this was due in any way to it having a slightly different pronunciation as a result of its original /-kh-/ it is now impossible to say, though it must be noted that Middle Dutch occasionally has forms whuch might suggest this. There is little of the vast variation in spelling to be found with "lachen", and usage is largely restricted to three main forms "lichaaam, lighaaam, ligchaam". Often the choice of a particular writer is guided by his awareness of the etymological developments of "lachen" and "lichaaam", but this does not entirely explain the immense gap between the spelling of "lichaaam" on the one hand, and all other '-ch-' words on the other, in so many writers from all social, educational, and literary levels. The variants noted are listed below, as before, in alphabetical order.

**CCH: Licchaam**

The use of the very widespread '-cch-' spelling has been noted only once applied to "lichaaam". This is in the Van Hoogstraten/Hannot dictionary of 1704. In this (and consequently also in Giron 1710, which can scarcely justify being called a second instance), there is a cross-reference "lighaam zie lichaam",...
but all the phrases and derivatives listed under that word have the spelling "licchaam"! It cannot be ruled out that other '-cch-' spellers may have applied the same combination to "licchaam", though none have been noted, and several use "lacchen" alongside "lighaam" or "lichaam", for example the States Bible.

GG: Licgame

This form occurs in the early texts collected by Obreen and Van Loey. Like "lickhaam" listed below it may indicate a pronunciation different from that now heard, with /k/ before the fricative /ch/. On the other hand it may indicate an entirely normal /g/ as in "seeggen, brugge" where the combination is very common.

CH: Lichaam

Through all the many permutations of 'ch, gh, och' etc in the words "lachen, prachen" and the like, '-ch-' has always been the commonest form to be used in "lichaam", regardless of the usage in those other words. This situation has remained unchanged from Middle Dutch to the present day, with the exception of the widespread use of "lighaam" in the 18th century, and of Siegenbeek's "ligchaam". It is thus this form that one would expect to find in most texts until the end of the 17th century.

In Middle Dutch this is indeed the case, '-ch-' being the major form, and it was used for example in the Exercitium, in the Boecius translation, and by De Castelein, Marnix, D'Heere, Coornhert, Roemer Visscher, etc. etc. Of these Marnix and Roemer Visscher used '-cch-' in "lacchen". This form was also used in the dictionaries of Plantijn, Kilian and Mellema, and adopted by De Heuiter and the Twe-spraack, - all these in the 16th century. Even Lambrecht, who uses 'chgh' in all other words, spells "lichaem".

In the 17th century this form continued to be almost the only one used, again even by those who did not use '-ch-' in "lachen". Thus it is used by Dafforne (p.59), the States Bible, Kok (p.57), Leupenius etc., in their grammatical treatises, by Hexham, A.Montanus, Van den Ende and Binnart in their dictionaries, and by the writers Starter, Camphuysen, Van Borssele, Van Heemskerk, Hooft, Stalpaert van der Wiele, De Witt, Brandt, Huygens, Brune, Zoet, Luyken, Dullaert, etc.; of these Starter, Huygens, Van Heemskerk, Brune, Zoet and Dullaert for example used "lacchen".

Only towards the end of that century did any change come into the spelling of
this word, when it was widely replaced by '-gh-' (q.v.). Despite the efforts of
Winschoten and Sewel for that new form, the accepted traditional spelling with
'-ch-' was retained by most, e.g. by Van Hoogstraten in his list (though not
entirely in his dictionary, see "lichaam" above), and by the writer Van Alkemade
in his early works (e.g. the Munten), and the editors/printers of the Boekzaal
except when Sewel was the editor.

The main stimulus for a "lichaam" spelling in the early 18th century came
from its adoption by Nyloë and (more important) Moonen. Thus it was naturally
used by those who (more or less) followed Moonen's system, such as Smids and
Poot. It was also adopted by Schermer, who did not use Moonen's '-gh' forms,
and by many others too numerous to mention; it is the commonest form.

In general it is characteristic of those who spell "lachen" that they did not
consider "lichaam" to need any further explanation. This is understandable. Less
justifiable is the total lack of explanation for "lichaam" (or for that matter
"lighaam") in those who used '-ch-', '-gch-' etc. in "lachen", for very few
indeed make any attempt to do so. During the 18th century however, those who
spelt "lichaam" nearly all spelt "lachen" too, e.g. E.C.P., Stijl, Bolhuis,
Ballieu, Kramer, although the latter also spells "lighaam"(q.v.) in the Von
Moerbeek edition of 1774,- 1755 has only "lichaam". These grammars simply treat
"lichaam" together with "lachen". Some dictionaries adopted "lichaam" as main
entry, e.g. Halma 1708, Kramer 1719 & 1768, Des Roches 1769, Winkelman 1783, and
Holtrop 1739, who all spell "lachen". Pomey 1739 spells "lichaam; lachen/
lacchen", and Marin 1717 admits "ligchaam" alongside "lichaam" to conform with
his "lagchen" spelling. Van Hoogstraten's list has "lichaam" alongside
"lacchen", as too does the Grammaire pour apprendre... of 1757.

With the adoption by Siegenbeek of '-gch-' for "lagchen", he showed somewhat
more consistency than many of his predecessors by also adopting this spelling
for "ligchaam", with which it also shared a common fate in the hands of
Siegenbeek's critics, such as Bilderdijk, Willems and Haltbertsma. When the
latter's spelling was reviewed by De Jager (Taal en Letterbode III,139) he
commented on his use of "lichaam" and suggested that "vermoedelijk volgde hij
hierin Bilderdijk na". This is rather surprising as this is about the only
point which the systems of the two men had in common! It is by no means the
case that all 19th century "lichaam" spellers were followers of Bilderdijk, as such a form predates him by at least 700 years. It is therefore not at all "vermoedelijk" that such an influence is involved here. All other critics of Siegenbeek, including ultimately De Vries and Te Winkel, used '-ch-' for "lichaam" just as they did for "lachen".

CHCH: Lichchaam

As with the spelling "lachchen", the acceptance of 'ch' as a single letter would logically demand the use of "lichchaam". But this form is much less common than the doubling in "lachchen". As before, such forms must have occurred in the 17th century as they are mentioned by Sewel: "ik ... wil (liever) spellen ... 'lighaam' als 'lichaam' of 'lichchaam'". An example of such a spelling from soon after this date can be found in the Heidensche grootmoedigheden by Kornelis Boon in 1704. As mentioned in the previous section a "lichchaam" spelling can also be found in the Boekzaal for 1697 (later ridiculed by Van der Linden and Poerast), but this is not standard and occurs only in exceptional circumstances.

In mid century Van Belle gives the impression of still knowing this form, though as noted before, he may well be merely copying Sewel's examples. The form was indeed still current, however, and Van Belle could have known of such examples. One such instance is in Mestingh's Verhandeling of 1771 (e.g.p.17).

The only pre-Siegenbeek grammar to recommend this spelling is C.W.Holtrop in 1783 & 1791, on the same grounds as argued by many for '-chch-' in "lachchen": "Ik schrijf LICCHAAAM met eene dubbele CH; omdat het algemeen gebruik der schrijvers in de spellinge van dit woord verdeeld is, en omdat ik bijzondere redenen heb waarom ik liever de gedubbelde CH dan de enkele, of CHG, of GCH of GG verkies. ... Sommigen schrijven, bij voorbeeld, LICAAM, sommigen LIGGAAM, deze LICCHGAAM en geenen LICCHAAAM, en weer anderen LICHAAM; want LICHAAM luidt als LIE-CHAAM of als LIC-HAAM, of als LIX-HAAM. LIG-GAAM is te zacht gespeld, LICCH-GAAM LIG-CHAAM zijn beiden oneigen om uittespreken. LIG-HAAM, geeft den klank van het woord niet" (p.55, 79).

When this and other spellings were superceded by Siegenbeek, the '-ch-' was no longer seen, although, as noted before, both Siegenbeek (and consequently the Nut works, see "lachchen"), and Te Winkel accepted that it would logically be the
best form. Those later reformers who adopted the "lachchen" spelling, - Smits and Carlebur, did so too for "lichchaam".

CHG: Lichgaam

The Middle Dutch dictionary of Verwijs & Verdam gives only two spellings for "lichaam", - the normal '-ch-' and "lichgaam". This is in contrast to the many variants given for "lachen" (also including '-chg-'). De Jager (Archief III) records "lichgaem" in the Middle Dutch Lancelot.

After the Middle Dutch period however, this spelling seems to have died out almost completely. Even Sewel who uses '-chg-' for all other words did not use it for "lighaam" (sic), for reasons which are not altogether clear (see "lighaam"). It can be argued that the form "lach" justifies "lachgen", whereas the lack of any form related to "lichaam" repressed a '-chg-' spelling for this word; but this is an inadequate explanation, as it would also exclude "richgel, huichgelen" etc., all of which Sewel spells with '-chg-'.

It is possible however, that some adherents of the Sewel school may have extended the theories of the master and included "lichgaam" to conform with the pattern. Such a tendency is supported by Van Belle in 1755: "lighaam" is hierom ook beter dan 'lighaam, lichaam, lichgaam' of 'lichchaam". C.W.Holtrop also gives it as a variant in 1783. No examples of actual use of such a spelling have been located, and none of Sewel's works propose it.

CHH: Lichhaam

It has been noted that '-chh-' was used in the 1762 edition of Sewel/La Grue for "lachhen". This was not extended to other words however, and "lichaam" is spelt with the normal '-ch-' (e.g. p.27). Yet there was a suggestion for its adoption in this word, and in this word alone, almost a century later. This came from De Jager, and was the result of his etymological investigations. Bearing its origins as a compound in mind, he decided that the ideal spelling would be "lichhaam". But the word being no longer felt to be a compound, he realised that such as "ideal" was as unnecessary as a similarly argued spelling would be for other historical compounds, such as "armoede"; consequently the word could safely and legitimately be allowed to conform to the Siegenbeek system and have '-gch-'. In this he was undoubtedly wise, as such a far-
reaching etymological spelling could set a dangerous precedent, and would not
be overconducive to a simple spelling system.

CKH: Lickhaam

In a western Dutch manuscript glossary dating from about 1400 De Man records
a use of this spelling. Although this would clearly suggest that the writer
might not have pronounced a pure /ch/, it is impossible to say whether he still
thought of the word as a compound of "lijk" and "heem"; the use of the short
vowel, already present in early Middle Dutch, would tend to argue against the
presence of such a thought.

"Lik-haam" is curiously given, apparently as a contemporary variant
pronunciation, by C.W. Holtrop in 1783 (see "lichchaam" above).

GCH: Ligchaam

The spelling of "lichchaam" with '-gch-', like that of "lagchen" precedes by a
considerable time the introduction of the Siegenbeek system, and can probably be
found in Middle Dutch. The first example noted here is in Duikerius's
Voorbeeldzels of 1693 (p.210, 688); though he also spells "lagchen", the two are
not always found together. And at the same time it can be found in De Bruyn's
Reizen of 1698 (I,p.7), though "lighaam" can also be found (I,70) and "lichchaam"
(II, in 1714). Marin's dictionary (1717) records "ligchaam" as a variant of the
main entry with '-ch-', and Halma gives a cross-reference.

The form was still current by mid-century, for example in the Spectator. It
was also used by Van Belle, whose theory that 'ch' "dient eigtelyk en allermeest
om ene lettergreep te beginnen, minst, om ze te sluiten" caused him to reject
the other forms in favour of this: "'Ligchaam' is hierom ook beeter dan 'lighaam',
lichaam, lichaam' of 'lichchaam'". This last entry is puzzling as his ideal for
"lachen" was the double '-chch-' form which he here finds unsuitable for
"lichchaam". It is not clear why '-gch-' is inferior to '-chch-' in "lachchen" but
superior in "ligchaam". Van Rhyn also uses "ligchaam" (p.15,30) in 1758. The
other mid-century grammars to adopt '-gch-' for this word, those of Zeydelaar and
Van der Palm in 1769, are more consistent as they also spell "lagchen, pragchen".

Two later dictionaries which include this spelling are those of Winkelman in
1783 and J.W. Holtrop in 1789, though both (in emulation of their respective
models Halma and Marin) only give it as a minor variant and refer the reader to
the main entry under "lichhaam", as they did also for "lagchen - lachen". It is
given as a variant too by C.W. Holtrop (see "lichchaam"). In 1799 this form is to
be found in the grammar of Schwiers: "ligchamelik" (p.73), "ligchaam" (p.190ff).
This is strange as for all other words with intervocalic '-ch-' he equally
consistently uses the simple '-ch-', e.g. "lachen" (p.123,146). Although it is
common to find "lagchen, lichaam" side by side, it is unusual to find the
situation reversed.

In the 19th century Siegenbeek, followed in the South by Behaegel, removed
the inconsistencies of the previous centuries by causing "lichhaam" to conform to
the rule applied to "lachen", and adopt '-gch-'. He evidently saw no reason to
make it an exception (see "lagchen"). After this date the treatment of this
word has been the same as that meted to "lachen, prachen" etc., except for De
Jager's thoughts on "lichham" (q.v.). Those who followed Siegenbeek used '-gch-
for both words, and those who criticised Siegenbeek used '-gch-' in neither. It
must be added in conclusion that a pre-Siegenbeek use of "ligchaam" is very much
less common than the pre-Siegenbeek "lagchen, praghen" etc..

GG: Liggaam

One of the few recorded spellings with the form "liggame" is in the Middle
Dutch passages collected by Obreen and Van Loey, and would appear to bear the
same relationship to "liggaam" mentioned above, as did "seggen" to "seegen".
The only recommendation of "liggaam" came from Van Helderren (see "laggen"), but
it is also given as a variant by Holtrop (see "lichchaam"). It is also the
normal form of spelling in modern Afrikaans.

GH: Lighaam

Whereas the use of 'gh' in "laghen" is extremely rare, the spelling "lighaam"
is extremely common, especially in the 18th century where it is almost as common
as the '-ch-' form. One of the originators of this usage was Winschooten, who
rejects '-ch-' in all positions in Dutch words, and uses a 'gh' form instead.
Actually in all other words with intervocalic 'ch' he used '-ggh-' (see "lagghen"),
and this is the only word for which he allowed 'gh'. The examples of his usage
given above have to be taken from his dictionary of 1684, as he does not discuss
such usages in his Letterkonst of the previous year. After this date many
writers who adopted his 'gt' system also took over his 'ggh/-gh-' spellings.
As he does not discuss this situation he gives no explanation for the exception
of "lighaam" from the 'ggh-' pattern.

In this usage, however, Winschooten found an unexpected and powerful ally in
the person of Sewel. Powerful since his grammars and dictionaries were held in
some esteem, and unexpected because he makes no other use of 'gh'. In this
respect he is the same as Winschooten, as he too gives no real explanation.
Sewel's usage in the other words was '-chg-': "my (dunkt) dat (ch) beter past om
een lettergreep te sluyten, als te beginnen, om welke reden ik liever 'lachgen'
als 'lachchen' wil spellen, en 'lighaam' als 'lichaam' of 'lichchaam'". This
would imply that he considers this '-gh-' to belong to the second syllable,- as
in fact it should according to the now accepted Dutch syllable division rules,-
whereas the '-ch-' in "lach(g)en" belonged to the first, thus necessitating the
insertion of 'g' to start the second. It cannot be that Sewel is arguing that
"lach" gives "lach-gen" but there is not any analogical form "lich-", since this
does not account for his consistent use of '-chg-' in all other words, such as
"tichgel, wichgelen, huichgelen". Whatever his reasons, this was his consistent
spelling in all grammars and dictionaries (though there is a cross reference for
"lichaam") until the 1766 revision adopted '-ch-'.

Although the form is known from an earlier date (Zoet 1675 p.305, alongside
"lichaam" p.30, Heugelenburg's poems 1682, Van Helderens dictionary and English
grammar,- of "laghen"), the "lighaam" spelling was almost sure to find widespread
application now that it had the joint support of Winschooten and Sewel, and this
is in fact the case, even spreading amongst writers who followed neither grammar
in their other usages. Thus 'gh' was used by Leydekker 1692, Lodensteyn 1695
(aside "lichaam"), Van Yk 1697, De Bruyn 1698, Van Alkemade 1699, Pars 1701,
and Rusting 1707, each of whom also used Winschooten's 'gt' forms in preference
to Sewel's '-cht/-gt' alternation. This form was also recognised by Hannot/
Van Hoogstraten in 1704, though only as a secondary alternative. The use of this
form continued in the 18th century, and was used again by Sewel in his revision
of La Grue, and consequently also by Cuno. It also occurs in M.S. (p.64),
Heugelenburg's grammar, Huydecoper (e.g. book XV #. 431), Gelliers, and both works
of Hakvoord (in all consulted editions).

Use of this spelling in works outside the field of literature can be found in the books of Van Musschenbroek 1736, Stammaets 1740, Van der Schelling 1746, Speelman 1751, Houttuyn 1761, Verbeet 1762, "De Denker" 1764ff, many of which were respected works of reference, as was also the case with the more widely known history of Wagenaar 1749, which also used this form. Some of these instances may well be probably due to the adoption of this spelling by certain printers, notably Andries Voorstad who published Van Alkemade and Van Yk, and Philipus Losel who published Van der Schelling and many others; other works by these writers published by other printers do not always show the same spellings.

The occurrence of "lighaam" in grammars later in the century is much less common. Van Belle rejects it, and it occurs only as a secondary form in such dictionaries as even mention it - with the exception of Sewel. Its use in Kramer's grammar (1774 only) may be due to some influence from Sewel, as the latter's '-chg-' forms also occur sporadically in that work. Another grammar which used it, and possibly the only other one to do so apart from Winschooten and Sewel, was that of Janssens, though whereas he also adopts Winschooten's 'gt' system, he spells "lachen" with '-och-'. For example in his Practical Dutch Grammar of 1792 "lighaam" can be found on p.21, 26, 78 etc., and "lacchen" on p.25.

Two other late users were Chalmot and Wilcooke, both in 1798. The latter's dictionary adopted its spelling from the earlier works of Sewel, hence its use of '-gh-' here, which was by this time not as common as earlier in the century. It is an interesting sidelight of this spelling that the '-gh-' spelling was in the main used only by minor literary figures, and by writers (both major and minor) outside the field of pure literature, such as Wagenaar's histories, and various reference works. Most "major" literary figures of the 18th century tended to use "lichaam", and to avoid the almost pathological dread of 'ch' as exhibited by Winschooten and others.

HH: Lichaam

This final alternative was mooted, not as might be expected by De Heuiter as part of his "h-for-ch" system, but by Leupenius. He did not, however, think it
195. at all acceptable: "De 'c' heeft by ons geen ander gebruik dan aan de 'h' een sterker uitblaainge te geven, dan sy van de 'g' of 'h' bekomen kann, als in 'lichaam, mensch, schaapen', dat men qualalyk soude kunnen schryven 'lihhaam, mensgen, sgaapen'". Thus although he rejects it, it does suggest itself to him as a form which might appeal to some writers; in addition, since the forms "mensgen, sgaapen" are not unknown (see chap.13), it is possible that Leupenius also knew of actual instances of the use of "lihhaam". As with other grammarians it is interesting that he does not apply the same rule to "lichaam" as to "lachen", for which he uses '-cch-', and like the others he gives no reason for this discrepancy, nor is a straightforward answer immediately apparent.

Intervocalic 'ch' in loan words

This affects the words "echo" and "Bacchus", the only two such words to be in common use. Because of their nature as loans, both would tend to retain their original spellings as just given. However a few users extended their rules for Dutch medial '-ch-' to include these words. Such a usage would naturally be frowned upon as a sign of ignorance, which would then inhibit the spread of such spellings.

Echo: a spelling "eccho" can be found fairly early in the 18th century in the dictionary of Halma, where the reader is referred to the main entry "echo". Sewell's dictionary in the revision by Buys on the other hand has the form "eccho" as the main entry, earlier editions did not include the word at all. This might suggest that the form with '-cch-' was current at the time of Buys's revision, though he may have taken it from Marin, from whom he seems to have borrowed much material for his revision (see below). Marin's dictionary (e.g. the 1768 edition) has this form, and the French dictionary of Winkelman in 1783 refers "Eccho zie Echo", which is probably copied from the similar entry in the latest edition of Halma (1781), on which his work is largely based.

In the Siegenbeek system such forms were relegated to the status of being uncivilised, though this feeling did not go unopposed. One of the fiercest was Thijm in his treatise on loan word spellings: "De vraag is niet: hoe heeft men het wel eens gedaan? noch ook, hoe zullen wij het heden, en van nu af altoos
doen? - maar hoe BEHOORT het te wezen? op dat, wanneer wij als ons-zelven in het spellen van dit of dat woord gelijk blijven, wij in geen inkonsequentiën vervallen mogen, met betrekking tot de spelling van andere woorden der taal; gelijk bijv. zij doen, die 'laGCHen' en 'eCHo' schrijven'. "Echo" should thus conform to the Dutch spelling pattern and become "egcho". De Vries and Te Winkel felt that if 'chch' were to be adopted for "lachchen" then consistency (the same argument as Thijm's) would demand "echcho" (see "lachchen" above).

**Bacchus:** Being a proper name, this did not figure in most dictionaries, and where it did its nature was even more restrictive on spelling variation than was that of "echo". It can be found in Sewel/Buys, Wilcocke, Marin and Holtrop, all with the regular '-cch-'. It is also one of the very few words to figure in Giron 1710 and not in Van Hoogstraten/Hannot.

In Zeeus's Gedichten of 1725 can be found a spelling "Bachant" with only a single 'c', Rusting's Werken use "Bachus" alongside the more regular form, and very exceptionally indeed there appeared an anonymous work in 1715 entitled "Bagchus óp zijn' troon", which, as the word "troon" also shows, was not unduly concerned about preserving foreign spellings in loan words.

An isolated reform move came in 1317 from Behaegel, using "Bakhus" (I,193), but it is not known how widespread this form was.

**Medial 'ch' after a long vowel or dipthong**

The words here concerned are those such as "goochelen, goochem, guichelen, huichelen, juichen, loochenen". As the 'ch' comes after a long vowel, no doubling of the 'ch' is needed, and indeed a plain '-ch-' spelling is the most common, irrespective of other usages. Several, in accordance with their theories on 'ch' being a "single" letter, felt no need to double the preceding vowel, and thus spelt "goochelen, loochen", e.g. Van Hoogstraten/Hannot. Nonetheless some users do diverge from this, and as with "echo, Bacchus" above, it would be pointless to detail the legion of writers who used the normal form. The vast majority of writers, whatever their usage after a short vowel (lachen, lichaam), used '-ch-' in the words concerned here.

Occasionally in Middle Dutch a form such as "logenen" did occur for "loochenen", and it was noted above that Lambrecht extended his "lachghen" forms...
to cover the situation after a long vowel,—as in "loochghenen, beguuchghelen"; this was also the case with Jan de Laet, the printer of Van der Werve's word list,—in his preface he uses the word "loochghenen" (fol.A3), whereas Van der Werve himself has the entry "Negeren, loochenan".

But the first consistent user after these of any spelling other than '-ch-' was, as so often, Winschooten. When replacing '-ch-' by '-ggh-' in "lagghen", he did so too for "loogghenen, huigghelen, guigghelen, guigghelaar" etc., even though a doubling of the 'g' was unnecessary. Possibly he did so in order to preserve the uniformity of his system.

This too was probably the reasoning employed by Sewel in his first dictionary,—the second time in this chapter that Sewel has been seen with a similar anomalous usage to Winschooten! In the 1691 edition he extends the '-chg-' of "lachgen" to all these words, giving "goochgelaar, guyghelen, huyghelaar, loochgenaar" ("juichen" is not included in this edition, nor was it in Winschooten). It would appear that someone pointed out this inconsistency, or rather superfluity, for in the 1708 edition he amended both the spellings and the references to them in his "Korte Verhandeling...", to allow the spelling to be changed to '-gh-', as was already used in "lighaam" (surely he did not hear a long vowel in "lighaam"?). The amended comment reads: "GH kan somtyds ook te passe komen, als in de woorden 'looghenen, guyghelen, juyghen, toejuyghing, huyghelen' enz., want hoewel de meesten hiertoe 'ch' gebruyken, echter kan ik niet goedvinden eene Sillaab daarmee te beginnen, zo lang my een andere uytweg openstaat". This again is the same argument as he applied to "lighaam", but not to "lachgen, wichgelen". This form was then kept in the later editions (the Boekzaal review of an edition of 1767 may be based on advance copy of the 1708 edition, whose introduction is dated 1707), until that of 1766, where this paragraph is omitted, as it was no longer applicable to the newly adopted '-ch-' spelling. His grammar of 1708ff contains a similar comment.

Tuinman is the only other grammarian who thought such spellings possible: "Men kan (deze woorden) wel anders schryven, door 'looghenen, pragghen, lagghen' en dan die de 'g' verdubbelt te zyn, op dat men geen 'loogenen, pragen, lagen' leze". This is true for the last two examples, but is not applicable to "looghenen", as indeed his very usage shows! He seems to be thinking only of the
second and third examples, even though referring to all three, as the reference to "looghenen, loogenen, loogghenen" does not follow from his argument (Behaegel in 1817, p. 363, misquotes Tuinman as using "loogghenen" in the first phrase).

The spelling "googhelen" is given in Kramer's dictionary of 1719 as a variant: "guichelen, goochelen, googhelen"; and exceptionally in the dictionary of Van Hoogstraten/Hannot of 1704 can be found the entry "huiggelen". This is in addition to the entry "huichelen", gives precisely the same translation, and there is no cross-reference between the two! The same situation obtains in Giron who does not seem to have noticed the anomaly when copying from his model.

Poeraet mentions a spelling "loochchenen" (see chap. 2), but no instances have been located. The only dictionary to apply ' -gch-' after a long vowel is that of Marin, who spells "googhelen, juigchen, loogchenen" (but "huichelen"). There was also a plea for such a spelling in the grammar of Schütz, who also uses Marin's "lagch" forms; there may be a case of direct influence here. E.S.d.G. similarly uses "juigchen", and may be influenced by either, as his article is in the same volume as Schütz.

Literary examples of such spellings are elusive, and the only one found (though much more) is in the Rymen of Heugelenburg: "huiggh'laar (p. 3), Huigghelaaren (p. 23), juigghen (p. 24)" etc.. The spelling is not the same as that of his later grammar and word-lists. The Rymen actually date from 1682, the year before Winschooten's spelling book, and two years before his dictionary, so that it would seem that Winschooten was here reflecting a current usage, rather than initiating a new system. This does not deny that the main stimulus for such spellings in later years may have come from his works.

Apart from the main spelling for such words, with ' -ch-', all other alternatives, namely ' -chg-, -gh-, -ggh-, -gg-' are very isolated, though this does not imply inferiority!

**Intervocalic 'ch' in dictionaries**

As explained earlier, dictionaries are often of more use than grammars in gaining a full picture of contemporary spellings, as they often felt obliged to include as many variants as possible in order to entice all the users of such variants to buy their work. A grammar, on the other hand, usually (though not
always) propagated the rules of the writer, giving only those forms which he
felt to be best. Thus on the whole a grammarian prescribes and a lexicographer
describes. Nowhere is this more true than with the words with medial 'ch'. Due
to the various factors involved: onomatopoeia, etymology, syllable-division,
foreign origins, tradition etc., very few dictionaries use the same form for all
the words concerned.

Dictionaries are also of vital importance, compared to grammars and above
all literary works, as they are obliged to include all the words which may be in
use by the potential user/purchaser. For example the tracking down of instances
of less common words such as "tichel, prochie, guichelen" would be rather
difficult in a literary text, where even the words "lachen, lichaam" may not
occur if they are not relevant to the content. Dictionaries on the other hand
automatically include all such words, and in this way a much fuller picture can
be gained from the entries contained in these works. This is especially valuable
for the words here concerned, as a number of very minor variants are involved.

One of the most confusing, and most interesting, features of dictionaries is
the inclusion of cross-references from a minor spelling to the main entry.
However, not only do the actual main entries not always use the same system, but
it is also not uncommon for the secondary entry to refer the reader to a
spelling which is not entered!

Ignoring loan words such as "echo", which rarely conform to the given system,
and which may thus be considered a self-consistent closed class, one of the most
consistent pre-Siegenbeek dictionaries is Sewel's 1691 first edition:- consistent
that is insofar as it uses '-chg-' for all words, even after a long vowel. Even
this work however makes an exception for "lichaam". With the change to '-gh-
after a long vowel the system was still just as consistent. When the Buys
revision changed to '-ch-' in all words, it might appear that this would result
in a fully consistent usage for the entries, but this is not so, for several
words retained their original '-chg-' spellings (see "lachen" above). Wilcooke's
dictionary based on Sewel has the same inconsistency as Buys, but not for
exactly the same words!

Winschooten's intention in his dictionary was clearly to use '-ggh-' for all
such words, but '-gh-' slips in for the word "bogchel" and the derivatives of
"belagchen"; he also uses '-cgh-' (deliberately?) in "gicghelen".

During the 18th century especially, with its plethora of spelling variants, the situation was anything but ordered, though several similarities occur between the different works, even though each writer may be inconsistent within his own book, thus showing that certain compilers based their dictionaries on certain other earlier works.

In this light it is illuminating to give in fairly brief schematic form the main variants to be found in the principle Dutch dictionaries of the 18th century. It can be seen that several interesting patterns evolve. The works used are Sewel Dutch-English 1691, 1708, 1727 ("Sewel"), and the revised edition of 1766 ("Buys"); Van Hoogstraten/Hannot 1704, 1719 (Giron 1710 is not mentioned separately, being in this respect identical); Halma Dutch French 1781 and an undated 6th edition (all editions seem to be the same in this spelling); Marin's dictionary of 1717, 1730, 1752, 1768 ("Marin"), and the revisions of 1773 by Zeydelaar ("Marin/Z") and 1786 by Zeydelaar and Holtrop ("Marin/ZH"); Holtrop's own Dutch-French dictionary of 1789; the Latin dictionary based on Pomey, 1753; Kramer's Dutch-German dictionary of 1719, 1768; Winkelman Dutch-French 1783; Des Roches 1769, 1835; and Wilcocke Dutch-English 1798. Only the Dutch-foreign section has been used throughout this summary. As far as can be ascertained (e. & o.e.) this is an almost complete list of the occurrences of the main variant spellings in the works given.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Dutch Dictionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>chch</td>
<td>Bochchel, Hoogstraten, Marin, Pomey, Halma, Winkelman (cross-reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buchchel</td>
<td>Halma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lachchen</td>
<td>Hoogstraten, Kramer, Halma, Winkelman, Holtrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tichchen</td>
<td>Marin, Pomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cch</td>
<td>Buschel, Halma (cross reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buchelen</td>
<td>Hoogstraten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>echo</td>
<td>Marin, Buys, Halma, Winkelman, Marin/ZH, Wilcocke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaschel</td>
<td>Hoogstraten, Pomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuchen</td>
<td>Pomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(be)lachchen</td>
<td>Marin, Pomey, Hoogstraten (NOT in Giron)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>licchaam</td>
<td>Hoogstraten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pocchen</td>
<td>Hoogstraten, Pomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rocchelen</td>
<td>Hoogstraten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schaccheren</td>
<td>Marin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with the exception of "echo" the following have no '-cch-' forms:

Sewel, Buys, Kramer, Wilcocke, Marin/Z, Winkelman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Dutch Dictionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gch</td>
<td>Bogchel, Marin, Halma, Winkelman, Holtrop, Des Roches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bogchelen</td>
<td>Holtrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gigchelen</td>
<td>Pomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>googchelen</td>
<td>Marin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hagchelyk</td>
<td>Marin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
juigchen Marin
kagchen Marin, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH, Halma
kugchen Marin, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH
lagchen all except Sewel, Buys, Wilcocke, Pomey
ligchaam Marin, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH, Halma, Winkelman, Holtrop
longchenen Marin
pogchen Marin, Holtrop
pogchen Marin, Holtrop, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH, Halma, Winkelman
pragchen Marin/ZH, Holtrop, Des Roches
rigchen Marin, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH, Pomey
rogchen Marin, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH
schachchen Marin, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH, Holtrop
tigchen Hoogstraten, Pomey, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH, Halma, Holtrop
wigchen Marin, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH, Halma, Winkelman, Holtrop, Des Roches

Sewel, Buys, and Wilcocke have no 'gch-' forms, Kramer only has "lagchen", and Van Hoogstraten only has "lagchen, tigchen".

Bochel Buys, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH, Winkelman, Holtrop, Wilcocke, Des Roches
buchel Halma, Winkelman, Marin/ZH, Holtrop
echo Hoogstraten, Pomey, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH, Halma, Winkelman, Holtrop, Des Roches
gichelen Kramer (otherwise only Sewel 'ch-' and Pomey 'gch-' list this word)
kachel Kramer, Marin, Buys, Halma, Winkelman, Holtrop, Des Roches
kuchen Kramer, Marin, Halma, Winkelman, Holtrop, Des Roches
lachen all except Wilcocke and Sewel (Buys has "lachen")
pochel Marin, Buys, Halma, Winkelman
pochen Kramer, Marin, Marin/Z, Halma, Winkelman, Des Roches
prachen Kramer, Marin, Buys, Halma, Winkelman
rachen has 'ch-' among listed alternatives in all except rochelen Van Hoogstraten
richel all except Sewel, Wilcocke, Buys
schachchen Hoogstraten, Kramer, Marin, Halma, Winkelman
tichel Hoogstraten, Kramer, Marin/Z, Marin/ZH, Halma, Winkelman, Holtrop
wichelen Hoogstraten, Marin, Pomey, Holtrop
Sewel has 'ch-' only in "rochelen, prochie, lichaam".

Gichgelen, kuchgen, pochgen, richgel, schachgeren, tighgel, wichgelen are all in Buys and Wilcocke; Wilcocke has in addition "kachgel, lachgen, pochgel, prachgen" from earlier Sewel editions (see section on "lachgen" above). All pre-Buys Sewel editions have 'ch-' in all words except those mentioned above. The only other occurrence of 'chg-' is "wichgelen" in Kramer.

Gg, Gh, etc., and "riciaam" see the main chapter.

None of the dictionaries consulted has a thoroughly consistent system, though several works from the previous century had managed this (e.g. Binnart, Hexham).

It is impractical to note here which are main entries, which secondary entries listed alongside the main entry, and which merely cross-references. Some only occur in the phrases entered beneath the main heading, e.g. "lachen" in Van Hoogstraten.

Under closer analysis these variants show the influences between lexicographers:- Wilcocke is based partly on Buys, partly on earlier Sewel editions,
Buys is influenced by Marin (1752?); Marin is strongly influenced by Halma (see below); Halma (1719?) may have influenced Kruyder; Holtrop is based on Marin/ZH (1736), with some influence probably from Halma (the entry "lachen, lagchen, lachchen"); Winkelman is based on Halma (1731?); Girou is based almost word for word on Van Hoogstraten/Hannot; Pomey is based, more loosely, on Van Hoogstraten, and may be influenced by Marin (cf. "bochchel, tichchel").

Considering the often almost libellous introductions to Halma's dictionaries in which he accuses Marin, a former employee of his, of stealing the proofs of his dictionary, and plagiarising them, e.g. "Nu zal 't niet ondienstig zijn den lezers te doen zien dat dit Woordenboek, om verscheide redenen, te stellen is boven dat van Marin, die zijn uiterste best gedaan heeft om het werk van een Man, wien hy zoo zeer verpligt was, te laaken en te benaâelen,..." (1729, and similarly a tirade of 22 pages in the 1719 edition!), it is not surprising that there are many similarities between the two works. It is interesting, however, to note how often the entries are reversed (e.g. Marin: "tichel zie tichel", Halma: "tichel zie tichel"); this is especially true of the Zeydelaar revision.

It should be apparent from the above listings that very few dictionaries of the 18th century present a self-consistent system, and that the situation for words with intervocalic '-ch-' in this century, if not confused, was certainly in a state of great flux.

Summary:

spellings to be found: laccen licchaam
lacchen liggame
gicghelen lichaam
lachen lichchaam
lachchen lichgaam
lachchen lichhaam
lachghen lichgaam
lachhen ligchaam
lagchen liggame
laggen lighaam
lagghen lihhaam
laghen
lagghhen
lah-en
hapax (misprints?): lagchgen, roogghelen
Chapter 5: D in final position.

'-d', '-dt', '-t' in final position

hypercorrect spellings

the use of '-d', '-dt' '-t' in verbal endings is discussed in the next chapter.

The chronological development of the various alternatives

In Middle Dutch the normal spelling for nouns whose inflexion was spelt '-den' was with the phonetic '-t', parallel to the '-ch' spelling discussed in chapter 3, regardless of any rules of gelykvoormigheid. Towards the end of the 14th century, and it is generally agreed (e.g. by Van der Meer, J te Winkel, Van der Weghe) as a result of influence from High German, there arose a '-dt' spelling, which gradually spread throughout the Dutch-writing areas. Its function was presumably to indicate 'd' as part of the "root", and 't' for the pronunciation. The term "root" was used by early grammarians in a sense different from that now understood. It was a term borrowed from Hebrew grammar and named the basic word from which all related forms, whether derivatives or inflexions, were evolved. Thence the term came to mean, in Dutch, those letters which were felt to be an essential part of the nature of the word, and which could therefore not be omitted in any of the various forms; the Latin term often used for these was the "literae radicales", translated as "wortelletters". Any other letters found in inflexion or derivation were "literae accidentales" or "literae serviles".

For example a 'd' was found in "goede, goedheit" and was therefore an indispensable part of the meaning of the word, since it was certainly not part of the inflexion or of an ending '-dheit"; hence there had to be a 'd' also in "goed(t)". Whether a phonetic 't' was added to the root 'd' was immaterial to the argument, but the spelling such as "goet" was ruled out.

This theory is basically different from that incorporated in the rules of gelykvoormigheid: the one is based on etymological derivation procedures, and the other, in its generally understood meaning, on the visual appearance of the word, and the avoidance of too great a divergence between the related forms of a word. The end result is very often the same, but this does not imply that the cause is the same. Strangely, adherent of neither school of reasoning applied their theories consistently, most making an exception for such as "schrijf"
where by the rules given 'v' should be regarded as radical (in the literal sense), because of the word "schrijven",— see chap.7 (see also Leupenius's Aanmerkingen, ed. Caron, p.3, note 8). Examples of '-dt' are to be found in the early texts collected by Obreen and Van Loey, including "wandt, weerdt," and past participles such as "ghevrijdt, ghadt" (gehad). It also sporadically appears where ther is no real justification,— see final section of this chapter.

Arising at much the same time, and for similar reasons, are what will have to be called, for want of a suitable translation, gelijkvormigheid spellings, such as "land, dood" in the same texts. This spelling constitutes the root letters, but omits the '-t' added in the '-dt' spelling for the sound (/t/). Hypercorrect spellings with '-d' are also known from an early date.

There are thus three common Middle Dutch spellings, representable by the forms "land, lanit, lant", of which the latter is the oldest. All three forms are naturally equally common in all words, since the form used depends not on the word in question, but to the system of the writer. Nonetheless it is noticeable that two words in particular seem to have formed exceptions to this: the name of the deity was spelt through most of the Middle Ages as "God" or, a little less frequently "Godt",— "Got" is quite rare; the word "stadt" also seems to have had a distinct inclination towards the '-dt' spelling, even for writers who use '-t' or '-d' in other words such as "land, hand, goed". No adequate reason for this has been found.

It is not unknown for a sort of reverse gelijkvormigheid spelling to be found: where most writers took the form "landen" and deduced the uninflected form "land", some spellers started with the form such as "lant", and in inflexion then had to add 'd' because of the change in sound, resulting in a form such as "lantden". "Geminctde" in Obreen & Van Loey is formed in this way. This reverse gelijkvormigheid persisted for quite some time, but only with a few, and usually less educated, writers in the 17th century.

Typical of the normal Middle Dutch spelling is the usage of the Exercitium: the 1489 (Deventer) edition has almost entirely '-t', as in "peert, hoet, draet, tijt, root" etc., but always "God", and very often "stadt". The Ghent Boecius on the other hand has very many '-d' spellings, but no great consistency. Van der Schueren's Teuthonista of 1477 is inconsistent, with both '-t' and '-d' side
Although the introduction of the gelijkvormigheid spelling is usually, and with some justification, attributed to the Twe-spraack, it would be wrong to assume that its writer, assumed to be Spiegel, was first amongst grammarians to use it: it would be more accurate to say that he was the first to argue its case (see below). Before him, in 1550, Lambrecht consistently used '-d' spellings, but did not discuss his system, or any system at all, for his work is mostly concerned with permitted letter-combinations and the pronunciation of individual letters. He uses '-d' both in nouns and adjectives, and in past participles, which is not true of all users: very many kept '-t' in participles, especially when used predicatively, since in that function they are indeclinable. This latter system was used for example by Plantijn, and later on by Leupenius, Verwer, and others to be mentioned where appropriate. Lambrecht's only exception is to allow '-t' in the suffix '-heit', which is again a very common exception made by a great number of writers in later years. His Naembouck has the same spelling system, and also includes such telling cross-references as "wort, beter woord; Abt, beter, abd". Seurier, on the other hand, uses only '-t' forms.

The '-dt' spelling continued alongside the old '-t' and the newer '-d' forms, all three being used in the various marginal translations of Erasmus's treatise, e.g. "bereyt, listicheyt, snood, kind, oadt, Riedt". These are almost certainly printers' spellings, and not Erasmus's own choice; very probably he would have preferred the '-d' spelling as he professed to hear a difference between final '-d' and '-t': "Quin frequentiter 'd' & 't' differentiam confundimus, veluti quum pro 'David' sonamus 'Davit', & 'ad Petrum, ad te', 'at Petrum, at te'" (p.175). As he is attacking such assimilation in Latin rather than Dutch it cannot be known if he subjected his mother tongue to the same rules, though it is the Dutch pronunciation of Latin which he is discussing. He is criticising the sounding of a letter in a manner more appropriate to another letter (i.e. final 'd' being pronounced as /t/), on which habit he elsewhere exclaims (with reference now to Greek vowels) "frustra igitur sunt distinctae literae si sono nihil differunt", though here the argument is reversed,—different letters should not have the same sound, and different sounds should not be attributed to a single letter (i.e. /t/ & /d/ to 'd'). Four and a half centuries later his
thoughts were echoed by the motto of the VWS, "één klank, één teken".

A consistent user of '-dt' was Plantijn in his Thesaurus of 1573, but whereas his main entries have this spelling, his cross-references and subheadings often deviate, e.g. "een bruyt toemaken". All his past participles end in '-t', e.g. "gehoort, gebruyct", as does the suffix '-heyt'. Kilian wavers between '-d' and '-t', with a much less common '-dt' (probably setters forms). He frequently gives two alternative forms, such as "abd, abt; nood, not; hood, hooft; oort, oord; bat, bad". '-dt' can be found in the sub-entry "het broodt dijdt", and the entries "thendt, abelheydt" (cf. "achterheyd"). The Kilianus Auctus preserves "abd, abt", corrects to "het brood dijdt", but has new inconsistencies, e.g. "bat, zie bad, batstoove". His uncertainty on "abd, abt" possibly derives from Lambrecht's Naembouck, which he used when preparing his own work (see introduction to Verdeyen ed. of the Naembouck. Sasbout, like Plantijn, has a consistent '-dt' system.

Sexagius's usage is mostly '-t', the only exceptions being "bed, igerd", which Goemans (Leuvense Bijdragen IV,V) explains with reference to their longer Middle Dutch forms "bedde, aarde", so that either some voicing was preserved in the final /d/, or a very faint final /a/ was retained. He does not discuss his usage in this respect.

The first to discuss the choice of spellings in these words was Pontus de Heuiter: "'d' heeft groote gemeenschap met 't', 'woort, voort, hoort, got, bat, hat, zat, mat: woord, voord, hoord, god, bad, had, zad, mad'. In gebruikte in d'ende der voors, woorden liever 't' dan 'd'. ... 'Godt', wat douter 't' of 'd'?", - it should be either "God" or "Got" (p.33-4). This choice is in keeping with his more phonetic spelling system, but he makes no further justification for his choice of '-t' in preference to '-d'. He does not say that final '-d' is the same as '-t', merely that there is a "groote gemeinschap", though this may in part be due to autosuggestion.

Three years later Spiegel shows a similar tendency: "'ghód, pót, ghad, ghat, pad, spat'... verschelen in geklanck wainigh. Nčchtans wilt niet schicken datmen ... 'ghó' ende 'pó' (zou schryven) om datmen 'ghoden' ende 'potten' zeit"- a clear statement of the principle of gelijkvormigheid. The text of the book, however, does not keep to the writer's tenets, and all three possible
spellings can be found, though 'dt' ("midts" in the introduction, "verhoedt" p.46) is not common.

Spiegel's recommendations did not have immediate impact; the majority of contemporary writers continued in the old vein, using either 't' (Marnix), or 'dt' (Mellema, Van der Noot, Roemer Visscher), or more commonly both forms indiscriminately (Stevin, Valcoogh). Van Beaumont's Tyt-snipperingen, written c.1596 (published 1640) sets out with 'd' or 't', and progresses to 'dt' later on. Although this might reflect a change in opinion on the part of Van Beaumont himself, there is also evidence that most of the forms are the responsibility of the printer, since the preferred form for a given form often seems to depend on what page it is printed on, rather than where it fits in the chronological development, e.g. p.1 is mostly 'd', p.2 mostly 't' or 'dt', p.3 'd' or 't', p.4 almost entirely 't' etc.; practically no page is consistent, casting much light on contemporary indifference to spelling forms, but not much on Van Beaumont's own preferences!

The early works of Hooft, Coster, Heinsius show a similar irregularity from book to book, usually exhibiting the printer's rather than the writer's choice. But as it is the spelling system itself which is of most importance, it is of lesser importance whose it actually is - the writer's or the printer's, and it is usually impossible to say with any certainty which it is. For example Hooft's Achilles of 1614 is 50% 't', 50% 'dt', whereas his Baeto of 1626 is only 'dt'. Van Borsselen's Binckhorst has 'd' with occasional 't', though his other poems also often have 'dt'.

However, Spiegel's proposals began to find echoes; in 1612 Van der Schuere pointed out that since 'd' is "soet" and 't' "hard", "ende alzoo men de zoete boven de hardige lieven moet, inzonderheid daer 't reden vereyscht, zoo dunkt ons datze voorwaer buyten de reden niet verdwaeld (maer weidig to volgen) zijn, die willen, dat alle woorden in D sullen eindigen, die in D verlangen". He goes on to criticise the indiscriminate use of 't', or 'dt' "hoewel dit misbruuyk by velen (ja by meest elk een) geplagd word". "Wand, wanden" he claims has no need of 't', and "want, wanen" no need of 'd', "saeeromme en ween't niet onvoeglijk, datmen maar alleen in 't en liete eindigen alle woorden, die niet in 'd' en verlangen, ende geen ander". That he probably heard
no actual difference between final '-d' and '-t' is suggested by the entry under "Ha", where he says that but for the 'h' there is no difference between "aasd" and "haest". He also applies the '-d/-t' rule to past participles.

Most common usage continued with '-t' or '-dt' however, though '-d' becomes gradually more common. In 1624 Van Gherwen (possibly influenced by the Tweespraak) and De Hubert advocated the use of '-d', the latter explaining "Ik spelle 'duegd' met 'd'... want men seijt in 't meervoud 'duegden'... 'gebragt' met eene 't', om dat men seilt 'gebragte'". De Hubert went further than many in his application of gelijkvormigheid, using final double consonants, though this extreme (see chap.17) found few followers.

Van Heule, one year later, would have nothing to do with the new spelling. Like De Heuiter, whose example he followed in many ways, he proposes the phonetic '-t': "Daer zijn veel Byvouglieke woorden, die in het Eenvoudig een T op het eynde hebben, in welke plaetse D in het Veelvoudig gestelt wort", e.g. "Smit, smeeden; Gebet, gebeeden; Stat, Steeden", and he gives rules for when 't' is to be changed into 'd' in this way. He criticises the '-d' spelling on the grounds of tradition: "om dat wy zeer veel swaere Silben hebben, zo hebben onze Voorouders, de swaere letteren die wy van natuyr hebben, zo veel als het lijdelic is geweest, altijt in lichte letteren verandert... Siet Grotius en Kilian". Other authorities named by him, both in the 1625 and the 1633 edition, include De Heuiter, Marnix, Coornhert, and Heynsius, though some of these are not altogether regular (e.g. Kilian).

Two years after the first edition of Van Heule, Dafforne is still opposed to the comparatively new gelijkvormigheid spelling, especially in words where the singular and plural have other differences, as in "stat - steden, lit - leden, -heyt -heden"; in addition, he asks, what is wrong with "ghebet, ghebot" if "graeft, schreeft" are correct with an unvoiced final consonant.

Ampzing, in 1628, condemns the extreme gelijkvormigheid system of De Hubert, but regards "de enekte gevolg letter des meervouds, op 't eynde des eenvouds, geheel noodzakelijk... Ende ofschoon de 'd' swaerder ende doffer luyd als de 't', ende daernom de rechte uytsprake so wel niet en schijnt te treffen; so kan dat immers met eenen gemeenjen regel liever geholpen worden, te weten, dat de 'd' in 't eynde der silben klinkt als eene 't'(het welke de Franzoysen ook so doen)
From this time the gelijkvormigheid system is more and more commonly given as the rule in grammars. Plemp agrees with it in 1632, but the second edition of Van Heule retains his '-t' ruling, and cites as further support for this the spelling adopted by the States Bible. Anomalous in both editions is the presence in the list of examples for '-t, -den' (I p.31, II p.61) of "God, Goden", and in the first only of "Gebod, Geboden" (II: "Gebot, Geboden"), with a final '-d'; it would seem that Van Heule shared the Middle Dutch writers' dislike of the spelling "Got". The spelling rules of Van Heule are to be found repeated in the later grammars of Hexham and Beyer, who used his 1633 edition as their main source. Hexham's dictionary however uses '-dt', probably based on Nellema.

In the same year as Van Heule's second edition the Bible translators completed their decisions on spelling (first draft, referred to by Van Heule, was 1628), and offered such a plethora of irregularities and exceptions as only a committee can produce, voting as they did on each word separately! They are as follows:

1. conclusum, communiter T solum, quod in syllabarum incremento et plurali liquefat et mutetur in D... exceptis quibusdam in quius D est radicalis, ubi DT usurpandum, sic scribendum:'hant, hont, avont.
2. Participia tamen 'genoedt, gelant, gevoedt'.
3. 'stedt, glat, glatt', quod multi in D mutant in 'gladdicheyt'
4. 'saet, daet, aert' masc. per T in fine
5. 'verbondt vel 'verbont', 'gebot' vel 'gebot', 'gebedt' vel 'gebet' promiscue
6. 'God', an 'Got', an 'Godt'? Postremum pluribus suffragys fuit conclusum
7. Participia 'benint, gesint, gehoort', et similia, per T
8. 'Gehadt' est anomalum
9. ... 'Woort' non autem 'woord'
10. 'Gedoodt, dooht' mortuus, per DT 'Doot' mors per T.

In summary form this is: all words should end in '-t', except past participles of verbs with 'd' in the root, and words formed from such; plus "gehadt, dooht, stadt", "Gedoodt" and "doot" (mors) are regular according to the rules as given.
In literary works, unless the writer had definite views, the printers continued to follow whichever usage appealed to them, but many writers do seem to have had preferred forms. Throughout his life Hooft used more or less consistently the '-dt' spelling, except in past participles and '-heyt', both of which are more common with '-t'. In his Waernemingen, which on the whole have little bearing on spelling, he merely points out the presence of 'd' when part of the root, e.g. "gezeidt" because of "zeyden", as contrasted to "gelaert" where the root is "leer". No.124 further comments "'geleidt' als 't voor 'gelegt' staat, te spellen zonder 'd', aldus 'geleit';-- despite the forms "leyden, legden" (of "zeyden"), in order to differentiate the word from "gelaedit" from "leiden".

Starter and Westerbaen preferred '-d', Cats Revius and Anslo used '-t', Bontekoe, Scrivelerius and Pointers used '-dt'; Stalpaert van der Wiele oscillated between '-d' and '-dt'. In most editions of Camphuysen's Rijmen the spelling within each poem is largely consistent, but varies, often radically, from poem to poem, and it is utterly impossible to disentangle any personal spelling system. The Rijmen of 1647, 1654 and the Gedichten of 1675, 1680 differ greatly from each other, but all use, with little consistency, '-d' or '-t', but very rarely '-dt'. His earlier works "Het Schilt der Ghevraeckte Gemoeideren" 1619, and "Godt de Wraeck", "Lydens Begin" both 1620, all have about 40% '-t' and 60% '-dt'. Reaelly De Ruyter, De Swaen used '-t' or '-dt', and De Witt has an almost consistent use of '-dt'.

Vondel used, erratically, '-d' or '-t' up to circa 1625, and '-t' or '-dt' from then until c.1644. Thereafter he adopted a system with '-dt' after a short vowel ("bedt, stadt, Godt"), '-t' after a long vowel or consonant ("wearet, lant, gout, -heit, strijt"), which was further modified by his desire to separate homonyms such as "gemoedt, te gemoet; vondt, vont; aert (nature), aerdt (earth). Foreign words and names (e.g. "David") preserve their native spelling. The dating given here is that put forward by Moller (Ts.1903).

The system of De Ruyter, alluded to above, shows several interesting traits probably largely due to the elementary nature of his education. He uses mostly final '-d' and '-t' in the normal manner, though he very often has '-t' for '-d' ("vryenb, boort") or '-dt' for '-d' or '-t' ("stadt, buyten gaedts, vloodt").
The most interesting are what Koelmans calls "compromisspellingen"—the sort of reverse analogy sometimes found in Middle Dutch referred to above, giving such spellings as "onthooftden, noortden, belooftde". Such forms must not be considered innately "uncivilised" since for many years very eminent grammarians defended the identically formed spelling "beeldtenis" (though here the reasoning is the other way round). Koelmans also records some of De Ruyter's attempts to "correct" his spellings, e.g. 't' changed to 'dt' in "schoudt, nyenadit, bonedt, pardt, sadt, vloedt, boordt"; as can be seen these changes were not always improvements, and ably illustrate contemporary confusion.

Montanus, in 1635, was not attracted to the idea of gelijkvormigheid, preferring the phonetic '-t'. Amongst the instances of "onsige stofmerking" (p.25) he includes "'wijd', daer de ... 'd' voor een 't' is gestelt, om dat daer af kost ... 'wijde'. He will not, however, totally reject any consistent system: als men niettemin ... oneigenheit gebruikt, zoo ist zeer dienstich datmen daer in enemaerich gae; dat is, in gelijke geleegenheit, gelijke oneigenheit altijd gebruike". For all words he uses '-t' himself, listing for example in the "Letterwisselingen" (p.122) the change of "d' in 't', Gelt, gelden; Got, Goeden; vrucht, vrugdbaer; hoof, hoofdooed".

Usage in dictionaries and vocabularies at this time continued to be mostly conservative or inconsistent: Binnart uses only '-dt', the Dutch Scholeraaster has mostly '-t' but '-d, -dt' do occur, whereas the identical texts forming part of the Grooten Vocabulaer 2 years later have mostly '-dt' which is the spelling often favoured by the printer Waesberghe. Kok (1649) also uses '-dt'. At the same time opposition to both '-t' and '-dt' was being voiced by Van Attevelt and Van der Weyden, who complains that many writers "bijna geen onderscheyd en weten te maken tusschen 'd' ende 't', schrijvende 'broot, doot, gelt, Got...' ende andere med 't', in de plaatse van 'brood, dood, geld, God...' med 'd'", and that some "vele overtollige letteren, tot verlenginge harer schriften, gebruyken, als ... 't' in 'Godt'" (p.3,6).

In many ways the holder of theories opposite to those of the phonetician Montanus, Leupenius uses the '-d' spelling, not so much because of gelijkvormigheid, but rather (probably as a result of being "Bediener des Godlyken Woords" with the accompanying study of Hebrew) because of the "root" concept outlined
earlier. Montanus calls the root the "Grondletters" as distinct from the "Cleefletters", but has no qualms about changing the root letters for the sake of the sound (cf. "hoovddoec"). It is admittedly not always clear which principle a given writer is following - the idea of preserving the root-letters, or the idea of varying the word-image as little as possible (the most common reason put forward for the latter was to make the language easier for foreigners!)- for the end result is in most cases the same.

The Bible translators were certainly concerned with the root ("d' est radicalis"), whereas the Twe-spraak had been concerned with the word-image. Leupenius however is quite explicit: "Om wel te spellen of de bevattselen (= syllables) recht te maaken, moest men voor eerst sorgvuldiglyk acht neemen op de wortelletteren om de selve in de veranderinge van het woord, soo veel mogelyk is, te behouden, als in 'handen' syn de 'd', in 'ringen' de 'g'... wortelletteren, die moet men niet veranderen, noch schryven 'hant, rink'... maar 'hand, ring'".

Words such as "bedd" had a double consonant because of the plural form "bedden" (see chap.17), but "kind, stad, blad, -heid" etc have a single 'd' as there is only one in "kinderen, steden, bladeren, -heden" etc.

One apparent exception to the rule is the past participle, which Leupenius always spells with '-t' when part of a verb. His reason for this was simply that in such a function the word is undeclinable, and is a different part of speech from the attributive adjectival participle, which needs '-d' because of its inflected form: "want men seggt 'geleerde, beminnde' niet 'geleerte, beminnte'; als ook in de deelneemende wyse van de ander wysen te onderscheiden, soo seggt men 'ik hebbe geleert' niet ik hebbe 'geleerd'". This '-t' spelling is therefore not an exception to Leupenius's rigorously applied rules, and can also be seen in the '-d' stem verbs, whose participle ends in '-dt'.

Casparus van den Ende, whose Schatkamer appeared the following year, writes all past participles with '-t' regardless of the stem, but for nouns he supports the gelijkvormigheid spelling: "...'brood, dood,...' om dat men in 't meervoud 'brood-en, dood-en...' zegt". His views were strongly criticised however by Bolognino: "Gasper vanden Enden stelt seer wel voor grontreden dat het schryven met het spreken moet overeenkomen, ende nochtans schryft hy anders alsmen sprect in veul verscheyden wórden. ... Alssi (sic) schryft 'brood, dood', want
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sprekende sêten 'broodt, doodt' met een 't'. Ende noch arger schryft hy
'hoofd'; want sprekeende sêten 'hoofd' in sulcker voegen dat de 'd' nit gehoort
en wordt, már de 't'. Hy sê ooc datter somtyts een 't' naer de 'd' wordt
bygevoegt, sonder te seggen wanneer, ende hy doeget in 't wordt 'mâgt', ende
in t'wordt 'gevoegt', in de welcke de 'd' geensins en wordt gehoort. már in
de wórden 'broodt' en 'doodt' wordt de 'd' noch eenigsins gehoort, ende wórter
ooc in geschreven, om daten in't meervout schryft 'brooden, dooden'"(p.31).

The contemporary confusion, or rather flux, is impartially described by
Hillenius: "'t' or 'd' are sometimes, and often written in the end of words,
and sillables, which hath the power of 'dt', and ought to be pronounced like 'dt',
as 'God, Ghod, Ghodt, gebod, ghebod, ghebot, ghebodt, wort, word, wordt, gheeft,
woort, woord, woortd"n.b. not "Got". It is possible that he does not mean
that 'dt' should be pronounced /d+t/, but that 't' or 'd' sound exactly the
same as the traditional 'dt' spelling, viz. /t/ (though compare his statement
with Bolognino above I). The examples he gives also include 'gh/g' alternations.

As with several other aspects of spelling, the South tended to be more
conservative, and preserved the '-dt' spelling still. This spelling is, as
Ampzing pointed out, a form of gelijkvormigheid: '-d' for the word form and '-t'
added for the pronunciation, - it is only not quite as radical as the simple
'-d' spelling. The southerner Bolognino, as just noted, preserves '-dt', and
the revised version of Binnart's dictionary similarly has "peirdt, grondt" etc.
(as did the 1635 version). The Amsterdam editions of this work retain the
Southern spelling. Laconis... of 1666 still spells '-dt', but Bilius's preface
of 1661 had rejected this Southern usage in his book (like Bolognino and
Binnart printed in Antwerp),- not "opghetoghentheydt" but "-heyt".

After the 1660's most grammarians, unlike the still very unsystematic usage
in printed books, almost unaniomously concur in recommending the '-d' system in
their spelling rules. Niervaert does so in 1676, though his usage is erratic.
The Verhandeling of Nil Volentibus were also concerned with the potential of
this system in homonym differentiation: "Wij zeggen 'bat, daat, bêt'... enz.,
mee het geluid van de 't', daar men ze uitspreken moest met het geluid van de
'd', aldus 'bad, daad, bed'. En wij maaken also geen onderscheid tusschen 'Gôd',
het oppere wezen, en 'Gôt', de naam van zêker volke, tusschen 'wand'... en
"want"; tusschen 'rad' en 'rat', tusschen 'blood' en 'bloot'... en andere
diergelijke". Although this work was not published until 1728, the members of
the company at the time of writing (c.1673 according to Te Winkel Ontwikkelings-
gang III.44), Meijer, Blaauw and especially Fels, adopted their considered
spelling, or most aspects of it, straight away, and their influence was
certainly considerable. How much it is due to them is impossible to ascertain,
but after this time '-t' spellings become much less normal both in rules given
by grammars and in the usages of writers and printers.

This does not imply that '-d' was universal; some conservative users still
preferred '-dt', as for example did Arnout Leers the printer of all editions of
Hexham's dictionary. In the foreword to the revised version (1672ff) he defends
his (i.e. not the compiler's) spellings with '-dt', '-ck-' double vowels etc.:
"omtrent de Woorden en Woorde-boecken valt in onse dagen een wonderlijcke strijdt,
soo over de spellinge als over onduytsche woorden in de Duytsche Tale by sommige
gebruuyckt. De gewoonlijke (i.e. "traditional") spellinge te gebruycken houdt
men als of het een verderf der Politie was in het Vrye Hollandt. Het wordt voor
een Crimen uyt-geroepen, dat men soude schrijven 'Af-breeckinges' ende niet
' Af-brekinge', daer nochtans het eerste het beste is. ... (Men moet) gêlerde
lieden (niet) soo vileyn door-strijcken, die juyst op die nieuwste stelten niet
genegen zijn te gaen". His theory is that dictionaries above all should not try
to be à la mode "maer na alderhande Schrijvers", including those now dead whose
books were still in use. It is presumably with these latter that he justifies
his '-dt' forms. The reprints of the earlier editions and the revised versions
all use '-dt', so it seems that the wishes of the printer here were of more
weight than those of the compilers Hexham and Manly.

The reprint of Roemer Visscher's Brabbelingh in 1669 also showed the older
'-dt' forms, even though the first edition (1614) had had '-t'. Such a usage
was certainly dying out by this time however, as is recorded by Richardson in
1677: "Nota. They have generally been used after 'd' to write 't', to make it
be more hard, & fully pronounced; but now they leav out one of those letters: as
where they have written 'woordt', a word, they now begin (n.b.!) to use 'woort',
yea and sometimes 'woord" (p.4). He is slightly inaccurate in thinking "woort"
a new spelling, but his apparent surprise at the form "woord" is telling.
Van Attevelt’s Letterklank of 1682 retains the ‘-d’ of the 1st edition, and Winschooten, the following year, complains that “sommigen zijn soo dom, dat zij een T gebruiken, gelijk in ‘lant’ voor ‘land’, daar de D sonder teegenspreken behoort gebruikt te worden. Ander (quansuis wat voorsigtiger) die voegen bij de D, sonder oorsaak, een T; gelijk suiks in ‘Beeldt’ voor ‘Beeld’, ‘Draadt’ voor ‘Draad’”. (It is often quoted, since De Vooy, that Winschooten finds the spelling “lant” “dom”, whereas it is clearly the users of the spelling who he so dismisses).

Van Helderen is, like Winschooten, an ardent opponent of the use of ‘d/t’ in homonym differentiation, but unlike him he uses the ‘-t’ spelling in all his works, though his dictionary is a little less regular and “God” always has ‘-d’ or ‘-dt’, never ‘-t’. Gargon defends the ‘-d’ in 1686, as does La Grue two years earlier, though he does think it an acceptable alternative in certain words: “Souvant le ‘t’ se changeant en ‘d’, comme ‘broot’ pain, ‘brooden’, ‘draat’ fil, ‘draaden’, ‘bant’ lien, ‘banden’. Mais plusieurs bons écrivains veulent qu’ou le ‘d’ se trouve au plurier, qu’il soit aussi écrit au singulier, ains ils écrivent ‘brood, draad, band’ &c. & pour lors il n’y a plus de difficulté. ... J’ay formé mes regles selon la bonne & non selon la mauvaise ortographe” (p.37,67). The difficulty he refers to was in knowing whether the final ‘-t’ remained in the plural or changed to ‘-d-’. Sewel’s revision of this work still contained similar comments, though in the later editions (e.g.1762) they are somewhat out of place.

A southern grammar often indebted to La Grue for its comments, the Nouvelle Grammaire Flamande: Grammaire plus exacte, 1701, recognised ‘-d’ as the normal spelling, and, unlike many, realised that final ‘-d’ is pronounced exactly the same as ‘-t’: “à la fin des mots le D prend le son du T; comme ‘land’ païs; ‘stad’ ville; ‘pand’ gage. Lisez ‘lant, stat, pant’. D’ou vient qu’on écrit autrefois ‘landt, stad, pandt’”. (This can be compared with a comment in a much later foreign grammar, that of Ahn: “D und T... sind in der Aussprache genau von einander zu unterscheiden ... ‘hard, hart’”, where autosuggestion is probably at work. Even Siegenbeek was unsure on this: “Het komt mij, namelijk, voor, dat de ‘d’ op het einde der woorden wel niet aan den natuurlijken toon der uitspraak geheel voldoet, maar dat daarbij echter niet
een zoo scherp geluid gehoord wordt, als aan de 't' eigen is" (Invl.der Wel.),
and those following his example at the time included Bosdijk, who states
unambiguously that "hand" ends in /d/.

Sewel's own original works, like his later revision of La Grue, defend the
use of '-d', even in past participles, as too do Duikerius and Kuyper. An
apparent anomaly in Sewel is the occurrence of some 'dt' medial spellings:
"(de 'd') voegt...wel in 't woord...'goedtje' of godeken". Similar entries in
his dictionary include "Kindeken, Kindtje; Handtje; Hondtje; Mandetje, Mandtje".
This is not a '-dt' spelling on a par with those just described, nor a medial
'-dt-' spelling as in "noordter" described elsewhere, but is caused by the
regular addition of the suffix '-tje' to final '-d' (cf. "breedte").

Van Hoogstraten's list is erratic, using "vreemt, beroemt, quaedt, raadt,
raadt, beraamd, opgesteld, lant" etc., though the basis of his usage seems to
be '-t', with '-dt' after a short vowel (cf.Vondel). Hilarides uses '-d', but
Nyloë cannot accept this: "De 'd' wort by velen in 'heid, hand, land, God'
alleen zonder 't' geschreven; maar ik beroep my op elks oren, of men in de
uitsprake dier woorden geen 't' kan horen; en zo daar een van beide kan afwezen,
zal het de 'd' en niet de 't' zyn... In 'hand' komt al de kracht der uitsprake
op de 'd' aan, en zy is niet magtig om het alleen uit te houden"(2nd ed.p.33).
The pronunciation is too hard for a 'd', and furthermore if 'd' is accepted so
too must 'v' and 'z' in final position. His first edition of 1703 uses '-dt' but
does not discuss the spelling, so that the use of '-t' here is probably caused
by his reading of Moonen (as happened for other spellings,cf. chap.15).

Moonen's grammar of 1706 could find nothing in favour of '-d': "Wy (kunnen)
niet goetkeuren de hedendaegsche nieu-gesmeedde spelling, waardoor, om quansuis
de afkomste en verwantschap der woorden nader te koonen, de welluidendheit ten
hoogsten benadeelt wordt". He prefers '-t' to both '-d' and '-dt', and defends
it "met dezeen grontregel, ook in andere taalen bekent en gebruikelyk, dat
letters van het zelve werktuig (="organnm") dikwyls met elkandere verwisselt
worden". A solitary exception is made however for the word "Godt": "'Goedt'
echter schryve ik met een D voor de T, om hem van eenen 'Got' te onderscheiden".
This difference is frequently put forward (it is the only word with '-dt' in
Marin's grammar of 1751, e.g. on page 15, in the later Niew Ned. Speldeboek
of 1772, and is mentioned specifically by C.W. Holtrop in 1783 and De Simpel, as a contemporary Flemish usage, in the 1820's!), although it is difficult to conceive of any circumstance where real confusion might occur. Very often the use of the form "Godt" was influenced by the mystical idea of the Tetragramaton, that the name of the deity should have four letters (Deus, Geos, dieu, Jawe). Huydecoper (p.32) traces it back to Vondel and his followers, though it is much older than that. Moonen also makes an exception for present participles, which he spells with 'd', for which Van Gaveren criticised him on the grounds of consistency.

Sewel reacted to Moonen by inserting a paragraph in the notes in his 1708 dictionary and in his grammar of the same year. There must be, or have been, some difference between final 'd' and 't', he claims, otherwise the Romans would not have used a different letter in "Brabantia" and "Hollandia". He also makes this use of 'd' to point out that it avoids "eene verwarringe, die zelfs kundigen zou kunnen mis leyden" if such as "'Rad' van eenen Wagen, en een 'rat' als 't een dier betekent" were both written with 't' as in Moonen's system.

Van Gaveren was one contemporary non-grammarian who agreed with Sewel and opposed the theories of Moonen, though he was doubtful about the long-term trends amidst the reigning confusion: "Ik geloove dat W. Sewel groot gelyk heeft. ... Nochtans zal ik by myne spelling blyven, tot dat' er een vaster regel zal beraamt zyn" (Bkzl. 1707b,539). His own usage is 't'. A contrasting comment is found a year earlier (1706a,15) where he seems to have been more decided: "Ik (hebbe) meer de zinlykheit van een ander, dan myn eigen gedachten gevolgt". Francius however, a few years earlier, had shared Van Gaveren's doubts: "Zo dra 'er zekere regelen der Spelkonst zijn, zal ik m' er naar schikken. Zo lang die 'er niet zijn, en ieder zijn zin volgt, volg ik den mijnen, en 't geene my 't redelijkst voorkomt". These views amply reflect the contemporary lay view of the arguments of the grammarians.

In his defence of Moonen, Poeraet took up the point made by Nyloe with the analogy with final '-f'. If the alternation between 'f' and 'v' (brief/brieven) and 's' and 'z' (huis/huizen) were permissible, then it was also permissible for 't' and 'd': "Hadt nu de D in het woortsluiten de zelfde stuiting als de
T, haar Gebuurletter, en niet de zelfde buiging in het openen, zo zouden ook
de B, V, en Z in het besluiten der woorden de stuiting van haar Gebuurletter
kunnen overneemen". For him the adoption of final *-d' implied a parallel
adoption of final *-v', *-z' and *-b' (he used "quabbe, hebbe" normally, see
chap. 1), which is a point with some validity.

Although Moonen had substantial influence with his grammar, which was held
in high esteem for many years after, his advocacy of the *-t' spelling did
not check the trend towards more widespread acceptance of *-d'. Several writers
(or printers) continued to use *-t', including Poot, Zeeus, Schermer, and
Pomey (1739). But Moonen was the last of his generation of *-t' grammarians,
together with Nyloe who was almost certainly influenced by him (see above), and
nearly all subsequent grammars recommended *-d'.

Verwer (1707) uses exclusively *-d', but like Leupenius before him, and Ten
Kate and many others after him, he sees no reason to extend this spelling to
past participles when used in a finite verb; the attributive participle must have
*-d', as might be expected, but it is not necessary in verbal forms: "'De
Beesten zijn verjaagt', dog 'een verjaagd beest', eeven gelijk men zegt'een
verjaagde wolf" (Ten Kate I, 127). The only area of doubt in Verwer's mind is
for the suffix *-heit' (a common exception to *-d' rules). On p. 27, when
describing suffixes, he mentions "hede, munc heit", but on p. 52 he describes
how nouns formed from adjectives "exeunt in heid". His usage varies periodically
through the book, going in phases of *-heid' followed by a phase of *-heit' etc.
For one word only does he use *-dt': "eene 'maente', pro quo munc scribimus
'maendt', in plurali 'maenten'" (?)

A shift in the opinion towards the *-d' spelling is reflected in Halma's
dictionary, for in the 1729 edition the editor (Halma died in 1722) writes that
"De spelling van de voorgaende druk heeft men niet raadzaam gevonden te volgen.
Eerstelijk heeft men noodig geagt alle de overtollige en met de afleiding der
afkomstige woorden t'eenemaal strijdige letters te verwerpen. By voorbeeld in
de woorden 'Godt, Landt, Tandt' en oneindig meer andere, heeft men de letter 't'
uitgesloten". Similarly the past participles now have two spellings listed,
with *-t' (verbal use) and with *-d' (attributive, cf Verwer above), instead of
only *-t' in the earlier editions. Tuinman (Oude en Nieuwe Sprkw. No.127) argues
for '−d' in nouns but gives '−t' in participles as a "letterverwisseling".

Huydecoper, in 1730 formulated the rules for '−d/−t/−dt' spellings which were to become the accepted standard in the North for the next 240 years. But he, like several others, was of the opinion that final 'd' was pronounced differently from final 't': "men schryft niet 'brood' en 'noot', omdatmen zegt 'brooden' en 'nooten', maar integendeel men zegt 'brooden' en 'nooten' omdatmen in 't eenwoordige zegt 'brood' en 'noot'" (p.32). "en die 'God' (Deus) uitspreeken als 'Got' (een volknaam), en 'nood' (gevaar) als 'noot' (een boomvrucht) kunnen met het zelfde recht beweren, datmen moet schryven 'ik hef' voor 'ik heb', want daar is geen minder onderscheid tusschen 'God' en 'Got' als 'er is tusschen 'heb' en 'hep'"; and those who maintain "datmen schryve 'brood' en 'noot', omdatmen in 't meervoudige zegt 'brooden' en 'nooten', ... dien moeten de herssens dwars in 't hoofd leggen" (p.31). His rules, just like those later of Siegenbeek and of Te Winkel, are for '−d' in nouns, adjectives and participles (including the suffix '−heid'), whenever 'd' appears in inflected forms, otherwise '−t'; '−dt' was only allowed in verbs (see chap.6).

It is certainly intriguing to note which grammars were in use side by side in the first half of the 18th century. Moonen, the '−t' speller, was printed in 1706, and reprinted in 1719 (1718?—see Bkzl.1718b,723) and 1740 with an undated 5th edition. Nyloë, in his later editions another '−t' speller, was first printed in 1703, with the revised 2nd edition in 1707,1711 and 1721, 3rd edition in 1723, 4th 1746, and 5th in 1751 (published with an introduction by Van Hoogstraten). Sewel, a '−d' speller, had his grammar printed in 1708,1712, 1724, 1733, 1756, and his influential dictionary appeared in 1691, 1708 (1707?—see Bkzl.1707b where it is reviewed), 1727, 1735, 1754 and 1766. Heugelenburg, another '−d' speller in 1714, 1719, 1727, 1768,1775, 1798, and several undated editions. Yet despite the fact that two of these were '−t' users, and both were held in high esteem, there were very few '−t' spellers in practice.

Somewhat puzzling in this respect is the usage of Van Overschie; he spells most words consistently with '−d', "oiwd, tyd, God, geluyd, schuld, Stad" etc., yet "blout" always has '−t', despite "bloudwyn"; "quast" and "gout" (=goed) are similarly singled out without explanation. His system for past participles is also unusual, but is regular: all are spelt with '−t' except for verbs whose
stem ended in 'd', which have '-d', e.g. "gestelt, meegedeelt, vervult; versae, bevryd". This is presumably by analogy with his verbal spellings "speelt, word" where a theoretical '-dt' is similarly simplified to '-d).

The first new grammar to appear in the North since Moonen (i.e. excluding Huydecoper and Ten Kate, which are not grammars in the normal sense), was that of Van Belle in 1748. By this time the '-d' spelling, largely because of the influence of Huydecoper and Sewel, was the norm, and Van Belle agreed with their view: "De D, dus verre als B in eigenschap Dient om Dak, Rad te spellen, Hand, (om Handen;) (Om Steden, Stad, niet Stat) en Land, (om Landen;)". He is highly critical, in the footnotes, of Moonen, accusing the '-t' spellers of having "Fries voor hunne Hollândse ooren", and praises Sewel as protagonist of '-d'. He goes on to say that "Zy klinkt zo scherp als T aan 't eind van 't woord: A.Pels zegt wel 'zo rymt men Noord met Voort!'". Clearly the tenets of Nil Volentiibus were well known, and the most widespread vehicle of their views, to which Van Belle here refers, was the introduction to the often reprinted translation of Horace's Poetics by founder-member Pels (first published 1677); the latter does indeed say "zo mag men 'kindsch' met 'Prins' berymen, 'noord' met 'voort'" (p.7).

It is doubtful if Van Belle had a very wide field of influence (though his work was well known and often respected), but the same cannot be said of the writer whose spelling and language were to command much esteem for many years,-Wagenaar in his "Vaderlandsche Historie". He too uses '-d', but as this was already almost standard in the North it cannot be claimed that he was of great influence in causing it; certainly however he would have been important in confirming it as an acceptable usage.

In the South however, the situation was somewhat different. As already mentioned, the '-dt' spelling persisted longer here than in the North, and in 1713 E.G.P., at the same time as Moonen, Verwer, Nyloë and Sewel were arguing the merits of '-d' and '-t', defends the '-dt' forms on the grounds of the spoken language: "Daer begint een ander nieuw gebruyk in te sluypen, door het welk men in plaets van 'Godt, hadt, landt, stad, bescheydt' enz 'God, had, land, stad, bescheyd' gaet spellen: maer ik houde steen, en roepe tot getuygen alle die het gehoor scherpelijk willen senleggen, dat in die woorden de T merkelijk meer gehoort wordt als de D, en dat men oversulks dese
veel eer als de eerste in geval van noodt-wendige verkortinge, zou mogen achterlaten. Ik berakte my tot de selfde, dat men, nauwekeurigelijk toeluisterende, de D ook seer wel in die woorden kan hooren; en dat 'er geen kleyn onderscheyt te gevoelen is, wanneer men 'Godt, handt, stadt', en wanneer men 'kot, kant, vat'... duydelijk uytspreekt. Want in de laatste woorden bit men de lettergreep plotselijn af; daer de D in de eerste woorden de lettergreep doet hangen en langer duuren". It is not clear exactly what difference he hears (if any at all really), but it may have its roots in some possible dialectal retention of earlier longer forms with 'e' (which is an accepted feature of some Southern dialects), where the difference between 'd' and 't' would indeed be heard (cf. Bilderdijk, who knew and admired E.C.P.'s work, claimed that "hand" is pronounced either /hant/ or /hand/, see below). Thus E.C.P. always uses 'dt', without feeling any inconsistency with the rule he gives on p.22, "dat men niet meer letteren tot een woordt moet gebryken als 't nooddig is". He is prepared, if absolutely necessary, to adopt the 't' system.

Not due to E.C.P., but more from force of tradition, the 'dt' system continued in the South, though Van Geesdalle (1700,1712) followed the Northern example and used 'd', opposing 't' and 'dt' which he records as the normal usage, "De Vlaemsche sdrijven alle alzoo" (p.46). The Ursulines vocabulary of 1733 has the same typically Southern 'dt' spelling.

Towards mid-century however the tide began to turn in favour of 'd', probably under Northern influence. Verpoorten supports 'd' in 1742, as did P.B(incken) in 1757, and both, together with several other Southern grammarians (Steven, Janssens, Van Belleghem) use 't' in past participles in verb forms. Pomey's dictionary of 1753 similarly points out to the readers that in this edition "de overtollige Letters... (de 't' achter 'd') overal achtergelaeten zyn,... en dat men gestelt heeft ... 'gebed, gebod' &c in plaetse van ... 'gebedt, gebodt' &c"; a few anomalous 't' forms are retained, e.g. "quaat" is listed in addition to and separately from "quasd".

The convergence to Northern usage did not go uncontested, and the Snoeymes of 1760 still felt it necessary to advise against the 'dt' spelling still persisting in many popular works such as Aerschot, in 1766. Even in 1815 De Neckere calls 'd' a "nieu gebrauk" outhing the normal 'dt' (p.53).
In the North the 'dt' spelling in nouns adjectives and participles was for the most part dead by 1720 (it was also little used in verbs such as "hij word, gij deed" at this time). It occurs sporadically in the writings of Poot, Langendijk (especially in the word "stadt"), and others, and is specifically rejected by Heugelenburg. Sewel's revision of La Grue (1719ff) has consistently 'd', as would be expected from Sewel, with the anomalous exceptions of "broodt" (p.64-5) in all its parts! No explanation is given for this. Cuno's grammar of 1741, a translation of this work, as well as conscientiously copying this anomaly with "broodt" (p.80) and similarly "Aardt" (p.94), repeats the list of words (Sewel/La Grue p.30, cf. La Grue 1684 p.87), which may have either '-d' or '-t' in the singular, e.g. "jeugd/jeugt, raad/raat, zaad/zaat".

Occasionally books still appeared in the North with a more consistent 'dt' system, for example Boomkamp's "Alkmaar en deszelfs geschiedenissen" 1747, published in Rotterdam. A possible explanation for this is that the printer or typesetter may have been influenced by contemporary Southern spelling habits. Meijer's Woordenschat was printed with 'dt' up to and including the edition of 1745, though it also has a great many '-t' forms.

Kramer's grammar (1774 p.63) applies the usual argument for nouns to past participles, but with a difference: "ik hoorde', nicht 'ik hoorte', weil das Participlum pass. ist 'gehoord'; aber nicht 'bemerkte' von 'bemerken'... sondern 'bemerkte', weil das Participlum ist 'bemerk het hobbende'-. he takes the argument the other way round from normal. Instead of prescribing '-d' or '-t' because of '-de' or '-te' respectively, he gives '-d' and '-t' as basic and derives '-de' and '-te' from them! (cf. Huydecoper's theory on "brood" and "noot" above). That the situation was still far from settled outside the carefully formulated pages of grammars is suggested by the comment of Schwiers in 1799: "It is/difficult to distinguish (the D and T) in terminations, that even learned men will make mistakes". Even in his own book "Stadt" appears twice on p.76. It is possible however that his statement draws more from Sewel's comment to the same effect than from contemporary mistakes.

It was now almost universally agreed in both North and South that 'd' was the better spelling, as can be seen in the systems of Des Roches, De Haes,
In fact with only a handful of exceptions the 'd' system was to remain unchallenged until 1956:

Pietersen in 1776 had sought in vain for a rule to help decide whether 't' or 'd' was needed in a given word: "De regel om te weten, welke Zelfstandige en welke By-voeglyke Naamwoorden eene D of eene T in hunne buiginge hebben, schynt niet gevonden te konnen worden. Immers hoe veele Spraakkonsten 'er zyn, in geene van die wordt hy geleerd". He is presumably seeking a parallel to the rule that 'f' remains 'f' in inflexion after a short vowel, but always becomes 'v' after a long vowel (cf."stof stoffen, hof hoven"). In his earlier Aanmerkingen he had commented in similar vein "dat tot nog toe niet beslist is, of men die woorden, naar hunne oorsprongelyke of volgens het meervoudige getal met D schryven mag", though most grammars agreed in rejecting the former ('t'). He gives an extensive list of further references to earlier grammars defending 'd' in support of his argument (p.24-5). It is fairly unusual, however, from this time to find doubt set upon the accepted 'd' system, as mentioned above.

The first of the handful of challengers of the 'd' system was in 1769 when Van der Palm tried to reintroduce the 'dt' spelling, arguing "dat de D, wheens hare zoetheit, de lettergreep in diergelyke woorden niet kan sluiten, en aan de andere zyde, dat het meervoudige toont dat men in het enkelvoudige geene D missen kan. Om derhalve aan de uitspraak en tevens aan den aert der woorden te voldoen, gebruiken (wy) DT beide. ... Doch de zaak is van geene groote aengelegenheit, als men zich zelven slechts altoos gelyk is" (p.13). He seems to have laid less store by his usage than by his grammar itself: in an article in the"Verhandelingen" of the Zeeuwse Maatschappij 1787 (p.293), discussing contemporary grammars, he modestly writes that "hiertoe kunnen wy aenpryzen die van K. van der Palm, welke de gemakelykste is die ik ken"!

His is a lone voice however, and the first of the radical moves begins soon afterwards, in 1777, when Kluit wrote his Vertoog over de tegenwoordige spelling der Nederduitsche Taal. He seeks the regularity of the Middle Ages, especially inspired by his study of Melis Stoke. Most Middle Dutch words, he claims, ended in 'de' or 'te', so that there was no question of confusing the final letters.
Only with the loss of the final '-e' did the final consonant sounds fall together. But he sees no reason at all for any doubt as to the real spelling: the difference between 'd' and 't', he claims (p.31), is just as clear as that between 'f' and 'v', 's' and 'z', 'ch' and 'g', and as few have difficulty in deciding which to choose of these, he cannot understand why there should be any problems with 'd' or 't'. And as to "noodt, handt, kwaadt", they are as ridiculous as "wijvf, leevf, huizs, leesz", as Huydecoper had pointed out. He is critical of the latter's reasoning from "brood" to "brooden", and argues that "brood" should have a '-d' not so much because of the plural form, but rather as the shortened form of "broode". Differentiation of homonyms by means of '-d' and '-t' has no appeal to him, and he calls it "een taal-verderflijke en ongerijmde bedenking".

With a reference to a Latin parallel, he then argues that a letter change from '-t' to '-de' is no more "ongerijmd" than "scribo - scriptum, lex - legis" etc. Much as he would personally prefer the regularity of the Middle Dutch system '-t,-de' parallel to '-f,-ve; -s,-ze; -ch,-ge', he ruefully has to admit that "tegen een algemeen gebruik, hoe kwaad ook, is het vergeefs te worstelen", and accepts the standard '-d' system. He points out, however, that to be consistent one should also spell "med" because of "mede", and "wand" because of "wenden".

The spelling "wand" does occur, but it is rare; "med" on the other hand is a common spelling, and is often also spelt "medt" by those who preferred the '-dt' system. Goorhert's Voorreden of 1568 and Jan van der Noot both use "medt", the Twe-spraack sometimes uses "mids" as does Simon Stevin, and Van der Ghucht uses "mids". Some users of "med" are Van der Weyden (1651), probably copying Van Attevelt (1650 and 1652: "med 'd' moeten geändigd worden de woorden 'med, voord, terstond', omdat men zeyt 'mede, voorder, stonden' p.6), Van der Linden (1696) and Van Alkemade (1700). Chalmot still uses "mids" in 1798.

Kluit felt so strongly on this point that he also introduced similar comments into his revision of Van Hoogstraten's list: "t ware te wenschen dat het gehoor van velen onzer tegenwoordige Taalkenners even zoo geslepen ware omtrent het verschil der klanken van de letters 'v' en 'f', 'g' en 'ch', voor al der 'd' en 't' (als omtrent dat der 's' en 'z')" entered under the letter C.
An old question was revived in 1780 in the answers to a "prijsvraag" on school improvements offered by the Zeeland Scientific Society (published in 1782). One of the contributors, H.J. Krom expressed a desire to see an improved grammar giving suitable linguistic guidance for school use. One way in which spelling was affected by this was his doubt on the choice between 't' and 'd' in past participles, although by this date the matter was almost resolved. It is possible that he had met the use of 't' in non-attributive participles ("De beesten zijn verjaagt" etc.) in older grammars, and these had raised the doubts in his mind: "Dat (het deelwoord) met een 'd', als een adjectivum of toevoeglyk woord gebruikt, (moet geschreven worden, spreekt vanzelf, ...), maar zoo klaar is het niet of ik moet schryven 'hy is bemint' met een 't', want in zulk een zin wordt nu het woordt onveranderlijk on onbuigbaar".

It would seem then that this distinction between the two uses of the past participle, by means of the spelling, was still alive in some quarters, though it is certainly not as common as earlier on in the century. A further reference to it is made in the introduction to the new fourth edition of Halma's dictionary in 1781 (the year after Krom's comment was written): "In de voorige uitgaven vind men dikwils een deelwoord tweemaal, alleen met een klein onderscheid in de spelling, als 'herbloeit' en 'herbloeid'; 'herbouwt' en 'herbouwd' e.z.v. waarvoor wij alleen het laatste, op zijne plaats, behouden hebben, wijl zulke deelwoorden de 'd' tot eene sluitletter moeten hebben, om dat men in het vrouwelijke en meervoudige altijd zegt 'herbloeide, herbouwde' en niet 'herbloeite, herbouwte'". This had been true for example of the 1729 edition (see above). Even in the Grondregels of the next century this usage, common in the South to a greater extent than in the North, was still being discussed: "zou men dan niet behoren te schryven: 'deézen knegt had zynen meester bemind, wy hebben dit kind geleerd'?, on the same grounds as 'd' in nouns (p.3). It is probable that this book, based largely on Bincken, is reacting to the latter's use of this system.

Little more dissention from the 'd' spelling was now heard for almost a century. Bilderdijk used "aert" (nature) to distinguish it from "aard" (earth), even in inflexion such as "ontaartde"! Thijs keenly supported the 18th century
spellings "iemant, niemant, sints" on the grounds that they were not liable to inflexion (Wagenaar for one had used these forms in earlier years). And Balthazar Huydecoper Junior (a pseudonym) claimed that "De konklusie uit 'honden' tot 'hond' is even onjuist als om uit 'huizen' te besluiten tot de spelling 'huiz', uit 'dieven' tot de spelling 'diev'", in his criticism of the spelling rules adopted by the W.N.T..

When the new science of phonetics arose, and with the improvements in historical linguistic methods, in the later years of the 19th century, it was only to be expected that someone would suggest its application to a new spelling system. This came first, and in its most radical form, in the pamphlet "Over uitspraak en spelling" by Prof. J.P.N. Land in 1870. Although he indulged in very detailed representations of the vowels (see chap.3), he did not think that the accepted Dutch sound-law, that only unvoiced consonants are heard at the end of a word, should be reflected in the spelling: "De onvermijdelijke klankwijziging die een woord aan 't slot ondergaat zou men mogelijk (!) willen uitdrukken (even als de 17e eeuw 'broot' naast 'brooden' schrijft)"; this is rather an unexpected laxity in his system.

Although the Kollewijn school was often accused of wanting a phonetic spelling, despite their equally frequent denials, the scrapping of the standard gelijkvormigheid spelling was not among their official demands. Of course some of the more radical members certainly wished it to be (see for example Van den Bosch's comments in the next chapter), but the wish remained unofficial.

Hettema wished to use the "iemant, niemant, sints" spelling propagated by Thijm, but Huisman, in an attempt to moderate the radical claims of others, suggested dropping the Kollewijners' pleas for loan word spelling reform, yet added the much more controversial "zaak, die alsmede groote vereenvoudiging zou brengen,... de 'd' en de 'dt' op het einde der woorden. ... Voor de praktijk ware het wenselijk, kortweg den regel te stellen: 'Men schrijft de 'd' (evenals de 'v' en de 'z') alleen aan het begin van een lettergrep, wat op hetzelfde neerkomt als: 'schrijf alleen een 'd', als ge een 'd' hoort'."

The official policy of the movement however was not to jeopardize the cause by asking too much at once, following the worthy example of Ampzing who had feared "dat alle dese veranderingen niet wel te gelijk over de brugge en
souden willen". In their original Voorstellen they had actually proposed correcting the anomalous spelling "buskruit" to conform with "kruid", though they dropped this suggestion in 1895. One critic who did realise that they did not wish to adopt a phonetic spelling was Wille, though he was equally sure that once the progressives' demands were satisfied, the simplification of '-d' to '-t' would inevitably follow, in which history has proved him quite correct.

The privilege of being the first since Land to suggest a radical new spelling, and the first since Moonen to plea for the abandonment of the gelijkvormigheid rule in this system, belongs to S. Rombouts with his pamphlet "Naar een betere spelling" in 1957. All his life a "principieel vereenvoudiger" (Van Ginneken), and supporter of the Kollevdijn proposals, he published his pamphlet in the midst of the disappointment and heavy criticism which surrounded the newly appeared "Woordenlijst". The latter had never questioned the rules covering the use of final consonants, and Rombouts clearly regarded the time as ripe for a new and radical proposal.

On page 36 of his tract he pleads for a parallel treatment with the letters 'f/v' and 's/z': "Wat voor v en f en voor z en s geldt, en al sinds eeuwen gegoIden heeft, moet nu ook voor b en p en voor d en t gaan gelen:

... a) graf, graven;... (similarly:-) a)hoet, hoeden; bet, bedden;...

b) gaaf, gave;...

b)goet, goede; ront, ronde;... 

c) ik geef, wij geven; hij gaf;... c) ik bit, wij bidden; jij bat;...

... e) gelaat, gelaafde;...

e) gedoot, behoet, gedode, etc.

Later on (p. 39) he continues that "alle voltooide deelwoorden van swakke werkwoorden gaan voortaan uit op 't', geen enkel meer op 'd', zelfs niet 'gehat'. Dit alweer volgens de grondregel van de spelling". He criticises the lack of consistency in the present system, and claims that "Hier is orde in te scheppen eenvoudig door de grondregel te volgen:... aan het eind van een woord staat nooit 'b'd', of 'g', evenmin als 'v' of 'z'! Waar we 't', 'ch' of 'p' horen, schrijven we 't', 'ch' of 'p', waar we 'b', 'g' of 'd' horen, schrijven we ook 'b', 'g' of 'd'!". Although his proposals were not received unsympathetically, they were too radical for most since they affected a very great number of common words and indicated a departure from a well-accepted (if not consistently applied) spelling rule.
The reform plans of Klück, the year before Rombouts, also included final '-t' spellings, but his system is far removed from the latter's as it also involves comprehensive reform of the alphabet (see chap. 19). As Rombouts knew of his suggestions it is possible that he received encouragement from them in his plea for '-t'.

In the same year as Klück, the Nederlands-Belgische commissie voor de spelling van de bastaardwoorden was set up to answer some of the criticisms and dissatisfaction expressed about the Woordenlijst spellings. Although it was also concerned with a number of possible changes in the spelling of native Dutch words, the replacement of '-d' by '-t' was not one of them. Its first "Rapport" finally appeared in 1967, 12 years later, but it was anticipated by 4 years by the founding of the Vereniging voor Wetenschappelijke Spelling (VWS), who were dissatisfied with the generally conservative views of the commission members as well as with the original Woordenlijst spelling. Under their leader Paardekooper they put forward proposals for a "doelmatiger spelling" (DS) just as radical as those of Rombouts. Their basic rule was simply "één klank, één teken: Gebruik één VAST teken voor één foneem,... 'd' klinkt als 't' aan het eind van een woord en daarmee overeenkomende morfem" (extract from their "Programma" quoted by Hermkens p.132). Thus "hoed" has the same final sound as "voet" so it should be spelled with '-t', and similarly "Nederlant, Brabant" etc.

These pleas were echoed by Van de Velde and the later "Aksiegroep".

In 1969 a further government report appeared (due to dissatisfaction with the first one), optimistically (or suggestively?) entitled "Eindvoorstellen...". These too did not concern themselves with final '-d', although they did discuss it. Their conclusions were not well received by the VWS and other radicals, as nothing new was proposed. For example the comments of the "Didactiek Commissie van de sectie Nederlands" (DCN) on the periodical "Levende Talen" wrote that "De commissie Pée-Wesselings heeft het werkwoord de analogieregel gedeeltelijk laten varen, de D.C.N. zou ook de gelijkvormigheidsregel overboord willen gooien. Dat impliceert dan... dat het voltooid deelwoord altijd een 't' als uitgang krijgt... zoo ook de 'participia praeverbalia'gebekt, gebaart, gemantelt';... dat in verband hiermee het foneem /T/ consequent met het teken 't' gespeld wordt" (1970, p.436). This, and other "amendementen" given by them
would in fact transform the Eindvoorstellen into the tenets of the WS!

Again the following year the chairman of the DCN (J. de Vries) and the chairman of the "sectie Nederlands" (P.H.S. Batelaan) repeated their claims: "We willen de regel der gelijkvormigheid ... verlaten voor het fonem /t/ aan het eind van woorden uit alle categorieën". This proposal to forsake the rule of gelijkvormigheid with '-d' in favour of the '-t' spelling received much publicity in the next few years giving the radicals great hopes for its eventual implementation, despite opposition from such as Mulisch (p.35, 42, ff).

Hypercorrect spellings

It is often interesting to note the results when the application of a rule falls into the hands of one who does not fully understand the reasoning behind it. In the case of gelijkvormigheid this has often given rise to hypercorrect spellings, usually manifesting themselves in words ending with '-d' when there is no cause for this. This case is distinct from such as "med" mentioned above, for here, although modern habit does not recognize it, there is a logical argument for its use, being a shortened form of "mede". Similarly many (e.g. Bilderdijk) argued the case for and against the spelling "angwoord", calling upon various etymologies. Hypercorrectisms on the other hand are incorrect or inappropriate applications of a rule, and although many of the instances are due to the negligence of a type-setter rather than the writer the point remains as valid, it is the setter's reasoning now that it faulty not the writer's.

Hypercorrect '-d' spellings, caused by a user's thinking that '-d' should always be used at the end of a word for the sound /t/, are much more common than other hypercorrect final consonant spellings. The reason for this is that gelijkvormigheid only really applies to '-d' and '-t' words. Where a given user employs the '-v' system ("briev" etc.) it is conceivable that he would produce hypercorrect '-v' forms, though due to the very infrequency of '-v' spellings, incorrect '-v' forms are scarcely to be found. So few words end in '-ch' that there is little likelihood of hypercorrect use of 'g' in, for example, "lag, prag"("lachen, prachen"), and where these do occur they are probably part of a general 'g'-for-'ch' system (see chaps 3 & 4). Hypercorrect '-z' spellings
are unlikely to be found for the same reason as given for '-v'. In contrast to this, final '-d' and '-t' alternation forms such a familiar part of the Dutch spelling system that misapplication of the rule of gelijkvormigheid is a fairly common phenomenon in certain periods, notably the early 17th century when these rules were relatively new.

Some apparent instances however are merely due to less obvious relationships, similar to "med:mede" mentioned above. In this and similar categories can be included Jan de Witt's "regardt" (apparently pronounced with a final /t/), the very common spelling "vaard" or "vaardt", Van der Schuere's "Nederduydsch" calling upon "duyden", Gargon's "sad" (because of "verzadigen" and despite "zatte"), and the still current spelling "steeds". Personal names, despite their lack of inflected forms, are also often found with 'd', e.g. Erasmus has "Griedit" in a marginal gloss.

A special case is found for the word "abt"; here a final '-t' is used because of the plural "abten", though a great many writers were equally drawn to the use of 'd' in "abdij" and preferred the form "abd". Conversely the use of the 't' in "abt" has caused some to spell "abdij" (cf Bilderdijk's "ontaartde" mentioned earlier). Concerning this form the WNT remarks that "Voorheen schreef men ook wel 'abdij', als ware het woord gevormd van 'abt' met een zekeruitgang 'dij'". This does not fully account for the '-td-' spelling which is, as explained, formed for logical, though not fully accepted, reasons. As WNT gives no examples of the "abdij" spelling the phenomenon cannot be dated accurately, though one of the principle and most influential users was without doubt Wagenaar.

It is probably to Wagenaar's usage that Zeydelaar, one of the few grammarians to comment on the spelling, is referring when he writes that "met 'b' schrijv' ik 'Abdijje, Abdis'&c. Sommige lasten de 't' hieruit én schrijven 'Abdije, Abdia'. Het eerste komt mij nogtans béter voor: immers schrijvet m'n 'Abt'". This '-td-' form is still found in the 19th century, e.g. in Tollens's "Nieuwe Gedichten" II (1856), in the poem "Avondmijmering" verse 19, despite Siegenbeek's opting for the "abdij" form. As no instances are given in Middle Dutch by Verwijs/Verdam, the '-td-' forms would seem to be restricted to the 18th and early 19th century. Des Roches is one of the few to record the forms in his
dictionary: "Abdis, Abtdis; Abdy, Abtdy". The spelling "abd", with 'd' because of "abdi" can be found in Kilian, Lambercht and, in the next century, in Rodriguez. It is slightly unexpected in the latter, since he spells all other '-d' words with 'dt'.

The category of true hypercorrect gelijkvormigheid spellings on the other hand includes all those words with a final '-d' (or '-dt') spelling, which have 't' in the inflected forms. These are caused, as explained above, by a confusion with the new rule. With so many '-t' words changing to '-d' (hoet: hoed, hant: hand, stat: stad) it can be seen that some might gain the impression that all final '-t' spellings should become '-d'. The same applies to the change from '-t' to '-dt'.

Hypercorrect spellings with '-d' or '-dt' for '-t' are known over a great length of time, from Middle Dutch to at least the end of the 18th century. The texts compiled by Obreen and Van Loey include such examples as "groed, ied, verlaed, saluudt" from a very early date. In the 15th century Boecius translation the colophon reads "gheprendt ...". De Castelein uses "verrodt", possibly for visual rhyme with "becrodt" (p.207), though the latter itself also comes from a '-t-' word (bekrotten = bekladden). He also has "tprofilijd" which may be a further visual rhyme with "tijd", or it may be in line with his verbal spellings such as "gaad" (see chap.6). Meurier uses "badt" for "beter", and Van der Werve's Schat, in the 1568 edition, has "ghesedt" in the introduction, where the 1559 edition has "geset".

The first grammar to comment on such forms is De Heuiter in 1581, including "mad, zad, voord" amongst words with '-d' which he would prefer to see spelt with '-t', though he applies the same rule to all '-d' spellings (see above). Van der Schuere later has a similar comment, including the word "wandt" for "want". Hypercorrect spellings of this type are common in the 17th century, though in the early decades they are mostly with '-dt', since '-d' is itself not very common (see above). An entry to the poetry competition of the Landjuweel at Mechelen in May 1620 is entitled "Schadt-kiste der Philosophen en Poeten", Boetius à Bolswert has "kandt" on p.14 (by analogy with "landt,bandt"), and De Ruyter has a very great number, including "vloodt, bonedt, gelgoodt, quydt, staedt, profedt, groot (= groot)".
A rather extreme example is the spelling "hed" for "het" in the Dutch Scholemaister of 1637 (fol. AAv*). In 1649 Kok has the spelling "hoagroothheidt" on p.8, and Hillentius records "zadt" as the past tense of "zitten" in 1664. It is not only minor or uneducated figures who showed such confusion in the face of the relatively new gelijkvormigheid spelling rules, Nil Volentibus record that they "zelfs eenen der voornaamste Dichteren onzer eeuwe (hebben) doen struikelen, zo dat hij 'wanten', voor 'wanden' gezegt heeft" (p.5), though they respectfully do not identify the poet in question. Such internal misspellings are much less common.

With the increasing frequency of the 'd' spellings in the later decades of the 17th century the hypercorrect forms tended more to adopt an irregular 'd' instead of the more common irregular 'dt' seen above. Luyken's Duitse Lier of 1671 includes the line: "Appelone zat ... In de schaauw der bomen, En streeelde een Luyj" (Achtste verdeeling: Op het schoon zingen van Juffer Appelona Pijnberga). The diminutive form "teekendje" is listed by Winschooten in his dictionary in 1684, and Sewel makes a comment on contemporary misspellings such as "schood, vlood" (see chap.6 with the comment on "kamd"). In the next century these hypercorrect forms can still be found, De Huybert for example using "brulloofd" in De Dubbele Schaking.

Towards the end of the 17th century there arose a few spellings which seem to be in the same category as those just mentioned, but which gained an extremely wide usage. These are the words "ooid, nooid, zederd" and to a lesser extent "ieds" and "ied". "Ooid, nooid" are used by Van der Linden in 1696, and "nooyd" is still in use by O van Haren in the middle of the next century; "ieds" is used for example by Van Alkemade, and "zederd" is used, later in the century, by Nestingh, Chalmot and others. Although no justification can be seen for 'd' in these words, such forms appear fairly regularly, unlike the hypercorrect spellings listed above.

It is an interesting implication of the comments given by such as Sewel, and later by Verpoorten (who mentions a contemporary tendency to use 'dt' in such as "volmaeckdt"), that these hypercorrect forms must have been fairly common, and moreover that these grammarians did realise that the forms were caused by a misapplication or misunderstanding of the rules, and are not in the same category.
as mere misprints or accidental misspellings. It is this fact also which makes them of great interest to the orthographic historian.

Summary:
Middle Dutch period: 't' almost exclusively at first.
14th century: rise of 'dt', and sporadic 'd'
1500 to c.1600: 't' or 'dt' used more or less consistently.
early 17th century: 'd' and 't' often used indiscriminately.
1625 -
1670 -
Mooren (later Nyloe) try to revive 't'.
1700 - 1725
1770 -
1956
-t' spelling resuscitated, gelijkvormigheid seriously questioned for the first time since Mooren.

-t' (often excluding -heit!)
North: Grammars:
Tweespraak, Van der Schuere, Van Gherwen, De Hubert, Ampzing, Plemp, Van Attevelt, Van der Weyden, Leupenius, Van den Ende, Nil Volentibus, Pels, Winschooten, Gargon, Jeevel, Duikerius, Van der Linden, Kuyper, Bakvoord, Giron, Halsma, Marin, Smid, Heugelenburg, Kramer, Van Vla, Tuijman Ten Kate, Huydecoper, Gelliers, Guno, Van Belle, Schutz, Van Rhyt, and all subsequent grammars except those listed below.

Usage:
Van Santen (2nd edition), Starter, De Deckor, La Croix, Ruygen, Van Tk, Leydekker, Pars, Van Alkemade, De Ruybert, Van der Schelling, Langendijk, Burman, Van Haren, Pater, Mestlingh, etc etc.

South: Grammars:
Lambrecht; La Grue, Van Geesdalle, Grammaire plus exacte, Steven, Verpoorten, Pomy, Binoken, Grammaire pour apprendre, Snoeymes, Des Roche, Ballieu, and all later grammars except those listed below.

Usage:
De Castelen, Bouvaert, common from later 13th century on.

-d' (often excluding -heit!)
North: Grammars:

Usage:
Forerden, Cats, Revius, Van Rusting, Van Hoogstraten, Poot, Schermer.

South: Grammars:
Van der Werve, Mourier, Sexagius, De Zutte.

Usage:
Middle Dutch, Excercitium.

-d't'
North: Grammars:
Grooten Vocabulaer, Rodriguez, Hexham (dic), Kok, Nyloë (1st)

Usage:
De Witt, Rotgans, Kemper, Van Eikelen, Boomkamp.

South: Grammars:
Plantsijn, Sasbout, Mellema, Binnart, Bolognino, Lagonis, Pielat, E.C.P., Pomy (1st)

Usage:
Middle Dutch, and many until late 13th century (eg Aerschot).

mixed usages (various extents): G, van der Schemere, Killian, Van der Gucht, Brune, De Ruyter, Luyken, Hilarides, Verwer, Overschie (-d/-t); Valcoogh, Roemer Visscher, Steven, Coornhert, Van der Noot, Smyters, Van Engelen, Hoot, Vondel, Van der Venn, Coster, De Svaen, Bredero etc (-dt/-t), and a great many others.

-d' with -t' in verbal past participles:
Leupenius, Kuyper, Verwer, Halsma (some editions), Steven, Ten Kate, Verpoorten, Binoken, Janssens, Van Belleghem & Waterschoot.

This seems to have been a Southern phenomenon in later years.
Chapter 6: 'd' in 2nd and 3rd person singular verb endings

Non d-stem verbs: 'd' in weak verbs
   'd' in strong verbs
   'dt' in weak verbs
   'dt' in strong verbs
   't' in strong and weak verbs

'd' stem verbs: Middle Dutch to c.1850: 't'
   'd'
   'dt'

Post 1850 reform movements
'dt' in 3rd person singular of past tenses ending in 'd'.

It is particularly in the spelling of the 2nd and 3rd person singular verb endings in the present tense of weak verbs that the difference between analogy and gelijkvormigheid is apparent. A regular inflectional form such as "werpt" causes the notion that the "ending" is 't', which thus, by analogy, is added to the stem in "leert" and "vindt". Where gelijkvormigheid is the underlying motivation however, this argument is of secondary importance, or ignored altogether, and the form used is "leert, vind", because of the 'd' in "leerden, vinden", thus forming a parallel with noun spellings such as "land, landen".

When analogy, together with the actual sound of the final consonant, is so powerful that it overrules gelijkvormigheid, such spellings as "vint, wort" occur, casting out the 'd' of the stem, and this time forming a parallel with the spellings "lant, landen". In "hij vindt" therefore, both analogy and gelijkvormigheid play a role, causing respectively the 't' and 'd'in the ending.

With those spellers who frequently or regularly use 'dt' in nouns, the 'd' for gelijkvormigheid, plus a "phonetic" 't', similar forms can also occur in verbs: "hij speeldt". This is quite distinct from the use of 'dt' in "hij vindt", and is basically the same as "hij speeld" in motivation. The situation for verbs with 'd' in the stem ("vinden, melden, redden" etc.) has often shown independence from the other verbal spellings, and will consequently be treated separately here.

There are thus three possible endings: 'd, dt, t'; and each will be discussed in turn, though it must be stressed that most of the discussion concerns usages, rather than extracts from rules given by grammars, as by far the majority of such works make no explanation for their system, and merely give the paradigms for various verbs, from which lists their motivations must be deduced.
Non '-d' stem verbs: '-d' in weak verbs, e.g. "hij leerd".

The use if a gelijkvormigheid '-d' under the influence of the imperfect tense forms (e.g. "leerde"), has its origins in Middle Dutch, in all probability at the same time as the rise of '-d' spellings for nouns (around 1400). The texts collected by Obreen and Van Loey include such forms as "hi beterd, toeghd, word" (= woont), and similar forms can later be found in De Castelein: "kend, wild, behoardmen", cf. "hij kend, wilde, behoorde". Other aspects of the latter's usage suggest that other factors are also at play here, as discussed below with reference to '-d' in strong verbs.

Lambrecht uses the same system as De Castelein, giving in his Nederlandsche Spellinghe such forms as "dat kend God; pronuncieerd, behoard, leerd, wild". The Voorreden of 1566 by Coornhert sometimes has these forms (e.g. "omhelsd"), but usually prefers '-dt'. Neither of these works discuss verb forms, and it cannot be known if there was any defence of them in the lost work of Van der Gucht, who uses such forms as "betaead" in other works. De Heuiter rejects this system, but Spiegel uses them both in his Hertspieghel ("kend, vernield, leerd") and in the Twe-spraack: "Hoord met opmerking ..." (p.52) and "dies zould'ick de 'c' ... bezighen ... daer de 'k' in gheklanck verdubbeld" (p.44).

The same usage continued in the 17th century: Van der Schueren uses it in his work of 1612 in "uytbêld, volgd, begeird, behoord, behaegd" etc.. For him it falls into the same category as nouns with final '-d', where "alle woorden in D zullen eyndigen, die in D verlangen, als: ...'slaefd, zorgd,... ruymd,... vierd', de welke in 't verlangen gesteld werden: ... 'slaefde, zorgde,... ruymde,...vierden'"; he then rejects the use of '-t' in these words (p.16ff). Thus "zorgd, zorgde" is the same as "woord, woorden", or even more noticeably the same as the participle "gezorgd, gezorgde".

Two literary users of the system at this time are Starter, - "Ick ... Bidde dat ghy wild doen vloeyen mijn gedichte" (introduction "Tot de Iong-Frouwen van Friesland" in "Friesche Lusthof" 1621), and Valerius, - "Waer dat men zich al keerd of wend..." (1626). Such forms are also used in the grammars of Van Gherwen (1624) -"tald, leefd, leerd, belangd" - and Ampzing (1628). However the latter only applies this rule to the 3rd person form, the 2nd person singular retaining '-t': "So schrijf ik ook inde werk-woorden den derden persoon in't
enkelvoudig getal van de verkondigende manier met eene 'd', om 't gevolg van den eersten persoon in den onvolmaakten tijd, in die woorden die dat gevolg hebben: als 'hij leerd, ik leerde'; Maer den tweeden persoon spelle ik ofte met eene 't', ende dat ofte om 't gevolg vanden tweeden persoon in 't veelvoudig getal: 'gy stoot, gy stootet': ofte als de 't' wel eygentlijk geen gevolg beduyd, maer slechts in beyde gevallen op 't eynde blijft, worden de meervoud ghemaakt met byvoeginge van een 'e' voor de 't': 'gy leert, gy leeret'; ofte ook met eene 'd', om 't gevolg naer den aerd der woorden: 'gy arbeyd, gy arbeydet'. Thus if the stem ends in '-d' or '-t' then the 2nd person singular ends in '-d' or '-t' only, respectively, e.g. "gy arbeyd, stoot", and if the stem does not end in '-d' or '-t' then the 2nd person singular takes '-t', e.g. "gy leert". He gives no reason why this relationship should override any influence from the imperfect tense, as happened with the 3rd person form "hy leerd".

Although he does not use them himself Van Heule does recognise the system. When describing verbs "van de eerst vervouginge" (1633,p.34-5) he writes that "als men ook by 'Deel' stelt eene T ofte D, zo is het 'Deelt'" (my emphasis). The comment is retained in Hexham and Beyer, both based on this work.

The same spelling is used by Plemp ("poogd, behoord" etc.), and the writer Stalpaert van der Wiele, for example in "St. Agnes Bruyloft" of 1635: "Stroyd roo Roos' en Lely-blaeu...". Not to be confused with this is a system mentioned by Kok who gives the principle parts of the 1st conjugation as "Krabben, krabd, ghe-krabt,... deelen, deeld, ghe-deelt,... ik mind, du mindst, hy mind" (p.25,35). These '-d' forms are imperfect tenses, abbreviated from '-de', and have no connection with the identically spelt present tense forms under discussion here.

In mid-century this system was still current and figures in Van den Ende's Schatkamer of 1654 (see for example the sentence quoted in chap.3), and is also fairly common in Luyken's Duitse Lier of 1671, e.g. "by speeld, gy spand, by mind, wuld, rend, schuid, sweefd" etc., to be found especially in the poems "Faren doet baren" and "Onzuivere min". In his other poems the '-d' form is much less common than the regular '-t', and when using '-d' he does so for both 2nd and 3rd person singular, unlike Ampzing.

Around this time a new edition of Camphuysen's "Stichtelyke Rijmen" appeared (it was subject to frequent reprints), showing many changes from the spelling
of earlier versions, though in all editions the system is far short of complete regularity. The 1647 and 1655 editions follow the 't' system, but those of 1675 and 1680 change to 'd', e.g. in the poem "Hoe ongelijken lot":

1647: Soo ghy 't besluyt om-keert
1675: Zoö gy 't besluyt omkeerd
Vergeldings nissen leert...

and in psalm 62: "'T Sy wat de wereld poogt" (1647), "'T Zy wat de wereld poogd" (1675). This is a common feature of these later editions, and is important in that it shows that this usage was not always due to blind copying from earlier texts, but was still living.

A keen supporter of this usage amongst grammarians was Winschooten who, unlike Ampzing, extends it to the "gy"-forms. Having just spoken of spellings such as "goedt" he goes on to say that "diegelyke mislagen werden ook begaan met de T, en DT, te setten op het end van al sulke tijd-woorden, die na haare aard, en eigenschap, alleen een DE in den onvolmaakte tijd vereissen: wie sal sig ontsien (immers onkundige en sloffe mensen) te schrijven 'leert', of wel 'leerd!', daar nogtans dat woord in de onvolmaakte tijd uitgedrukt werd met een D, als 'ik leerde'". Thus he spells also "volgd, verscheeld, verschild, behoord, schroomd" etc..

Literary users of this period include Neugelenburg in his Kort Bondige Ryzen of 1682 (see also below), Katryne Lescailje in her poem to Antonides van der Goes in the latter's "Gedichten" of 1685 ("beweegd"), though Van Hoogstraten "corrected" such to 't! ("beweegd") when he published her collected works in 1730. Other users include La Croix in 1685, Leydakker (1692 and 1705), Duikerius both in his Schouburg of 1696 (e.g. "Braaijd, Draaijd, Kraaijd" p.11) and in his Voorbeeldzels 3 years earlier ("erlangd, volgd, keurd, leerd" etc.).

In the polemic of 1696–7 between Rabus and Van der Linden it is noteworthy that the latter's use of the 'd' system is not criticised, even though Rabus himself uses 't'. He was certainly aware of his opponent's spelling, as can be seen when he quotes him (Bkzl. July 1697, p.78):"een God, die Alle Dag Toorn". All Rabus has to say on this is a criticism of the way the last word was printed "als een edel gesteente met andere letters", i.e. in a different font for emphasis. The 'd' forms must therefore have been so common that Rabus could accept them as normal without surprise or censure. Van der Linden himself was
not so generous however, and wrote in his "Rabbelary" that "(alle) Woorden, die (Rabus) in de Tegenwoordige en Volmaakte Tijd, med een 't' Speld, moet by med een 'd' Stuitten: om dat men in de Onvolmaakte Tijd een 'd' heevt".

Several other books of the same decade also show this system: Van Yk's Scheepbouwkunst of 1697, and Van Alkemade's Melis Stoke edition of 1699 and his Munten of 1700, though the latter also has '-t' spellings. The latter is by the same printer as Van Yk's Scheepbouwkunst, though other books of Van Alkemade's from different printers have the '-d' forms, so that the adoption of this system could just as well be the choice of the author as of the printer. The Haagsche Mercurius, edited by H. Doedyns (1697-9) is a contemporary periodical with similar usage.

With the new century the system continued relatively unabated, despite the mute opposition of Nyloe and Moonen, neither of whom discuss the phenomenon, simply giving their own forms. It is however used in a grammar of 1700, the Parallèle of Van Geesdalle (see the section on '-d' in strong verbs below), and likewise a little later by M.S. in 1712. Sewel mentions them in his Spraakkonst of 1703: "in woorden waarin geen D koast ... is het ten hoogste wanschikkelyk een D in den Tegenwoordigen tyd te brengen, alhoewel veele zich niet ontzien te schryven ... 'bemind ... veroord ... vervolgd ... schynd'".

Many writers in the early years of the century used this system, including Pars in his Index Batavicus of 1701 (waagd, woond, verhaald, etc.), Klaas Najer (beleevd, believd, etc.), and Smids, both in his Schatkamer of 1711 ("vertoond" p.4, "hoord" in the closing poem) and in his dedicatory poem to K.J. de With's Getrouwe Herderin of 1719, who uses '-t' herself, suggesting that '-d' was Smids's personal preference. Van Eikelenberg's Westvriesland of 1714 has many '-d' forms, especially in the poem attached to the title-print (vald, poogd, verzeld, leerd, legd...), and Kempher uses '-d' in his translation of Prudentius in 1712, although in his dedicatory poem to Van Eikelenberg's book he uses '-dt' (see below).

Two grammars appeared in the second decade of the century using this system: Heugelenburg in 1719 (1st edition 1714) criticises those who use '-dt' and himself has such spellings as "behoord, diend, spoord". The other gramm...
that of De Vin in 1716, though he does not discuss the various usages. Examples from his work include "veranderd, reisd, zegd, leerd, wild". Two years later this system can be found in Ferdinad Loy's "Den Nieuwen Spiegel der Jonckheydt", a Southern school book whose first edition was in the previous century, "hy diend maar om t'onderwyzen..." etc.; this usage was thus not restricted entirely to the North.

In 1722 opposition to this system came from Tuinman: "Alleen die (werkwoorden), welker wortelletter een 'd' is, moeten met een 'd' besluiten, B.v. 'hy leid, by ryd' enz. van 'leiden, ryden', enz. maar geen andere. Dus mag men niet schryven 'gy bemind, by begeerd'" (Oud en Nieuw... No.106). He did not feel that the 'd' in "leerde" belonged to the word in the same way as in "ryden".

Such opposition did not have immediate effect however, and the '-d' forms continue to be common, being used for example by the playwrights Goeree, P.V., Haps, G.Tysens, P.de Morand and others; specifically - Haps in "Sophonisba" 1714, Tysens in "Klearchus" 1727, De Morand in "Childerik" 1738, and an anonymous play "Britannicus" modelled on Racine, in 1729. It is significant that although these plays have more or less identical spellings, they each have different publishers (and printers?), suggesting that the forms were far from restricted in acceptability or application.

Goeree, in the dedication to "Alcander" from earlier in the century (1707), felt little sympathy with the often violent arguments about spelling. Speaking of one of his characters he writes "Ik heb zyn taal vervormd, hy spreekt nu naar de kunst,/ Den Zangberg toegewyd: ja durft ten Schouwburg treeden:/ Dog wat bezwaard van tong, en met beschroomde schreden,/ Voor 't nestelige volk, zo vrugtbaar in onze eeuw,/ Dat om een Letterfeil, met haat by gezond, een vallen zal op't lyf, als of een stad wou zinken;/ Hier zal een 'De', of 'Den', niet wel in d'ooren klinken;/ Daar zal de Spelkonst niet geschroeid zijn op de leest,/ Van hun gefronst verstand, en kibbelende geest". There is actually nothing unusual about his usage, except perhaps for some this use of '-d'.

In the second quarter of this century the same system continues to be quite common. Apart from the playwrights included above, it is used by Van Steyn in his mathematical periodical, and by the prominent literary figure Onno van Haren. In "Willem I" for example he writes "Het hoog' en natte Veen ..." Is nog een
diep moeras, het geen den Vyand keerd/ En een veel heeter Zon, en drooger tyd
begeerd". This may be one way in which he "zondig(t) ...talkens tegen de
conventionele vormen in spelling" (De Vooy, Schets p.60), but it is hardly
uncommon or restricted to him. Van der Schelling uses identical forms in his
works of 1727 and 1746, possibly in emulation of his father in law Van Alkemade,
though it may also be a printer's spelling since other books from the same firm
(Ph.Losel) also show '-d' spellings.

In the middle years of the 18th century several grammars discuss this way
of spelling verb forms, though not all of them adopt it. Nor do those who did
use it always give their reasons for doing so. Hakvoord and Gelliers, in
contemporary editions, fall under the latter heading, but Van Belle (1743) is
one of the former: "Het zou reegelmatigst wezen, dat men die, welker voorleeden
Tyd, onder de gelijkvloeiende, noodwendig eene D vereisen, ook in den
tegenwoordigen Tyd ens. met een D, in plaats van T, aan 't einde spelde, als:
van 'vermaanen', 'gy, hy gyl. vermaand', ens. schoon ik zelf, om 's
tegenwoordigen gebruikswille, tòt die heele, of ligt maar halve, nieuwigheid
nòg niet kan overgaan". He therefore regards '-t' as the most common form at
that time, which indeed it was, but it is hardly accurate of him to call the
system even a "halve nieuwigheid"! Spellings of this type do not occur in this
work of his, as he says, though in his later Schets (1755) they are normal for
the first six pages: "speld, behoord" etc., but thereafter are replaced entirely
by '-t'. He does not discuss '-d' spellings in the Schets.

Grammars written for foreigners learning Dutch reflect this contemporary
usage. La Grue/Sewel (1716) has occasional irregular instances of '-d', which
are faithfully copied by Cuno in 1741. The Nouvelle Methode and the Spraakwyze
of Marin list in the paradigms "gy hy ontfangd, wandeld" in the 15th edition in
1751, and his dictionary includes such phrases as "Hy trouwd een ryke Hout-
koopster...", listed under "Houtkoper". In later editions of his grammar, e.g.
that of 1767, most paradigms are changed to '-t', though the conversations in
the second half of the book still show occasional '-d' forms even in the edition
of 1800, for example "Wat noemd men Repartitie?"; isolated '-d' forms persist
in the grammar, such as "gij hij schilderd" on p.97. La Grue/Sewel shows a
similar anomaly where in later editions '-d' was eliminated from the text of the
Halma's grammar (3rd edition 1787) shows a similar usage to that of Marin, e.g. "gy by bewaerd" on p.47, and indeed there are a great number of other similarities between these two books, not only in spelling but also in the layout and content, with extensive passages being almost identical. This is true to a large extent also of their dictionaries, and influence from the one on the other is certain. Marin's works were the more widely used, or at least had the most reprints. His dictionary may have been preferred to that of Halma by virtue of it giving Dutch-Dutch definitions as well as Dutch-French; his spelling system would therefore have a wider impact on the reading public.

Other grammars using this system in mid-century are Sinkel, Van Rhyn, Schütz, and the anonymous "Kern". The "Kunst..." grammar of 1770 knew and rejected the usage: "De 'd' niet maer de 't' gebruiken wij in de tweeden en derden persoon des enkelvouds".

Zeydelaar too was at first opposed to this system, preferring '-t', though his defence is far from clear: "de tweede en derde persoon des enkelvouds en de tweede persoon des meervouds der werkwoorden, vier eerste persoonen in 'n' of 'r' uitgaan, moeten met 't' geslooten worden" (p.113), giving "gij, hij bemint, verkeert, verzint, leert" etc. This would suggest that all those verbs whose stem ended in something other than 'n' or 'r' should have '-d', yet such forms are not frequently found in his book. Furthermore on the few occasions where they do occur they are also found for verbs whose stem ends in 'n' or 'r', e.g. "ontkend" on p.105, "gij keurd" p.10. It would seem then that his intention is to use '-t' in all verbs, but his formulation of the rule is at fault.

In his "Vervolg" of 1772 however, he revises his opinions, and now feels attracted to the '-d' spelling: "Hierdoor zoude de regelmaatigheid nog meer bevordert worden... Liefst egter houde ik mij, en zal men wel doen, zig te houden, aan de Spel en Schrijwijze, door mij op hét voetspoor van voornaamme Taalkëmmeren in mijne SPELKONST geleerd".

Ballieu, also writing in 1772, uses "leerd, noemd" etc., though his Byvoegsel of 1792 uses '-t'. Again in the same year Elizabeth Wolff's poem "De Menuet en de Dominées Pruik" includes such forms as "straald, gloeid, behoord", showing that the system was still in practical use outside
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the pages of grammars. In the next two years two Southern grammars were also
to use this system, those of Van Belleghem & Waterschoot (1773) and of Boterdael
in 1774. The former more frequently uses ' -t' however. The Northern "Nuttig
en Noodig-speldboekje" of 1775 similarly has this system ("speld" etc.).

Janssens abides by the ' -t' system in his Spelkonste of 1775, but in his
later Grammar of the Dutch language, for English readers, he writes: "the third
person singular in the present of the indicative takes ... 'd' or 't'" (my
emphasis), though he seems no longer to show any preference for the ' -t' as the
book uses only ' -d' forms: "groeyd, kraeyd, bemind, regend, behoefd, betaamd"
etc.. No paradigms as such are given in the editions of 1792 and 1798, but
those in the revised "Practical Grammar" (1803) give ' -d' for the 2nd and 3rd
persons singular and 2nd person plural.

It is probable that Janssens was influenced here by Halma, as in the
English works he writes: "Ik heb Halma's spelling gevolgd, van den jaare 1791,
dewelke de eenigste is, aanvaard by de beste hedendaagse schrijveren". The
use of ' -d' may be part of this. No work of Halma's dating from 1791 has been
traced however, - it may be a late print of his dictionary or of his grammar.
It may also be a misprint for "1719" the date of the first edition of Halma's
Dutch-French dictionary, though the entry "1791" is not corrected in the later
editions of Janssens. Alternatively he may have meant a dictionary based on
Halma, such as that of Winkelman, considering it essentially a continuation of
the former's work. This latter supposition is born out by a review of Janssen's
own dictionary in the Monthly Review (vol.15,217) in 1808, where the reviewer
writes that he had "some assistance from the Woorden boek der Nederduitsche en
Fransche Ysalen (sic) of Francis Halma ... and still more from the Large
Low-Dutch and English Dictionary of 1791, which has Halma's collection of words
for its basis" (this reviewer incidentally is dubious about the merits of any
Dutch dictionary.- "It is surely more desirable that the Low-Dutch should sink
into a provincial jargon, and gradually disappear, than that it should be polished
into a classical language").. This latter work has also not been traced.

Another dictionary at the end of this century to use ' -d' is Wilcocke,
departing from the usage found in his model Sewel (e.g. "kend" on p.xiv). Earlier
on the same system is used by Dea Pepliers in 1777, and by Brender à Brandis in
his Kabinet (1731-36).

Even in the 18th century this system was by no means dead. One of the most persistent examples is in the verb forms "leyd, zeyd", formed on the past tense forms "leyden, zeyden". Von Moerbeek in his Sprachlehre (1804) has ' -d' only in "zegd" (p.195), but had earlier referred to such a usage in his revision of Kramer's grammar in 1774. When discussing the use of the letter 'Y' he mentions its occurrence in "leyd, zeyd" &c anstatt 'legt, zegt'&c" (p.119). It is not made clear why "zegt" needs ' -t' but "zeyd" can have ' -d'; for, as mentioned above, he uses "zegd" in his own work. It is clear however that he feels "zegt, legt" to be the normal forms, and this is born out by other usage in the book.

Van Daele became the last to actively encourage the use of ' -d' when he wrote that "Den grooten regel ... is desen: dat alle woorden, de welke éniger wyse verlangd wordende in de laetste lettergrep eene 'd' noodsaekelyk vereysschen, de 'd' behouden niet verlangd synde, en vervolgens met 'd' eyndigen" (No.28/9). This rule also covers nouns, participles and ' -d' stem verbs.

An extremely late instance of this spelling is to be seen in the grammar by Van Hasendonck, printed in London in 1814, 1823,—well after the introduction of the Siegenbeek system in the North. It is possible that his Southern education at the University of Leuven, in rejecting the Siegenbeek system, encouraged this usage in his book. He only actually discusses ' -d' stem and ' -t' stem verbs ("vinden, groeten"), but uses ' -d' regularly in all relevant weak verbs, such as "zy wandeld, de jongen speeld, Pieter woond in Amsterdam, hij zeild in de Theems, het lezen verheugd den geest, het regend, hageld, sneeuwd, dooid, blixemd, waaid" etc.. That this was still a living system for the writer (/printer?) is shown by the fact that several of these examples are in phrases added in the second edition, not being present in the 1814 edition. On the other hand many ' -d' forms in the first editions became ' -t' in the second edition.

Just how much this system was still current in the South is difficult to say; if it were not common then English users of Van Hasendonck's grammar would certainly have had a mixed reception in the Netherlands, especially, in this respect, since the 1814 edition consulted bears the imprint of the British Foreign Office! It may not be without significance that Wilcocke's dictionary which also uses ' -d' came from the same printer as Van Hasendonck. Their usages
have other elements in common also, see for example "lachgen" in chap. 4. In
this light it is possible that the isolated occurrence of such a form in a letter
by J F Willems ("vergund" in letter No. 124 of "Brieven"), is intentional, though
the writer does not normally use such forms. It could just as easily be an
error or a slip of the pen. Behaegel certainly still knew of such forms in
1817: "Schryft niet 'by leefD heden nog', ens.; schoön men zegt 'zy leefDen nog
over eenige dagen" (II. 337).

After the introduction of the Siegenbeek system in the North, and of the
Commission system in the South, the system involving the use of 'd' died out,
though it had been moribund since the latter half of the previous century.

Non '-d' stem verbs: '-d' in strong verbs, e.g. "hij neemd".

In view of the arguments put forward by various grammarians mentioned in
the previous section to the effect that "leerd" was used because of the past
tense form "leerde", it would seem illogical to find them using a '-d' spelling
in strong verbs. However this argument was not the only reason for using a
'-d' system, as the very occurrence of such forms as "gasd, schijnd, vlied"
shows.

Even in Middle Dutch such forms can be found, "staed" for example in the
texts published by Obreen & Van Loey, and "sijngd, crijghd, vaerd, comd, doed,
ontvliedghd, ghy songhd" in De Castelein. And in these examples, especially
the last, is the clue. Here there can be no call on either analogy or
gelijkvormigheid, neither of which could explain '-d' in "ghy songhd", but
rather a call upon phonetics: whenever the inflexional '-t' followed a voiced
sound, be it a vowel or a voiced consonant, it was spelt '-d'. Since this is
found to be quite regularly so, there must have been some trace of voicing in
the final consonants, otherwise there would be no tendency to reflect it in
this way in the spelling. In such other forms as "schrijfd" the 'f' may have
represented /v/, just as it still does in "leefde", and this form may have
causd the anomalous "besefd"; both "schrijfd" and "besefd" can be found in
De Castelein p. 33.

Support for this theory, is the parallel spelling of the proclitic neuter
article. Normally spelt 't-' before an unvoiced consonant, it is very often
found spelt 'd-' before voiced consonants, regardless thus of any demands of
grammar or analogy. Examples include "dleven, ind duutsch land" in De Castelein,
and "dword" in the Boecius translation.

It is thus possible, though uncommon, that a strong verb whose stem ends
in a voiced consonant or vowel can be found with '-d'. Very rarely indeed is
'-d' found after an unvoiced consonant, as in the case of "besefd" mentioned
above, and of "werpd" in Obreen & Van Loey. These forms are probably due to
analogy with the more regular '-d' forms,—the feeling that '-d' represented
/t/ in any word, or even that ' -d' was the normal verb ending,—or as a
hypercorrectism (cf hypercorrect ' -d' in nouns in chapter 5). This system with
'-d' in strong verbs is actually very closely related to that with '-d' in weak
verbs, for whereas the usual argument given was that '-d' was used because of
'-de' in the imperfect, this is in itself the same phonetic rule, since '-de'
is only used in the imperfect after a voiced consonant. It is possible that
the formulation of the "leerde;leerd" rule was a case of 'hineininterpretierung':
given the presence of the form "leerd" some grammarians deduced that it was due
to "leerde". Certainly no grammar ever defended the use of '-d' in strong verbs
until a very late date, nor formulated a rule which would allow their use.
The first to formulate this rule for weak verbs was Van der Schuere, but the
forms, in both weak and strong verbs, predate his book by over 150 years. The
result of the formulation of the accepted rule was that as the strong verbs had
no forms with '-de' to give support, the use of '-d' in their present tense
died out fairly quickly.

The earliest grammarian to use this spelling was Lambrecht in his
Nederlandsche Spellijnghe: alongside the wak verbs "kend, behoard; maact" are
the strong verbs "comd, gaad, slaad: crijght, vraaght"—Lambrecht evidently
regards the 'gh' as unvoiced. De Castelein on the other hand had spelt "vlieghd",
implying voicing, and Van der Ghucht uses similar forms such as "ghij mueghd".
Even Van der Schuere uses these forms, despite his rule given earlier that '-d'
should be used "daermen (d) in 't verlangen steld". Thus he uses "begind, vald"
(p.29,26), and on p.16 deliberately uses such a form when he writes that "achter
de klank-Letteren laet (de d) noch wel voor haer kommen de me-klank-Letteren
'f,g,l,m,n,r' als: 'thoofd, buygd...'' He does not, however, use '-d' after
vowels ("staet, doet") or in "komet" which regularly has 't'. This latter probably indicated a pronunciation with an intrusive /p/, often spelt "kompt"; a spelling "komd" conversely probably precludes such a pronunciation.

This system continued in use, albeit limited, for several decades: "begind" can be found in Starter's "Inleydingh tot vreughd en gesang" I.37; "Waarom begind ghy maeghden niet...", although two lines later he uses the more normal "begint". The same example is also to be found in Van Gherven, and both writers use other forms such as "betoond, belangd". Although by its very nature the 'd' system is only found amongst those writers who use 'd' in weak verbs, the converse does not hold, and many users of 'd' in weak verbs did not use 'd' in strong verbs. There are also those who used 'd' after voiced consonants in strong verbs, but not after vowels. Plemp is like Van der Schuere in this respect, and both differ from Lambrecht and De Castelein; examples from his work include "dringd, slaet". Krul (1640) also uses 'd' in such as "gaed".

Later in the century this usage is not at all as common as earlier, though even then it was a minority system. Nor is it as common as the weak verb 'd' spelling (see above). This may be due to a fairly large extent to the acceptance of Van der Schuere's formulation of the rule, with its implicit restriction to weak verbs. "Schynd" can be found in Plemp and, probably as a setter's spelling, in Pels's Voorrede of 1677. In a few works these forms are more standard: Heugelenburg uses "brengd" in his poems of 1682, and Katheryne Lescaultje uses "doed" in the dedicatory poem of 1685, quoted in chapter 2 above. The 'd' in "doed" could also be influenced by "deed" via "deed", though such a call on gelijkvormigheid seems remote; "ziet" however she spells with 't', so that this influence cannot be ruled out.

This system is found rigorously applied by Duikerius, both in his Voorbeeldzels of 1693 and in his Schouburgh of 1696. In the former can be found "dryfd, gseeft, komet, staad", and even "gij hebd" (p.456), and the yet more extreme form seen in "Wasted Myn Heere dat wy beide broeders zyn?" (p.576); in the latter work are such as "brengd, schrijfd" (p.33). Leydekker has much the same usage: in his "Synode" of 1705 can be found "doed, bedriegd, gy saagd" (the latter on p.241), and similarly in his "Philosophiën Duyvel" of 1692, including an example similar to Duikerius's, namely "UE hebd"; this is possibly
a relatively common spelling,—see the section on 'dt' below.

Criticism of such spellings came in 1691 from Sewel, who put them on a par with the hypercorrect forms such as "schood" for "schoot" (see chap. 5). In his grammar of 1706 he more accurately puts it together with "hemind" etc., His condemnation of such did not have complete success however, and the forms can still be found. Van Yk spells "drijvd, schijnd, geevd" in 1697, though "heeft" has 't' since it had no related form with 'v'. The spelling "heefd" or "heevd" has not in fact been seen in any of these writers, though "leevd, geevd" and even "hoovd" are not rare.

Van Alkemade's spelling system in his Munten, which shares many features with that of Van Yk (and is from the same printer, see chap. 7), does not use 'd', but they are to be found in his edition of Melis Stoke (from a different printer),—"schijnd" alongside "streefd". Pars too, again with many similarities to the usage of Van Alkemade and Van Yk (chaps. 7, 11, 13), uses "geevd, schijnd" (but "heeft, gaat") in his Index Batavicus of 1701. The friend of Pars and son-in-law of Van Alkemade P. van der Schelling, uses similar forms, though his writings appear much later, e.g. "schymd" in the Tiendregt of 1727, alongside "geevd" with 't'.

Although, as noted above, this form when used in Middle Dutch may be considered analogous to the use of 'd-' as a variant of the neuter definite article, the phonetic spellings "schijnd, begind, vald" etc. survived to a very much later date, as the force of analogy had already caused the article to be consistently spelt 't-' in all cases by the beginning of the 17th century. The 'd' in strong verbs was to continue for much longer yet, and lasted almost as long as 'd' in weak verbs, though by no means all users of the latter system used these forms. For the reasons stated earlier it would be most accurate to regard the use of 'd' in strong verbs and that in weak verbs as the same phenomenon.

One of the only two grammarians of the 18th century to apply this phonetic spelling was Adriaan de Vin in 1716, who based his usage "meest op de klank en uitspraak der woorden". This leads him to use "blijvd, schrijvd, vergeevd, draagd, neemd", alongside "grijpt, leest"—after an unvoiced consonant 't' is required.
But much more significant is the possibly unique comment from Van Geesdalle in 1700: "Den tweeden persoon ... maekt sich ook van t’Oneydig met te veranderen ‘en’ in ’d’ oft in ’t’. In ’t’ indien de consonans voren de ’en’ van t’Oneydig, is ’ch, ff, k, sch, p’ oft ’ff’ (= ’ss’) ... Maer in ’d’, als het eenige andere letter is” (p.191), covering such as “wandeld, praemd, leesd, veranderd”. He uses ‘d’ after the single ‘f’ and ‘s’ (cf. “leesd” above and his specification of double ‘ff,ss’ before ‘t’): “men vind noyt ’v’ an t’eynder der woorden in het Vlaensch ... van ’Leven, schrijven, blijven, loven’ maekt-men ’Leefd, schrijfd, blijfd, loofd’”. There is no mention of the argument that ‘d’ is used because of the imperfect tense form, as this would clearly not cover what Van Geesdalle considers the correct forms.

After Van Geesdalle and De Vin such spellings get progressively more rare. They figure without explanation in Marin (see "gy ontfangd" above). Zeydelaar had encountered them, and disapproved of them in his Vervolg, 1772 p.168, where he refers to the "ridiculous" spelling "doed" in an earlier translation of John Bell's travel tales. An isolated example can also be found in Wolff & Deken, in the work mentioned above: "Elk vliegd op Tirsis wenk", alongside "straald, gloeid; verschynt, beveelt" etc.

One of the last occurrences of ‘-d’ in strong verbs is in the grammar of Janson (Janssens) in 1792, e.g. "gy, hy vaerd, het vriesd, hy schryfd, verdwynd". He, however, did not do this on merely phonetic grounds, but had his own reasons. Following the example set by Verpoorten, who had proposed replacing all strong verbs by a system of regular weak forms, he gives past tenses with ‘-de/-te’ for nearly all strong verbs: "As the irregularities of the Dutch verbs only fall upon the past tenses and participles passive, all other tenses being regular,... I have only given those tenses". He now gives a detailed list, giving for each verb weak and strong forms, and sometimes also variants of the strong form, including the following: "ontfangde, vangde, hangde, druipte, kruipte, buigde, bekyfde, dryfde, schryfde, verkrygde, kykte, derfde, loopte/liep, hoopte/hiep, beginde, drinkte, zingde, bedriegde, vliegde, geefde, denkte" etc.; only for "gaan, slaan, staan, koemen, spreken, lacchen" and the auxiliaries does he give no weak form (he gives only "Ik loeg"!). Thus as far as his system was concerned all these verbs were, or could be, weak, and could thus conform with his weak
And here there may be a clue to some at least of the anomalous usages noted above, especially where '-d' was only used in a single instance in a strong verb (e.g. in Wolff & Deken), for many of the abnormal forms listed by Janson, both his weak forms for strong verbs, and the many variants of strong imperfect tenses, e.g. "ving, vong", do occur in certain dialects. It is possible that Janson was also trying to give a complete list of all the variants which the traveller, using his grammar, might encounter and thus be able to recognise. (It is open to doubt however if he was wise in presenting such a complicated picture of the Dutch language to English readers just embarking upon their studies!)

Most of these abnormal imperfect tense forms are the result of analogising tendencies, as happens in all languages, especially in less educated circles where the term "irregular verb" may well be unheard of (n.b. this does not imply that such forms are intrinsically inferior, - a great many become standard, cf. "dolf/dolde, joeg/jaagde, molk/melkte", English "dived"/American "dove" etc.). The existence of a less-normal weak imperfect tense form may have caused some of the instances of '-d' in normally strong verbs mentioned above, just as it did for Janson, though by no means all can be explained in this way, and phonetic motivation, as formulated by Van Geesdalle, must be basic.

For example the isolated "vliegd" in Wolff & Deken corresponds to "vliegde" listed by Janson, and the WNT comments that "een zwakke vervoeging, die eenmaal is aangetroffen (Ribadeneira & Roswyde. Gen. Legende (1665 5th edition)) moet wel als een anomalie beschouwd worden". It seems possible that rather than being an isolated anomaly, a weak conjugation was merely avoided in written works, but continued in oral use; it may then have been known to the setters of Wolff & Deken’s poem. The fact that Janson lists "vliegde" does not of itself imply that he had ever seen such a form, but neither does it rule this out.

Other verbs too have (had) less common weak forms: "De zwakke vervoeging (van schijnen), die in het Mnl(uits) niet zeldzaam is, is in het Mnl(ands) slechts zeer zelden ... gevonden" (Verwijs/Verdam). Examples are then given from Middle Dutch, and the WNT supplies further instances, both of "schijnde" and "schijnd" from the 16th century. "Dringen" has been known in a weak form as
a causative: "Wach hem, die in hem nooyt dringde dleven". For the verb form "begind" the alternative past tense "begonde" may have caused the '-d'; "verdwijnde, bedriegde" are both known in Middle Dutch (Gest. Rom. 6d, & "Ned. Froza" ed. Van Vloten, No. 32 respectively), and "vaerde" in known in Parthonopeus, in Plantijn, and also in modern dialects, notably West Flemish (cf. a dialect piece containing this form in the Ned. Spectator 9.10, 1733), see W.N.T. and Verwijs/Verdam. Van Helten records "blijcte, verdwijnde, scijnde, stijchde, strijde" et al., and such forms as "buigde", common in the 15th and 16th centuries, are discussed by Lubach in his work on 16th century verb forms (e.g. 810). The "Grammaire plus exacte" of 1701 gives "blaesde, slaepete". None of these existing forms however, can explain on their own the consistent use of '-d' in strong verbs ending in a voiced consonant by writers who show no tendency to use such analogically produced wak imperfect tense forms, though occasionally this influence may well account for some of the forms found.

It must be noted also that the references above to a "voiced consonant" do not apply solely to the spelling, but also to the pronunciation; this explains the use of '-d' after '-f' or '-s', as in "schrijfd, drijfd, leesd, vriesd", where the spelling is influenced by the unwillingness to put 'v' or 'z' at the end of a syllable (see chap. 7 & 11). These examples cannot then be counted as true instances of '-d' after unvoiced consonants, as was the case with "werpd" mentioned earlier. It is also possible that the longer forms "gevet, lezet" may have played a part in this use of '-d', in emphasizing the voiced quality of the consonant.

Non '-d' stem verbs: '-dt' in weak verbs, e.g. "hij leerdt".

The use of '-dt' in these cases is exactly analogous to the use of '-d' described above, except that the writer in question adds the phonetic '-t', just as occurred in nouns, e.g. "hand/handt". This is less common after the mid 17th century, as the '-dt' noun spelling also died out.

In Middle Dutch such forms as "hantierdt, meendt, wildt" can be found, and the Soecius translation sometimes uses such forms as "schoucit" from "schouwen". De Castelein uses similar forms (e.g. "speeldt") alongside his normal '-d' spellings, as does Coornhert's Voorreden of 1568 ("beindt"). Very often such
forms may be by analogy with "vindt, verbindt" etc (see below), and sometimes contractions from '−det'. Van der Noot uses these spellings occasionally, e.g. "behaeghdt", rhyming with "maeghdt, onversaeghdt" (possibly for visual rhyme, he normally uses '−t' in verbs). Boetius à Bolswert often uses "bemindt" (e.g. p.146), and the Dutch Scholemaster also uses "condt". De Ruyter in his rather old-fashioned usage has many such forms, such as "wondt (= woont), dyendt". In Van den Ende's Schatkamer the form "noemdt" appears alongside "behoord", "Bemindt" and "bepeeldt" also appear in the text of Hexham's grammar, though not in the verb paradigms. "Volgdt" is to be found in a poem by Asselyn in Klioos Kraam (ed. Rintjus 1656-7) I,321, though "volgt" is more normal (ibid, p.322).

Van Engelen, in his translation of Guarini (c.1650) makes widespread use of 'dt' forms, e.g. "ghy kondt, vlamdt" etc.

This usage, as mentioned, fell into disuse along with the general decline of '−dt' for '−d'. Winschooten rejected such a usage in 1683, but sporadic examples of '−dt' can still be found throughout the 18th century. In the dedicatory poem to Van Eikelenberg's West Vriesland of 1714, Kempher wrote: "Daar Hollandt U met eerbiedt noemdt ..." as one line of many to show '−dt' forms in both nouns and verbs. Van Eikelenberg himself occasionally uses these forms, e.g. "U wildt", but they are exceptional.

It was mentioned earlier that Onno van Haren used a '−d' spelling in his book "Willem I", his brother Willem employed the same system in his "Leonidas", though sometimes a '−dt' spelling crept in, both for the verbs under discussion here and for '−d' stem verbs, e.g. "Gaet, hoedt uw Vec, bebouwt uwe Akkers en Waranden,/ En deeldt niet meer in 't hoog Bestier". An isolated example can also be found in a letter by Staring of 1775, along with other odd spellings (e.g. "oppasschen, desselvs, braaff"): "De bijzondere liefde ... welk mijn waarde Oom mij geliefd te bewijzen, contribueerdt niet weinig ter mijner Vergenoeging".

Non '−d' stem verbs: '−dt' in strong verbs, e.g. "hij begindt"

Just as '−d' can be found after a voiced consonant in strong verbs where there is no question of gelijkvormigheid, so too can '−dt' be found. Middle Dutch texts yield such examples as "vaerdt", and Coornhert sometimes uses "begindt". Van der Noot's work includes "ghy maeghdt", cf. "behaeghdt" above.
and Van der Ghucht's "ghij mueghd". Van Engelen too uses such forms, e.g. on p.58 "ghy hebdt", as does De Ruyter with "valdt" etc.. Any system involving the use of '-dt' instead of final '-d' together with the system which yielded the '-d' in strong verbs described above, will automatically produce '-dt' in strong verbs, and it is not to be confused with '-dt' in '-d' stem verbs (q.v.).

The use of "gy hebd" by Duikerius and Leydekker, mentioned in an earlier section, is possibly also heavily influenced by the form "hebdy", though not all users of the latter use "hebd" (Van der Werve for example uses "gy hebt, hebdy"); but whereas this is in a way understandable, the use of "hebdt" is less so, since it has no form "hebdty" to call upon.

It is not unknown for hyperapplication of these rules to occur, and to find '-dt' used where the stem actually ends in '-t'; the writers had become so accustomed to writing '-dt' for /w/ in such words as "handt", that they used it for all final /w/ sounds. It became in effect a mere spelling variant for 't'. The Boecius translation of 1485, on p.clvii aa.2 uses "spruudt" as a part of "spruiten", and De Castelein's work includes the line "Eedt, driijnkt, speeldt (seyd hy) wild in vreugden baden" on p.134. This line is remarkable as it shows four different systems: '-t' after an unvoiced consonant (drijnkt), a phonetic or gelijkvormigheid '-d' after a voiced consonant (wild, seyd, - of "wilde, seyde"), '-dt' in the same position (speeldt), and a hypercorrectism ("sedt" from "sten")!

A similar hypercorrect spelling can be found in the Dutch Schoolmaster, with "sidt" as the imperative of "zitten"; the same book exhibits other hypercorrect spellings, e.g. "hed" described in chapter 5, and the two tendencies are not unrelated.

Non '-d' stems: '-t' in both strong and weak verbs, e.g. "hij leert, begint".

For those users who felt morphological analogy to be a stronger force than gelijkvormigheid, the question of using '-d' in verbs never arose; they used the standard "kenletter" or "merkletter" (i.e. the "ending") '-t' in all cases. This applied also to the phonetic spellers who never used '-d' even in nouns. This system is by far the most common throughout the period of written Dutch, although it was seriously rivalled by '-d' in weak verbs in the late 17th and early 18th century. De Vin even considered '-d' the normal, '-t' the old-
fashioned form: This system must also be one of the least documented, as almost all grammarians who used it felt the use of 't' to be so obvious and self-evident that it merited no discussion. When dealing with verb forms, the usual practice was to give the conjugation tables without any comment on the formation rules. The sole exception to this is for verbs whose stem ended in 'd', which were frequently the subject of fierce debate (see following sections). As is so often the case it is only those writers whose usage was at variance with the standard "gebruik" who felt the need to defend their system.

One of the very few to discuss this standard system was De Haute in 1581, and he only does so in order to reject the 'd' forms: "Ic gebruike in d'etinde der voorz. woorden ('hoort/hoord' etc.) liever 't' dan 'd'". This was on the phonetic grounds that /t/ was heard there, as in the nouns "woort, got" etc. Users of this system comprise in effect almost all the grammarians not mentioned in previous sections, Sexagius, Meurier, Plantijn, Kilian, Van Heule, Dafforne, De Hubert, the Bible Translators, Leupenius, Sewel, Van Helderen, Hilarides, Nyloff, Verwer, Niervaert etc. etc. Even Moonen van find little to add: "Het de T spelt men ... in de werkwoorden den tweeden persoon in het meervoudige getal der gebiedende Wyze, als 'Nemt, geef, leeft, hoort, zingt' &c als afgeleidt van de Wortelwoorden, de tweede persoonen in het Eenvoudige Getal, 'Neem, geef, leef, hoor' &c. De T is ook de merkletter en nootwendigh in het spellen der tweede persoonsen van beider Getallen der Aentooneende Wyze, en des derden persoons in het Eenvoudige Getal; als 'Gy, Hy, Nemt, geef, leeft, hoort, zingt' &c ". Thus for him the forces of analogy demand the use of the same letter in the same function, i.e. always 't' regardless of gelijkvormigheid or phonetics. This 't' he regards as the "merkletter", -a term he translates in imitation of his model Schottelius from the classical grammar term "littera caracteristica".

E.C.P. and Ten Kate follow the same system, as does Huydecoper. When the latter is discussing Vondel's spellings "Briet, zoode, kleet, verkeert" (I, 270 & 278), he adds: "Devryl onze gedachten hier ter plaatse gevallen zyn op deze driërlei Spellinge van D, T, en DT, willen wy onze Anmerkingen, hierontrent voorlang gemaakt, en by ons in gebruik, den Liefhebberen mededeelen, en redenen der zelve geeven. Staat dan by my vast, dat de tweede en derde persoon van den
Tegenwoordigen tyd der Aantoonende wyze, in het eenvoudig getal, altyd met eene T beslooten wordt; als GY, en HY 'verkeert, bemint, bindt' enz.". He then (p.34) refers to these rules in Moonen, and as applied by some writers (see below). He also finds this spelling useful in that readers then "noit behoeven te twyffelen, of het een deelwoord, of de derde persoon der aantoonende wyze is. Men schryve dan 'hy verkeert', maar 'hy is verkeerd'; 'zy bemint', maar 'zy wordt bemind'". This distinction would seem to some a little superfluous, but was often put forward.

The "Aanmerkingen" he refers to here are not those contained in his defence of Corneile of 1722, since he does not discuss the use of '-d(t)' in this work ('-sch' is the only spelling question raised, see chap.13). He is actually referring to the private unpublished notes which he had been compiling over the years, and which he apparently showed to those interested. He writes in the introduction to the Proeve (p.xxviii): "Uit vele Aanmerkingen, die wy voorlang, over onze Moederlyke Taale en Vaderlyke Dichtkonst, by ons zelf gemaakt, doch voor 't grootste gedeelte noch noit op 't papier gebracht hadden, dachten wy 'er eenige weinigen te voegen achter deez' nieuwe druk"; the last phrase seems to apply to the new book - i.e. the Proeve - rather than a new print of an existing book.

Van Belle's comments on these spellings, where he feels inclined to use '-d' but actually uses '-t', have been given above. Des Roches and De Haes do not discuss their usage apart from in '-d' stem verbs, but use '-t' in all other verbs, as do Elzevier, Verpoorten, Bircken, Zeydelaar, the Kunst grammar (see above) and many others. As mentioned in the previous section Zeydelaar actually defines his usage as '-dt' in '-d' stem verbs and '-t' after 'n' or 'r'; all other verbs he leaves undiscussed, but uses in then the standard '-t' ending.

Van Belleghem & Waterschoot use '-t', as does Janssens in his Spelkonste of 1775, though not in his works published in England (see above, under "leerd" and "begind"). The anonymous Letterschik of 1775 and the Inlayding of 1735, Stijl, Pietersen, Kluit, Bolhuis, the various Nut works, Terbruggen, Behaegel, and later works all use '-t' spellings only for these verbs, a system which was then adopted as normal by both Siegenbeek in the North and the Commission in the South. Thereafter this usage has not been contested.
"-d' stem verbs, strong or weak, e.g. "vinden, worden; geschieden, melden"

Middle Dutch to c.1350

In contrast to the previous section, the situation for verbs such as "vinden, worden" is probably the most discussed in the development of verbal spelling, though even here a great many grammars simply give the forms chosen by them, without any explanation of defence. Again three systems have been in use, representable by "hij vind, hij vint, hij vindt", but unlike such spellings as "hij leerd, leert, leerdt", all three alternatives have been more equally common, with this time the '-t' spelling as the least widely used. All three forms have existed since Middle Dutch, and all three still have their supporters.

The use of '-d'; '-t' or '-dt' in these verbs bears on the whole little relationship with the use of '-d', '-t' or '-dt' in weak verbs and nouns, except that the users of '-t' in nouns (hant, woort) very often had '-t' in the '-d' stem verbs (vint, wort) as well as in the weak verbs (leert, speelt), though of course the converse does not hold true. Users of '-d' in weak verbs very often used '-d' in '-d' stem verbs (leerd; vind), as both forms are the result of gelijkvormigheid motivations, though once more the converse does not always hold, and users of "hij vind" do not necessarily use "hij leerd".

'-t', e.g. "hij vint, wort, het geschiet"

This is chronologically the first to appear. Just as, before the introduction of gelijkvormigheid to nouns, the '-d' of the einfllected forms "handen, woorden" was ignored in "hant, woort", so too the verb forms were spelt just as they sounded - "hij vint, wort"; thus "vint/vinden" forms a parallel to "hant/handen". This is the standard form in Middle Dutch, and is quoted by De Vooys (Spraakkunst, 33) as being very common in the 16th century and even in the 17th century. This actually understates the case since the forms were still very common up to the mid 17th century.

In early books such forms can be found in the Exercitium and in the Boeckius translation, though the latter also uses '-dt'. In the 16th century '-t' is used as the normal form by Van der Werve, Van Beaumont, Van der Ghucht, Sesbout, De Heuiter, Valcoogh, and the Twe-Spraack, though the first two also use '-dt'. Van der Ghucht also uses '-d', and the Twe-Spraack uses all three. De Heuiter is the only one of these to discuss such a usage, and rejects all '-dt'
spellings, e.g. "'Godt', wat douter 't' of 'd'?" - one of them is superfluous; as mentioned above he prefers 't' in all cases.

In the early 17th century this system continues to be in common use, for example by Stevin (wort, strijt), Hooft (daest, zent, in Achilles), Van Santen (lijt, vint), Revius (vint), and Cats (vint, wort). Van Heule, in both his grammars, merely uses the forms without discussion, e.g. "Men mint, men zeyt, Net wort gezeeyt, Het wort gelooft" (1633, p.31, cf "men lijd" 1625 p.41).

Dafforne uses "wert" (present tense), but also "vindet, behoudse". Montanus however is quite regular in his "wort, gaeheiet" spellings, in accordance with his strict phonetic system which demands 't' as final consonant wherever /t/ is heard.

The use of 't' in past tenses of strong verbs seems, for some reason, to have been less common; '-d' is the normal form in "ik had, ik stond" etc. even for many of those who use 't' in the present tense, e.g. "ik wort". This is true for example of Van Heule, for whereas "gy hat, gy had" both appear on p.53 of the 1625 edition subsequent examples show this to be a misprint, and that "had" is his normal form. This preference for '-d' in the past tenses may have been influenced by the longer forms "ik hadde, gy haddet, hy hadde" etc., which Van Heule adopts in the 1633 edition of his grammar (p.88, cf "wort" p.33).

Vondel's system was varied. Until about 1644 his usage wavered between "wort, word, wordt", but after this date settled down to '-dt' after a short vowel (redt), but 't' after a long vowel or 'r' (wort),- the same system as he adopted for nouns. Huydecoper was later very critical of this practice (I, notes on verses 270,273): "'Briet' en 'zoodt', daar de D zo weinig in 'briedt' als in 'zoodt' mag worden vergesten. ... 'bindt', doch niet 'bint' omdatmen in den eersten persoon zegt ... 'ik bind'. ... Ik verwerp echter de uitspraak niet, integendeel derf ik haar, ... tot getuigen van myn gevoelen aanhaalen. Want, vooreerst, wat den Eersten en Derden persoon belangt, daarin beweer ik datmen behoor te schryven, by voorbeeld, 'ik vind 'er geen', en 'hy vindt 'er geen': en dat leert ook de uitspraak, dewyl dit uitgesproken wordt alsof 'er stonit 'ik vinder geen', en 'hy vinter geen". Further he says that the '-d' is often omitted in the 1st person ("ik ry, ik laa" from "ryden, laden"), but never from the 3rd person ("hy rydt, lasdt"). This justifies his use of '-d' in the
1st person and 'dt' in the third. It must be born in mind however that when Huydecoper was writing this, the 't' spelling in these verbs was all but extinct, and it is somewhat unfair of him to criticise Vondel for not using 13th century spellings.

In Vondel's own time the 't' was still common, and is used for example by Brune, Croon, De Decker and Luyken, though few use it consistently, and in the latter two its use is exceptional. This system can also be found in the grammatical works of Meijer (also 'dt' in the early editions), Beyer (following Van Heule) and Van Helderens. An interesting facet of many of these exceptional uses is that 'dt' was used for all words except 'wort', which often has an anomalous 't' spelling. This is true for example of De Decker, and also for Nil Volentibus's Verhandeling (braadt: wort). There is little apparent reason for this, apart from the extreme commonness of the parts of "worden" compared to other '-d' stem verbs, though these include many other common words such as "vinden, houden". It also seems that after the early 17th century, i.e. when gelijkvormigheid began to undermine the earlier phonetic system, the verbs with a vowel before the 'd' (houden, glijden, raden, etc.) showed most tendency to use 'dt' in preference to 't' (or '-d'). Thus such forms as "glijt, snijt, hout" are much less common in this period than such as "vint, wort".

Hillenius recognised all three alternative in 1664: "'t' and 'd' are ... often written in the end of words ... as ... 'wort, word, wordt'". The 't' system continued to be used by a few, e.g. Kuyper, even until the beginning of the next century. Van Hoogstraten uses them in his gender-list, and they often figure in the 2nd edition of Nyloë (his first edition favours 'dt', cf. chap.5). Hilarides uses 't' consistently both in his Taalgronden of 1705 and his literary works such as his Phaedrus translation of 1695.

Use of 't' in '-d' stem verbs rapidly died out after the 1720's, though it can still be found in Poot (1722): "wort, vint: bidt, zoudt, houdt, voedt", with 'dt' after a vowel. Schermer (1725) uses "wort" alongside "redt", though his spelling is very irregular, especially in the "Oude Gedichten". Soon after this these spellings became very rare as living forms, and died out until their resurrection in the 19th century (see below).
Users of this system justified the simple 'tj' with a call on gelijkvormigheid, but reject the forces of analogy. Because 'tj' was used in nouns by virtue of the 't' in "handen, landen" etc., giving "hand, land", the same line of reasoning gave "vind, word" from "vinden, worden". And just as they rejected the use of 'dtj' in nouns, they also avoided this spelling in verbs, one letter being superfluous and the 'tj' taking precedence. The argument for 'tj' by analogy with "speelt, leert" etc., was either ignored or felt to be of lesser importance.

At about the same time as 'tj' forms in nouns and weak verbs ("leerd" etc.) began to appear, spellings of the type "hij word, snijd" can be found, for example in Obreen & Van Loey No.3;3,4,5,11. And thereafter many of the people listed above as using 'tj' in the present tense of weak verbs can be found with 'tj' also in 'tj' stem verbs, both weak and strong, e.g. in Lambrecht, Van der Ghucht, the Twe-spraak, Van der Schuere, Starter, Van Gherwen, Ampzing. For Van der Schuere this case ("beduyd ... beduyden") was the same as "slaerd ... slaesde" and "goed ... goede" (p.16), and he uses these 'tj' forms in all singular persons: "ik word, het geschied" etc. De Hubert on the other hand uses such forms as "het beduid, het word" despite using 'tj' in weak verbs; it was for him thus more a matter of avoiding 'dtj' than pure gelijkvormigheid.

The use of the 'tj' spelling continued, for example in Stalpaert van der Wiele (who also used the "leerd" system), though he often had 'dtj' after a vowel, as in "ghy raedt" and the poem "Rijdt Ridder, rijdt Sint Jorris...". Usage in Hooft's Waernemingen which may safely be regarded as his own, is far from regular: most 'tj' stem verbs have 'dtj', but whereas 'tj' spellings do occur occasionally for some of these verbs, they are normal for "word". "Word" can be found in Nos. 9, 14, 101 etc., "wort" in Nos. 14, 25, but "wortt" is not used.

Other users in the mid 17th century include De Decker - who uses it in all cases (scheyd, houd, send, vlijd, vind), - Dullaert and Luyken. The latter is extremely irregular in this respect, cf. "spreid (p.8), spreit (p.9), brand (p.9), bindt (p.15), wordt (p.15)" etc. Of such words in the text approximately 65% have 'tj', and 30% 'dtj', though there is no system or pattern to the occurrence
of the variants, as was also the case with weak verb endings.

The first grammarian to adopt this system since Aeuszing was Winschooten in 1683 (though Hillenius refers to it,- see above). For him such forms as "gij soud, hij strijd, hij werd" were exactly analogous to "hij volgd, dien", and the nouns in ' -d'. Although he does not discuss ' -d' stem verbs separately, his system clearly shows this to be the case. The grammar of PH. La Grue on the other hand retains "vind, word, souv" etc., yet uses ' -t' in "leert" etc. In Sewel's revision of this work the usage is adapted to conform with his own system. Sewel himself at first retained ' -d' in certain cases (see ' -dt' below).

Gargon joined the few who defended this system, in 1686: "'lyden, laden, binden', en diergelyke, die schryv ik altyd met een 'd', als 'ik lyd, gy laad, by bind'". Most of the weak verb ' -d' spellers of the last decade of this century - Duikerius, Van der Linden, Najer, Van Alkesmade, Pare - all consistently use spellings of the sort "werd, vind, zoud". Van Geesdalle (1700) uses "word, bevind" etc. according to his rules given earlier, and the Grammaire plus Exacte of the following year, though using ' -t' in other verbs, uses "soud, word" with ' -d'.

In the first half of the 18th century these forms continue to be fairly common: Den Elger, Bouvaert, Steven, Kramer and Ten Kate use them alongside weak verbs with ' -t', as does Tuinman (see "leerd" above). Hakvoord, Overschie, Eikelenberg and Van der Schelling share this ' -d' with weak verbs. Rusting is distinct in using ' -d' in verbs (including "schijnd"), but ' -t' in nouns; this is difficult to justify. Another instance of the "word" type of spelling is in the Emblemata book of Pieter and Jan Huygen in 1700 (1st edition 1689); they use "word, vind, misleid" as well as "scheurd, voeld" etc., and this system must be shared by a host of other writers in this period. The later editions of the same book (e.g. 1740) still show the same spelling. Van Rhyn and Schutz both use "zoud" etc., but the latter lists ' -dt' in his verb paradigms.

One of the most extensive in defence of the ' -d' spelling was Van Belle in 1748: he regards the addition of the ' -t' as both unnecessary and inconsistent, and also considers the ' -d' form to be equally as established as ' -t' or ' -dt', if not more so. His criticism falls mainly on Sewel's theories (given later): "hét is zelf eene al te groote toegeevendheid van W. Sewel, eene T naa D te
gebruiken ... in den 2den en 3den Persoon der Werkwoorden die D of DD in de onbepaalende Wyze hebben: want daar zyn, in dit opzigt, 5derlei Werkwoorden, als:

1, die 'er ééne T, ten 2de, die 'er TT, ten 3de die 'er ééne D, ten 4de die 'er DD, en ten 5de, die 'er noch D noch T hebben, als: 1, 'laaten, weeten', enz: ten 2de,'betten, zitten', enz: ten 3de,'branden, zenden', enz: ten 4de,'bidden, redden', enz: ten 5de,'passen, schraken, vermaaken, weenen', enz:.


Wil men nu dryven dat dit met T naa T niet geschieden kan, maar wel met T naa D, zulks is volstrekt onwaar: want men kan zelf met evenveel, indien niet met meer recht, by voorbeeld, spellen: 'gy redd, hy redd, gyl:redd!', enz: als 'gy redt, hy redt, gyl: redd!', en derhalven ook, 'gy bett, hy bett, gyl: bett!'; welk laatste, van niemants smaak zynde, het eerste, naer rede, smaakloos of onsmakelijk maakt. In allen gevalle, ik beklaag den armen eersten persoon in 't enkelvoudig, dat die ... naer zulker Dryveren spellinge, zo veele eer, van met eene T vermeerderd te worden, niet mag genieten, dat men zo wel schryve, 'ik redt', als 'gy, hy, gyl: redt'; terwyl hy doch met dezelve persoenen gelyk staet, in zig door het Voornaamwoord bekend te maaken. (i.e. the pronoun shows the person, the '-t' is superfluous)

'Kortom, ik ontkent dat 'er nader reegel zy, dan om de Werkwoorden, die D of DD in de onbepaalende Wyze hebben, op den selven leest te schoeijen als die 'er T of TT hebben, en zo wel te schryven: 'ik, gy, hy, gyl: red, bid, brand, zendi', als 'ik, gy, hy, gyl: bet, zit, laat, weet', enz: desgelyks ook der gebiedende Wyze tweeden persoon in 't enkel- en meervoudig, enz:.

'Wil men ook versmaadlyk zeggen dat deeze spelling weer wat nieuws zy; zulks is waar óf onwaar; maar al waar zynde: waarom niet zowel eenig goed en nut nieuws omtrent de Taalreegelen als in de kleedinge aan het licht gebragt? Hadden Hoofd, Vondel en meer andere groote Mannen deswáge niets ontdekt en
médegedeald, zy waaren nooit opbouwers onzer Taale geweest. In allen gevalle; was ook de T-voor D-spelling nooit nieuw?

"Doch het is onwaar, ten minste voor zover de T-voor-D-of T-naa D-óververs niet kunnen bewyzen dat hunne spelling diesaangaande ouder zy dan deze, die men altans in sommige oud Duitse schriften van omtrent óf ligt meer dan 5oo Jaaren vind: is dat wat nieuws?", (p.7-9).

It can be seen that Van Belle is arguing here purely on grounds of phonetics and analogy: phonetics in that it is inconsistent to feel the need of an extra 't' in the 2nd and 3rd persons but not in the 1st (cf. Huydecoper), and analogy in that since the inflexional '-t' is dropped in "gy bett", then it is also unnecessary in "gy redt", though admittedly he seems to be thinking more of the gelijkvormigheid use of double final '-tt/-dd' (see chap. 17), than of an inflexional ending, for here, as throughout his argument, he ignores the morphological function of an inflexional '-t'. Indeed this use of '-t' does not seem to have occurred to him as relevant: "ik ontken dat 'er nader reegel zy ...". As he was also attracted to the use of '-d' in weak verbs, it is clear that like so many of his contemporaries he felt no call from analogy forcing him to use the same "merkletter" in all verbs.

His reference to historical usage is only partly correct, since, as noted above, the "T-voor-D" system (i.e. "-instead of-", nobody ever used '-td') actually precedes the use of '-d'. Nonetheless he is correct in pointing out that a '-d' spelling is nothing new. He is also correct in pointing out that a use of "gy redt" should bring with it the use of "gy bett" if consistency is of any importance.

In his 1755 grammar he is not so extensive, but once more the analogical use of '-t' is not mentioned, and he argues merely from the phonetic standpoint: "de eerste persoon staat by hem (=Sewel) zeerwel op voeten, so dat de D in die woorden alleen kan gaan; maar hoe de tweede en derde persoon daar in zo zwak zyn datze de T tôt eene kruk gebruiken moeten, is buiten m yn boekje en ook buiten róden". Sewel's argument that '-dt' is needed for clarity in such sentences as "de brand brandt in" cuts no ice with Van Belle who counters with "De wagt wagt lang". In view of the fact that VanBelle would have liked to conjugate "ik leer, gy leerd, hy leerd; ik neem, gy neemt, hy neemt", it is
understandable that like so many other users of the ' -d' system in weak verbs, he did not recognise ' -t' as a "merkletter", since in their systems it did not have that function; thus there was no reason for them to adopt it also in ' -d' stem verbs, and the use of "by vind" is perfectly consistent within their system. Only for those users who used ' -t' in weak verbs in the form "hij vind, word" etc. an exception to the rule.

A minor variation of the ' -d' spelling in ' -d' stem verbs, used by De Haes and Van der Palm, involving ' -d' in the first and third persons singular but ' -dt' in the 2nd person singular, is discussed in the following section.

Around this period ( - the middle of the 13th century -) a great division occurs. After this date no northern grammar recommended this spelling again, though its use continued, e.g. by Van "aren, Wolff & Deken, Pater, and in the dictionaries of Winkelman and Wilcooke, published respectively in Utrecht and London. Winkelman, both here and in his grammar which also has ' -d', is under the influence of Halma, from who he may well have learned the system. The only exceptions are the two editions of the "Kern" (published in Amsterdam), and reprints of older works, notably the "Nieuwe Fransche en Nederduitsche Spraakvyze" by Marin, and the "Nieuwe Fransche en Nederduitsche Spraek-konst" by Halma. Both these use ' -d', and both are thoroughly mis-titled, since they only present Dutch grammar insofar as translations of the French paradigms are given. Both are in essence French grammars for use in Dutch schools, and the same is true of a large number of a large number of other so-called bilingual grammars in the 17th and 18th century, such as that of Zeydelaar and the above-mentioned "Kern". Halma's and Marin's grammars have more than the title in common, for they are in many parts identical, and plagiarism is certainly present here, just as much as it was in their dictionaries (see chap. 4).

In the South however, this became the standard system, and indeed no Southern grammar recommended anything else but this form until the early 19th century "spelling war". In all probability the use of this system was often felt to be a national trait, a distinguishing feature showing independence from the North, - certainly it was felt to be so in later years. Such a usage had already been foreshadowed in Southern grammars from earlier years, - La Grue (1684), the Grammaire plus exacte (1701) - though other works (e.g. E.C.P.)
did not share it. The grammars and spelling books of Verpoorten and Bincken, with their later emulators Van Bolleghen & Waterschoot, Boterdael and Janssens, were undoubtedly the major factors in making this '-d' system the normal one in the South. The anonymous works "Snoeijmes","Letterschik" and "Inleyding" also use '-d'.

Of just as great importance possibly as Bincken and Verpoorten was the grammar of Des Roches, and his system is slightly different in that he avoids the weak verb '-d' spelling (laerd, etc.) which can be found in the works of the former, using '-d' only in '-d' stem verbs: "Om te weten wanneer tot het sluiten eens woorden de 'd' of 't' word vereysch, heeft men te zien of het grondwoord met een 'd' of 't' geschreven word; om dat 'worden' met eene 'd' geschreven word, zal 'ik word, gy word', en alles wat van 'worden' voortkomt met de 'd' en niet met de 't' geroepen worden", - those with stems in '-t' had '-t' (by laet), as did all weak verbs (by speelt). This grammar was held in high esteem in the South (although Des Roches himself was a Northerner by birth), and undoubtedly aided the spread, or acceptance, of the '-d' system. He later also edited the "Nouvelle grammaire flamande" in the next century.

Towards the end of the century the "word/speelt" system of Des Roches gained ground over the "word/speeld" system, and in the early 18th century was almost universally adopted (though not by Van Daele, see above). For example the often reprinted and revised "Grondregels" (based largely on Bincken) used this system in most editions of that period (e.g. 1805). Most grammars repeated the same theory, e.g. Van Hasendonck (1814, p.33): "All nouns, substantive and adjective (- a literal translation of "naamwoorden, zelfstandige en bijvoeglijke...!"), also the verbs and participles, which terminate with 'den' or 'de' in the plural, terminate with 'd' in the singular, as ... 'ik zend,... wy zenden,... hy vind,... wy vinden,'; he also extends this rule to cover weak verbs (see above).

Terbruggen, the following year, says much the same: "Men moet ten opzichte van het gebruik der 'd' het grondwoord nazien, en schryven 'ik brand, gy zend, men schud', om dat sy voortkomen van 'branden, zenden, schudden'. Daer en tegen schryft men met eene 't', 'gy spant, hy kent, hy wint', om dat sy voortkomen van 'spannen, kennen, winnen', en om dat in dergelyke woorden de
The most well-known Southern grammar of this time was that of Behaegel, who follows the same system. He formulated his defence of this now traditional Southern practice both in his grammar and in his "Verhandeling" submitted to the Commission looking into Spelling matters, arguing against the '-dt' system now supported by the introduction of Siegenbeek in the North: "Schoon het, naer den aerd onzer taale, middag klaer blykt, dat het bezigen van DT sondaigt tegen de hedendaegsche algemeen erkende en aengenomene regelmaet, verscheydene schryvers echter zyn er voor, dat men, ter bewaering van het eggendommeleyk onzer oude schoone tael de DT schryven, als eene verkorting van DET" (though he also felt that "'vinD, binD'... sondaigen tegen de algemeene uitspraak"I,379). This, which was the argument adopted by Willems, borrowed from Siegenbeek, was also supported by those who felt that it avoided confusion between various words which in some systems were spelt alike. To this Behaegel answers that "Wy zecken vruchteloos om een geval te vinden, waer in dit -DT zoodaenig ter bevoordering der Duydelykheid geschikt is". One of Behaegel's major critics, Leo d'Hulster, supplied him with these examples: "het geldt zijn vermaek, het geld zijn vermaek", and instances with a present tense and a participle, e.g. "verspreidt/verspreid". These, reminiscent of Huydecoper's example given above, and those used by Sewel, can be countered by the argument of Van Belle, namely that since there are still cases of homonymy with '-t' stem verbs, e.g. "wacht"(noun/verb),"ontmoet"(present tense/past participle), there is little justification in forcing a distinction in '-d' stem verbs (cf.chap.18).

De Simpel, another opponent of Behaegel, defends the Northern system both on grounds that the form "bindt" was descended from "bindet", and that analogy with "speelt" demanded "bindt". The second part of the argument is the stronger, since the first can be extended to justify all sorts of spellings such as "leest, geevt, weet" by virtue of older forms "lezet, gevet, weetet".

Typical of the situation in these years is an editorial note in the "Nederduitsche Letteroefenning" of 1834, a periodical under the editorship of Behaegel and Blommert, both ardent defenders of the Flemish language. On most pages the '-d' spelling is adopted (e.g. "hou" p.49), but on at least
one occasion other forms slipped in, necessitating an entry in the "errata" at the end, noting that "op bls. 48 zyn eenige woorden volgens de spelling der Redactie ingeslopen ... welke men op de volgende wyze moet herstellen:" - "wordt, vindt" should be changed to "word, vind".

Van den Bossche, in his Verhandeling, objected to the Northern spelling on the grounds that it was superfluous: "In de vlaemsche taal word het werkwoord altijd door het voornaamwoord of onderwerp omscheidelyk voorgegaen of gevolgd, men kan diensvolgens nooit zich in den persoon vergissen. Ik mag dus vryelyk seggen: 'Ik word, gy word, hy word', en ook 'word-ik, word-gy, word-hy?' zonder de minste bekommernis dat men aen den persoon zou twyfelen. De 't' agter de 'd' is dus volkomenlyk nuteloos" (p.72); it is also, he claims, contrary to "de wet der spaerzaemheyd" which he found defended by Siegenbeek himself. Such comments from the South could be repeated many times from the many writings appearing during the "spelling war", before the Northern system was adopted.

Followers of the Des Roches/ Terbruggen/ Behaegel school (e.g. P.Visschers) continued to use this '-d' spelling until the Belgian Spelling Commission adopted '-dt'. It did not appear in any more grammars until the reform moves of the mid 20th century (see below).

'-dt', e.g. "hij vindt, wordt; het geschiedt".

The use of '-dt' has long been accepted in these '-d' stem verbs, and is the most consistent in terms of analogy and gelijkvormigheid, though phonetically superfluous. Once more these forms can be found in Middle Dutch, but only comparatively late; in the Boecius translation they are the most common form. At this date the spelling is due not so much to gelijkvormigheid as to the influence of the still extant longer forms "vindet, bindet" etc.. In the 16th century this system can be seen in Van der Werve (who also used '-t', of "odieux ... dat gehaet wordt; ridiculeux ... daer mede gelachen wort") and Lambrecht. The latter uses the similar forms "ghey moett, achterlacht" as contractions from "-tet"; this is alittle inconsistent since for other verbs he ignores the longer forms and adopts '-d' (leerd, komd, etc. see above).

Plantijn uses this system, and Kilian lists "wordt, sax, sicamb,j, werdt", "het broodt dijdt" etc.. It is also one of the forms used in the Twe-spraak where
its relative frequency suggests that it is the preferred form.

This system continued to be the most common in the early 17th century, supported as it was both by the '-dt' spelling in nouns ("handt, woordt"), though this was differently generated (see chap.5), and the longer form '-det'. It was used for example by Van der Noot, Van Beaumont, Stevin, Roemer Visscher, Coster, Camphuysen, Hooft, Huygens, Bredero, Van Engelen etc., etc., some of whom have little else in common, and most of whom use other forms as well. Few grammars from this period describe this system, though several used it, including Smyters, Van der Wayden, Niervaert, Leupenius and Van Attevelt; the latter comments that "'-dt' gebruyktmen als 't woord vol-uytgesproken endigt med 'det'" (1682). This may be one of "Niervaard"'s usages which Hakvoord later objected to, though he also expressed a dislike of Cellier's work, who actually shared his own preference for '-d',-see above. It is significant that Van Attevelt only mentions the existence of '-det' in support of the '-dt' spelling, making no reference to analogy with "speelt, leert" etc., which was to become central to the defence of this system in later years.

In Nils Volentiens's Verhandeling this spelling is only mentioned in order to show that there is no difference in sound between 'dt' in "braadt" and 't' in "praat". Along the same lines Pels writes that "men kan met grond van reden schryven: O wreede, gy bekleedde de leden van het kind, dat zit en bidt: om volgens de regelen der Spraakkunst, de Buiging (Declination) en de Vervoeging (Conjugatio) der woorden uit te drukken". Pels is here verging on the rule that '-t' is the standard ending for the 2nd and 3rd persons, in contrast to Van Attevelt above. This system was in use in both North and South, being used in the South by Van Mander, Van Borssele, Poorters, and in the grammatical works of Bolognino and Binnart.

From 1691 onwards a major boost for this system came from the various works of Sewel. At first however he only applied the '-dt' spelling to the 3rd person forms, leaving the gy-form with '-d': "T Behoud ik liefst in de derde persoon der woorden, 'hy Bidt, vindt, stondt, wordt', enz. tot een onderscheyd van de eerste persoon, 'ik Bid, vind, stond, word'" (Dictionary 1691). In the later editions this was amended to "T Behoud ik liefst in de tweede en derde persoon der woorden, 'Bidt, vindt...'". Nor must it be
thought that this was merely a looseness of expression, or a slip of the pen, firstly because he specifically mentions "hy bidt..." (which is omitted in the later versions), and secondly because the paradigms given both in the grammar contained in the dictionary and in the editions of his Compendious Guide reflect this rule. In fact the various editions of the latter present an anything but uniform picture, as successive attempts were made to bring the gy-form into line with the hy-form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Gy-form</th>
<th>Dat-form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1691</td>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>gy had, gy had gehad</td>
<td>dat gy had, dat gy gehad had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>gy had, gy hadt gehad</td>
<td>dat gy had, dat gy gehad hadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1740, 1754</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>gy had, gy had gehadt</td>
<td>dat gy had, dat gy gehad gehadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1760</td>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>gy hadt, gy hadt gehad</td>
<td>dat gy hadt, dat gy gehad hadt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1703, 1756</td>
<td>Dictionary</td>
<td>gy hadt, gy hadt gehad</td>
<td>dat gy had, dat gy gehad had</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Spraakkunst has the same usage as these later editions of the dictionary. The 3rd person singular has 'dt' in all consulted editions. The use of "gehadt" is possibly a slip for "hadt gehad", - the three works to contain it are all reprints of the same "edition", - since this form of the participle is only used for the gy-form lacking the extra '-t'. The subjunctive, being shortened from "hadde" needed no '-t'. It would seem that the works printed primarily for the use of foreigners, i.e. the Guide, did not have the same attention paid to the setting as did the Spraakkunst and the later editions of the Dictionary, which all abide by the amended rule given above. And although most of the variants given above are in all probability setting variants rather than products of different spelling theories, the array is symptomatic of the confusion which reigned in this period.

The same rule is supported by Moonen: "De T is ook de merkletter ... schoon het Wortelwoort in D eindigt, wanneer de T achtergelaten wordt, noch de D in de T verandert". The combined influence of these two figures, supported by Verwer, join to make this 'dt' the standard usage in the 18th century, in the Northern Netherlands at least, but not so much in the South, though it is adopted by E.G.P..

Northern grammars to follow suit were De Vin and, naturally, Sowel's revision of La Grue: "Remarques que dans les secondes & troisièmes personnes des Verbes on met ordinairement un 't' à la fin, pour faire de la distinction..."
avec les premières personnes" (cf. Cuno, 1741; "Nimm in acht: dass in denen zweyten und dritten Persohnen, bey den Verbis gemeiniglich am Ende ein 't' gesetzt wird, um einen unterscheid von der ersten Persohn zu machen").

Huydecoper too, as noted above, defends this system, and he gives some examples of writers who used the same in the past, such as Six van Chandelier, Jonctis, Huygens, Bake, and the 1485 Boecius. More contemporary users include De With, Rotgans, Langendijk, Hoogvliet, J. de Haes, Foot, Zeeus, Schermer, Wagenaar etc.

It was mentioned earlier that a change occurred in mid century, with the Southern regions adopting a "word"-type spelling, and the North rejecting the same, with equal unanimity. From now on hardly any Northern grammar proposed any system other than '-dt', except for those few who were making a conscious attempt at spelling reform.

The system is supported by Elzevier in 1761 (p. 97) and by De Haes, though the latter made a major personal modification. It was noted above that Sewel at first spelled "ik bid, gy bid, hy bidt", but De Haes now reversed this and proposed "ik bid, gy bidt, by bid": "geenszins echter gebruiken wy (de 't') in den derden persoon van der aentoonende wyze en tegenwoordigen tyd, als in 'bid, houd, bind', en diergelyke; vindende wy beter dat de derde met den eersten persoon in den voorgeschreven tyd en wyze overeenkome, vermits wy in den tegenwoordigen tyd der aen- of by-voegende wyze gebogen worden en altoos met elkanderen overeenstemmen" (p. 10). Thus because the subjunctive is conjugated "dat ik vinde, gy vindet, hy vinde", the same pattern is to be preserved in the indicative, with the 3rd person being the same as the 1st. This can be seen in his extensive verb paradigms, such as for "visschen", where the passive is given as "ik word geviseht, gy wordt gevischt, hy wordt gevischt" (not a very felicitous choice for a verb to be given in the passive!).

This theory of De Haes's was later taken over by Van der Palm, but is criticised by Pietersen in his Rhapsodia of 1776, pointing out that this equivalence of the 1st and 3rd persons "ik vind, hij vind" cannot hold true for all verbs, specifically it only holds for '-d' or '-t' stem verbs, cf. "ik maan, hij maant; ik vraag, hij vraagt" where no such equivalence is possible. The non-universality of the rule condemns it as impractical.

Pietersen in turn then praises Elzevier and the members of the society
Dulces ante omnia musae" who defend the system in their "Proeve van...

Taalkunde" of 1775, e.g. in an article in vol I, p.79, by "M.T.", possibly Meinard Tijdeman listed amongst the members. Pieterson wrote that "zulks verstrekt my niet weinig genoegen, geavende geen geringe hoop, dat de eenpaarigheid onder de Kunstgenooten hierin zal toeneemen".

Before Pieterson however, two more grammars had voiced approval of this system, - Zeydelaar and the society "Kunst wordt door arbeid verkregen", the first in 1769, the latter in 1770. Zeydelaar quotes the theories of Sewel and also his argument that such a usage avoids confusion in such sentences as "de brand brandt in".

From this time in the North the standard rule is adopted, using '-dt' with "de 'd' als een wortelletter, de 't' als een kenmerk van den 2. persoon enkel. en meerv. ... en den 3. persoon enkelvoud" (Bolhuis), - i.e. gelijkvormigheid and analogy respectively. This is adopted by Stijl, Bolhuis, the Nut works, Siegenbeek, and consequently also in most contemporary written works, whatever their nature, - literary, technical, historical, etc.. The system was also accepted by Bilderdijk as being the natural form, though with an individual twist: The final consonant of "vindt, vondt" sounded "eenigzins anders dan (in) 'een kind ... een mond, ... een lint"", due, he claims, to the now supressed vowel in the historical form '-det', - "maar die soort van heimelijke vokaal tusschen 'd' en 't' is (om het dus te noemen) onbegrootbaar klein, en wordt daarom niet in aanmerking genomen" (Sprkl. p.58).

In the South this form was spreading, partly under the influence of Willems in his Schryfuyze (though it was in use earlier, e.g. by De Neckere): "Wy zouden er voor zyn dat men, ter bewaring van het eigendomlyke onzer oude schoone taal, de 'dt' schrewe, als eene verkorting van 'det', in den tweeden en derden persoon van den tegenwoordigen, en den tweeden van den onvolmaakt-verledenen tyd der antoonende wyze van onze verba, welke in de onbepaalde wyze eene 'd' in de laetste lettergreep hebben". It is to this paragraph that the criticism of Behaegel quoted above refers. Eventually this "Northern" spelling was adopted by all after the Belgian Commission decided in favour of "het behouden van 'dt' in de vervoeging der werkwoorden op 'den' uitgaende" (86). The Southern grammars of this date to show this spelling include
Renier, David, Courtauns, Heremans, Conscience, etc., and after this, Southern and Northern usages combine in favour of this system. Though not always wholeheartedly; Conscience, despite formulating the regular rules in his Sleutel, was not averse to breaking them: "De spelling die ik gebruikt heb is die, welke door de meeste geleerden in onze taal gebruikt wordt. Nochtans ben ik er dikwijls afgeweken, wanneer de zachtheid of harmony zulks vereischte" (Introduction to "Phantasy"). This only affects vowels with a dialect colour, such as "paerd, peerd", however, and the '-dt' verbal spelling is not disputed. Other aspects of the Northern system were disputed by various grammarians, Heremans for example giving "du hebs" etc. as the normal 2nd person singular form, in which he was possibly influenced by the pangermanic theories of Dautzenburg and Van den Hoven; a '-dt' spelling is naturally not found in the 2nd person singular form in his system, but this does not affect the validity of the statement given earlier, to the effect that he was a follower of the '-dt' system.

After 1850: the Reformers.

The first reformer is Kluit in 1777, who although preceding the title of this section by almost a century, deserves entry here rather than in the earlier sections, since his wish was to reform the spelling, not merely to perpetuate an old tradition. In defending the '-t' system, which was almost entirely obsolete long before the time of his writing, he acknowledges that the forms "brandt, vindt" etc. are descended from "brandet, vindet" etc., but, he points out, older texts also used "baatet, stortet, leezest" and none suggested adopting "baatt, stortt, leezst"; why then should "woort" be treated in this way? The true spelling should be "wort, vint, brant" etc., just as he also felt that '-t' should be used in Nouns (see chap.5), giving no weight to the claims of gelijkvormigheid. The only reason why "woort" looks acceptable whereas such as "baatt" do not is that the former is an established usage (kept in use no doubt by the '-dt' variant in nouns), whereas the latter is no longer in use (though it was indeed in use once, see above & chap.17); to this situation he philosophically resigns himself with the comment that "tegen een algemeen gebruik, hoe kwaad ook, is het vergeefs te worstelen".
Land, insofar as he concerned himself with these forms, felt that "gy hatt (of hat)" would be better, though he adopted neither of these forms. Kollewijn had no objections to the existing '-dt' system perpetuated by De Vries & Te Winkel: "dat men schrijft: 'ik red', met een 'd', 'hij redt' met 'dt', schoon wij in beide gevallen uitspreken 'ret', wij hebben er niets tegen; en de moeite om te onthouden dat de derde persoon van de onvoltooid tegemoetkoms tijd een 't' achter de stem krijgt en de eerste niet, is zo gering dat wijziging van de algemeen gebruikelijke spelling hier overbodig is" (Onze lastige spelling).

Some of Kollewijn's followers were more radical. Van den Bosch, for example (p.50) wrote: "Baseer alles op de klank, en laat een 'd' een 'd' zijn, een 't' een 't', enz. Laat het kind zelf de spelling van 'ik wort, hij wort, je wort, bevrijt, hoet, goet', en zoo voort aan zijn spraak mogen bepalen". Wille sees such radical proposals as the logical consequence of granting the desiderata of Kollewijn's "Voorstellen": "wat zou dan ten laatste behoeven tegen te houden, de drieledige voorstelling van 't' (t, d, dt) te vereenvoudigen tot altijd 't'? 'reit' voor 'rijd, rijdt, rijd'?". The forms "zout, wout" are actually included in the grammar written by Talen, Kollewijn and Hettema. Van den Bosch's reliance on children would have been supported by Marsman, who later suggested that the new spelling commission should include a man of 80 (for the conservative view) and a child of 3 (for radicality),- see Gerlach Royen "Romantiek" p.30. In 1908 J.Huisman similarly suggested "hat, deet", along the same lines as Van den Bosch (see chap.5).

The forerunner of the latest reform movements was Van deb Heuvel in 1933, where verbal spellings were his main concern. He did not like the presence of a different consonant in "noemt, noemde", but felt this to be tolerable since the pronunciation was a good guide. He also disliked the pairs "beleef, beleefd" - verb and adjective, "vertelt, verteld" - present tense and past participle, etc., but "deze moeilijkheid is bij het aanleren van de zeer eenvoudig geworden vervoeging en van de onderscheiding der woordsoorten gemakkelijk te overwinnen". This new system was achieved by dropping superfluous letters, e.g. in "antwoorde" (cf. chap.17),- "evenzo vervalt bij de vervoeging de 't' van de vorm 'dt'". He thus spells "jij, hij vind". His
introduction of "noem/nuemde" into the argument on verbal spelling shows that he was thinking along the lines followed by a large part of the 17th century and other periods, using "hij vind" alongside "hij leerde".

In contrast to this the more recent movements suggested the use of '-t', e.g. "jij, hij vint", as being in line with the pronunciation, and thus more natural to use. The way for this was laid open by the study of Van der Velde in 1956, when he criticised the shortcomings of education in Dutch language and grammar, as manifested in misspellings of verb forms. At first he did not wish to be a reformer of the spelling, but rather of the teaching system, though he later gave his support to the WVS and their proposals, rejecting the accepted rule: "Zonder Spieghels onzalige vinding en introductie van de gelijkvormigheidsregel zou de uitspraak automatisch aanvaard zijn als de basis voor de spelling der werkwoordelijke vormen".

Before the formulation of these proposals however, another voice had been raised in favour of a simplified spelling, that of Rombouts: "Waar we 't... horen, schrijven we ook 't... 'ik vint, hij vint, zij vinden, hij stont, zij stonden" (p.34). This system is thus phonetically based, both with respect to past tense forms, on a par with nouns and adjectives (see chap.5, and also below), and for the present tense '-dt' forms: "Van alle werkwoorden op 'den' of 'ten' eindigt de ik-vorm op 't': 'ik laat' is zowel een vorm van 'laden' als van 'laten'. Hieruitvolgt dat alle enkelvoudige persoonsvormen van de onv.
tog. tijd gelijk zijn. ... In de verleden tijd van de sterke werkwoorden is het presies hetzelfde: de stem gaat weer op 't' uit; het enige verschil is de klankverandering: 'zitten, zit, sat; binden, bint, bont'. Ook hier dus vallen alle persoonsvormen in het enkelvoud samen. Voor het meervoud bestond deze gelijkheid al eerder" (p.33).

This argument was also adopted by the WVS who similarly reject the rule of gelijkvormigheid. They pressed also for its adoption in the government reports, and pointed out once more that the rule which justifies the '-dt' in "vindt" could also justify '-tt' in "hij laat, groett" (see Paardekoper in chap.17). Such a reform did not fall within the terms of reference of the 1966 "Rapport" however, though requests to this effect were acknowledged: "Van verder strekkende voorstellen, zoals ... voor de spelling van de werkwoords-
Naturally this did not satisfy the reformers, and they continued to press for the '-t' spelling. With the "Eindvoorstellen" of 1969 the committee did finally concede to these pressures, although they did not accept the '-t' system, favoring instead the '-d' as proposed earlier by Van den Heuvel. This was presumably in line with their retention of the '-d' spelling in nouns, and the gelijkvormigheid rules in general. Thus "hij vind, wij vinden" would fall in line with "hand, handen". This is admittedly a simplification of a spelling which, on the evidence of Van de Velde, was causing much confusion for school-children, though it is in some ways less ideal than the '-t' system (hij vint), since it constitutes an exception to a simple rule, namely that '-t' is added in certain person-forms. The '-t' system on the other hand yields a fully consistent system, with "ik vint, hij vint" obeying the same simplification rule as "ik groet, hij groet", and "ik vint, wij vinden" forming a parallel to "hant, handen". Since the Eindvoorstellen did not propose the '-t' spelling for nouns, however, it would have been highly inconsistent had they proposed the "hij vint" spellings, and in their desire to retain the gelijkvormigheid rules the "hij vind" system is put forward with some justification.

This report in its turn did not satisfy the reformers in the VWS, who still pressed for '-t'. Their suggested amendments are discussed in the periodical "Levende Talen" 1970 (p.436) and 1971 (p.14): "De commissie Pee-Wesselings heeft voor het werkwoord de analogieregel gedeeltelijk laten varen (- i.e. '-t' is dropped from "hij vindt"), de DCN (= Didactiek Commissie van de sectie Nederlands, for "Levende Talen") zou ook de gelijkvormigheidsregel overboord willen gooien. Zolang namelijk 'verteld' en 'vertelt' naast elkaar blijven bestaan, houdt de tragedie (der werkwoordsvormen) aan! Dat impliceert dan: dat ook de werkwoordsvormen waarvan de stam op een 'd' eindigt, in 1.2.3.ev. uitsluitend een '-t' krijgen: 'jij/hij/u koopt, vint, wort'. ...

Hier dient, wellicht ten overvloede, opgemerkt te worden, dat het hoofdaankelijk dit foneem (= /t/) is, dat in het spelonderwijs, vooral met betrekking tot de werkwoordsvormen, verantwoordelijk gesteld kan worden voor de schrikbarend
The proposals of the Eindvoorstellen are criticised from the other side by Van den Berg (NTg. 3/71), who describes the inflexion of verb forms in the current system, formed by the addition of the phonetically superfluous person-ending '-t' to the stem ending in '-d'. The supplementary rules, that ' -dt' is pronounced /t/, and that ' -tt' is simplified to ' t', do not affect the regularity of this system "op grond van de regel van de gelijkvormigheid. ...

De manier van spellen waarbij een productief proces in de Nederlandse taal zichtbaar gemaakt wordt, biedt aan het kijkende oog een praktische informatie voor de interpretatie van de functie van de werkwoordsvormen. Vertanding van 'antwoordt' door 'antwoord' en van 'antwoordde' door 'antwoorde' is ten opzichte van het interpretatieve gemak van de vigerende spelling een achteruitgang; de syntactische functie van 'antwoord' is niet meer zichtbaar; de temporale en modale functie van 'antwoorde' evenmin. This, as criticism of the forms "antwoord, vind, houd", is justifiable, though the argument does not hold for all examples, only those such as "antwoord" where there exists a noun identically spelt. The abandonment of a universal rule, that 't' is added in certain persons, is a point against the '-d' system. Although this would not be true of the '-t' system, Van den Berg is not discussing this here, only the recommendations of the Eindvoorstellen. And although it can be pointed out that verbs such as "zetten, redden" already show this multiplicity of function which he criticises in "antwoorde", e.g. "wij redden" can be past or present, indicative or subjunctive, all without causing any confusion, this argument can be countered, as it so often has been, and with a certain amount of justification, with the claim that unavoidable homonymy in a few cases is no reason for abandoning differentiaional spellings automatically created by the "productief proces" of verb-formation.

Van den Berg is also opposed to the '-t' spelling, and "phonetic" spellings of many varieties, in that they produce a great number of homographs, e.g. "antwoorde, zinkt (from "zingen" or "zinken"), licht (noun, adjective, "liggen, lichten"), hout (= "hout, houdt, houwt)" etc. This can be countered by pointing out that these already exist as homonyms in the spoken language, with little confusion, and that similar homographs already exist, e.g. "plant" from
"plannen" or "planten" (though this is not a spoken homonym), "tast, getast" from "tasten, (op)tassen" etc., the context always makes clear which is meant. That Van den Berg is opposed to any reform such as that put forward in the Eindvoorstellen is made evident by the strong words which close his article: "vereenvoudiging van de spelling ... voor enkele gevallen te doen, leidt maar tot regels met uitzonderingen, die nieuwe onvoldaanheid en nieuwe spellingomrust scheppen. Het is onverantwoord ten opzichte van een zo redelijke spelling als de Nederlandse met spellingwijzigingen te komen zonder een gedegen voorafgaande studie van de principes die communicatie via geschreven taal optimaal maken".

A modification of verbal spelling along the lines suggested by the Eindvoorstellen is certainly in some ways a simplification therefore, though it does make for inconsistency and "regels met uitzonderingen". That a consistently phonemic spelling, with "hij vint, wort" etc., would cause little confusion despite the increased number of homonyms is amply shown by its almost totally consistent application in Middle Dutch, where such forms are in the majority. The contemporary readers of Middle Dutch were probably not superior to modern readers in discerning the meaning of any homograph encountered in the text, and seems to have experienced little difficulty.

There will be cases, of course, where the context is not without ambiguity. Mulisch, in his treatise of 1972, picks on one such example from a poem by Achterberg, beginning: "Uw doodgedeelte blindt/zintuigen en seizoenen". Here the word "blindt" is marked by its '-dt' spelling as being a verb, derived from the more normal "verblinden". Were the new spelling with '-t' adopted the verb form "blint" would be indistinguishable from the adjective, and since "blinden" is not a frequently used verb in Dutch the reader would assume that "blint" was indeed the adjective (the same holds if the "hij vind" type spelling is adopted). Mulisch's point is that the ability to distinguish in writing between the verb and the adjective enables him to achieve a greater flexibility in language use, a flexibility which is essential for the poem by Achterberg. Again it must be pointed out however that other forms such as "laat" already have this ambiguity in the written form, and the difference between the adjective "laat" and the verb "laat" is not representable on paper. In the poem he quotes, moreover, the verb "blindt"
would be indistinguishable from the adjective "blind" if the poem were read aloud; surely he does not think the written form of a poem more basic than the spoken form? The conclusion to be drawn from this is that in no matter what spelling system is adopted, there will almost certainly be cases where ambiguity could be avoided were certain other rules adopted; this is not however a valid reason for adopting such rules. It is a valuable contribution to the argument for the retention of such a rule, but is only of secondary importance if matters of simplicity or elegance are opposed to it. It is a feature of these cases where ambiguity is avoided that they only apply in limited numbers of examples, yet are used to argue for or against spelling rules applying to whole classes of words. Their importance is also often exaggerated, or overestimated (see chap. 13).

'-dt' in the past tense of strong verbs, e.g. "hij stondt"

During the currency of the '-dt' for '-d' spelling it was quite normal and regular to use '-dt' in the past tense of strong verbs whose stem ended in '-d', such as "ik stondt, hij deedt". In the 2nd person singular form the '-dt' was a contraction of '-det' however, and as such lived on after the general demise of the '-dt' for '-d' system. Some spelling systems on the other hand used '-dt' in the third person past tense forms, where there was no justification for it.

A large number of instances of '-dt' used in the 1st and 3rd person forms can be located, but by far the majority of them constitute merely the use of '-dt' in error, just as it is possible to find occasional uses of '-dt' in nouns amid normal '-d' spellings. These are quite distinct from the regular and anomalous use of '-dt' in the 3rd (and sometimes 1st) person form. Only when a writer (or his printer) regularly uses '-d' in nouns, adjectives, participles etc. and regularly uses such forms as "hij hadt" is it certain that he is following this system, and such regularity only really appears in the later years of the 17th century. Instances from earlier in the century are inconclusive (they can be found in Spiegal, Bontekoe, Bredero, De Ruyter, De Swaan and others).

One of the earliest definite users of this system was Sewel, who quite
specifically states in his 1691 dictionary that "Behoud ik liefst in de derde persoon der woorden, 'hy Bidt, vindt, stondt..." (see above). An example of this usage of his is the phrase "de ketel stondt op drie poten" included in the "Verhandeling" on Dutch spelling in all editions of his dictionary. Verwer, another '-d' speller (see chap.5), gives the verb conjugations as "...gy hadt, by hadt...gy/hy wordt, wierdt..." etc. (p.40,43).

The reverse phenomenon is found, however, in the normal '-dt' speller E.C.P. who conjugates: "Ik hadde oft ik had, Gy hadt, Hy hadt of had,... Ik, Gy, Hy, Gyly, wierdt". The latter is regular according to his '-dt' system, but the listing of '-d' in "ik had, by had" can only be explained by the co-existence of the longer forms "haddde", so that the '-d' spelling is meant to represent a voiced quality in the final consonant.

Kramer lists the same forms as Sewel: "had, hadt, hadt, hadden,..., wierd, wierdt, wierdt, wierden...", with '-dt' in both 2nd and third person forms. Two of the most consistent users of this system, and probably the most influential, were Huydecoper and Wagenaar, who regularly used "hadt, wierdt, verstondt, geboodt, hieldt, deedt" etc. in the 3rd person, e.g. in the former "... alsof 'er stondt" (I.33), "hadt" (I.37), and innumerable examples in his defence of Corneille. In the first person he uses '-d'. In his republication of Huydecoper's Proeve Van Lelyveld raised objections to this system: "Ik (most), by deeze gelegenheid, aanteekenen, dat men by onze meeste Schryvers, waaronder ook VONDEL, HUYDECOPER, WAGENAAR, alsmede de Vertalers van den Staten Bybel, geschreven vindt 'hy hadt, hy vondt, hy stondt, hij deedt', en diergelijken. Doch, mijns bedunkens, zeer kwalijk" (I.92). He clearly thinks that this is still a common usage at the time of writing in 1782, though he does not say if he has taken these users' other '-d(t)' spellings into consideration; certainly the Bible translators and Vondel used '-dt' in other cases where '-d' is used now (see chap.5).

It would seem to be largely the usage of Huydecoper and Wagenaar which was instrumental in keeping this system alive, for Sewel dropped it in his later editions. The early works of Staring abound in these forms, e.g. in "Adolf en Emma": "Zij zelve al snikkend, hem een sluier/ Om 't midden bondt/ Waarop met letters, nat van tranen/ Geschreven stondt...". Other users from this
period include Mestingh and, towards the end of the century, Chalmot. The latter also uses ‘-dt’ in the 1st person, e.g. “vondt” in the introduction p.xxxi, unlike in the Sewel-Huydecoper system.

In the latter half of the century several grammars came out against such spellings, in addition to the comments of Van Lelyveld mentioned earlier. The society "Concordia..." for example claim to emulate Huydecoper in all spellings except "in den derden persoon, in het enkelvoudig getal, van den onvolmaakten verleden tyd, van het werkwoord 'hebben', dat wy schryven 'had' zonder 't'"; "bad, leed" etc. in the 3rd person are used similarly alongside "bädt, leedt" in the 2nd person singular. This comment was later welcomed by another society, "Dulces ante omnia musae" in their Proeve (I.33).

Elzevier commented in 1761 that "de derde persoon alleen in D eindigen moet ... 'ik vlood, gij vloodt, hij vlood'" (p.99). And Pieterson, although he felt that the normal ‘-dt’ in verbs "bleek ... zo regelmaatig te zyn, als nodig om waargenomen te worden", opposed this anomalous usage: "Hoe keurig vele schryvers ook schryven, als zy dien derden persoon van der onv. Voorl. T. in DT doen eindigen, kan men gerustlyk zeggen, dat zy zelven niet gelyk zyn: want in andere werkwoorden bezigen zy in den zelfden persoon geen T, dat ook niet kan geschieden". Thus, since such as "vield" only have ‘-t’ in the 2nd person, so too must such as "stood, deed". As authority for this view he quotes the usage of Moonen and Huydecoper (1),"schoon zy niet opzettelyk daarover geschreven hebben" (Rhapsodia III). Like Elzevier he makes no mention of the use of ‘-dt’ in the 1st person, and this is probably a very minor usage.

The same is also true of Bolhuis: "In den 3. pers. enkelv. is "hij beminde, liep' zonder 't'; derhalven ook niet 'hij hadt, deedt, vondt, wierdt'". The fact that such comments occurred in more than just a few grammars, and over a reasonable span of time, suggests that the practice was fairly widespread.

One of the very few grammars to retain these forms was C.W.Holtrop in 1783: "BIDDEN, ik BID, ik BAD, gij, hij BIDT, BADT. ZENDEN, ik ZEND, ik ZOND, gij, hij ZENDT, ZOND'T - veelen schijnt deze T alhier overtollig" (p.47). He personally felt the bare ‘-d’ inaccurate in terms of the sound heard. Wester recalls the first Sewel system in avoiding ‘-dt’ in the 1st person imperfect
but using it in the 2nd and 3rd, possibly by analogy with the present tense (which may well be the ultimate cause of the system).

This use of the anomalous '-dt' must still have been known in the 19th century, since it is criticised by Sleegenbeek and by Smits, the former in his treatise "Verhandeling over de invloed der welluidendheid...", p.156. He only refers to it in the 3rd person, but Smits (p.79) appears to have known of it in the 1st person too: "De 't' is overtollig in 'ik vindt, ik vondt, hij vondt'', just as in nouns, though it is quite regular in second person forms as a contraction of '-det' (e.g. "gij vondet"). His mention of "ik vindt" in the present tense suggests, however, that he may be referring to a more general confusion of '-dt' and '-d', either as anomalies or as part of a regular system (as in earlier centuries), rather than to the regular "hij vondt" system. The erroneous use of '-dt' in the 3rd person singular did not last very long into the 19th century as a common spelling, and this may well have been influenced by the decline of "gij" forms with '-t' in favour of "jij" forms without ("gij zongt: jij zong"), so that no past tense forms had a 't' and the material for a false analogy was removed.

This development led to a new, but similar, anomaly: some writers now added a pseudo-inflexional '-t' to the "jij" form. Gerlach Royen (p.213) records one instance of this: "Terwijl deze auteur (Ina Boudier-Bakker) als elk schoolkind nauwkeurig de '-t' akkurant schrijft en weglaat in het werkwoordtype 'jij geeft, jij gaf: geef je, gaf je', is ze die schoolse kennis kwijt, wanneer het werkwoorden op '-d' betreft:

"Je wordt daar altijd treurig', 'Maar je hadt mooie nieuwe laarjes aan' ...

... 'je vondt, je stondt, je leedt, je hieldt'...

En evenzo met een 'hyperkorrekte' '-t' in de vragende woordorde: "Daarin rijdt je naar de spoor' ...

... 'vindt je, hadt je, werd je, deedt je, vondt je'."

Such usage is unusual however and most writers followed the normal system. The spelling of these forms was later affected by the suggested changes in the spelling of final '-d', those who supported '-t' in such as "woort, hant" also supporting "ik, jij, hij, stont, vont" etc., just as is found for all '-t' spellers throughout the centuries. The removal of the '-dt' form in the present tense would, as earlier with the demise of the "gij" form, remove a source of false analogy.
Summary:
Grammars regularly using or proposing ' -d' in weak verbs:
South: Lambrecht, Van der Ghucht, Van Geesdalle, Ballieu, Van Belleghem, Boterdael, Janssens, Van Dale.
Grammars regularly using or proposing ' -dt' in weak verbs:
North: Voorreden, Van Engelen (neither discuss)
South: Voorreden, Van Engelen (neither discuss)
Grammars regularly using ' -d' in strong verbs:
Lambrecht, Van der Schuere, Van Gherwen, Plemp, Duikerius, De Vin, Janssens, (some examples may be weak conjugations)
Grammars recommending ' -d' in strong verbs:
Van Geesdalle.
Others not mentioned use ' -t' in weak or strong verbs.
Grammars recommending ' -d' in '-d' -stem verbs:
Grammars recommending '-t' in '-d' -stem verbs:
North: De Heuiter, Van Heule, Dafforne, Montanus, Beyer, Van Helderem, Nyloe, Hilarides, Kuypert, Kluit, Land, Huisman, Rombouts, WVS.
South: none, though it does occur both in grammars and literature.
Grammars recommending '-dt' in '-d' -stem verbs:
North: Twe-spraack, Leupenius, Van der Weyden, Niervaart, Mil Volentibus, Pels, Van Attevelt, Sewel, Moonen, Verwer, De Vin, Huydecoper, Elzevior, Zeydelaar, "Kunst", "Dulces", Pieteron, Stijl, etc.
South: Kilius, Plantijn, Binnart, E.C.P.; De Neckere, De Simpel, Williams, Belg. Commission, etc.
Grammars recommending '-dt' in 3rd person singular only: Sewel, Wester.
Grammars recommending '-dt' in 2nd person singular only: De Haes, Van der Palm.

Chronology:
Most dates are of necessity extremely approximate, and examples can be found in most periods contrary to the main trends here indicated. To illustrate each type of verb conjugation the words "worden" ('-d'-stem), "spelen" (weak verb with '-de' in the imperfect), "nemen" (strong verb with stem ending in voiced consonant), are used in the appropriate form.
- 1600 mostly phonetic spelling "speelt, neemt, wort"; gelijkvormigheid "wordt" also common especially in South, as also "speeld".
1600 - 1620 "speeld" spreads, especially in the North; "wort/wordt" both standard, "word" uncommon; "wordt" especially in the South, and "wort" in the North, though not at all fixed.
1620 - 1630 "word, speeld" spread, influenced by adoption of "hand, woord" system in nouns; "wort" now less common.
1630 - 1650 "speeld, word" still frequent, "nemend" uncommon; "wordt, speelt" predominate.
1650 - 1680 "speeld, word/wort" become slightly less common; mostly "wordt, speelt".
1680 - 1750 "speeld, word" revived; "speelt, wordt" equally common, due to influence of Sewel and Moonen; "wort"(Nyloe, Kuypert) rare, and dies out completely later on.
1750 - 1804 The North/South split:
North: "speeld, word" abandoned in favour of "speelt, wordt", under influence of Huydecoper, Sewel, Moonen. "wort" only in Kluit.
South: "word" becomes standard, especially under the influence of Des Roches and Bincken; "speeld" still common.

1804ff North: Siegenbeek confirms "speelt, wordt" as regular forms.
South: "word" continues, especially influenced by Behaegel and Terbruggen; often defended on patriotic grounds, "speeld" now uncommon.

1839 South: Belgian Commission adopts Northern verbal spellings.

Chapter 7: '-F' & '-v', '-Fle' & '-vde', '-Ft' & '-vt'.

To say that the spelling of words with a final '-v' is common would be misleading. All the same it has a respectable, though largely elusive and often controversial history, and does not deserve the scant attention meted in most surveys of the history of spelling. "Tegen het einde van de achttiende eeuw beproefden sommigen o.a. de jonge Staring de konsekwente spelling 'diev, haaz', maar dit ging te zeer in tegen een algemeen gebruik" is all that De Voors (Spraakk. 8.33) tells, whereas Jan te Winkel (p.104) picked out two other examples: "(Pars) schreef aan het eind en voor medeklinkers een 'v', waar de analogie het vorderde, in plaats van een 'f', maar vond geene navolging, dan bij enkelen, zoals E. Zeydelaar". This spelling actually begins long before the end of the 18th century (W.N.T. yields examples from c.1725 onwards), predating even Pars by over 50 years, and it is unlikely that Pars was of direct influence on Zeydelaar, as their systems differ in other areas.

Indeed the very earliest sign of such forms is to be found two hundred years before Staring, in the spelling reform thoughts of Sexagius. To be true he does not use 'v' in final position, but this is because he does not use 'u, v, w' in the normal way. Because of the influence of Latin usage Sexagius decided to use the letters 'u' and 'v' without discrimination for both /u/ and /w/ (e.g. "zum") and ignored the letter 'w'. The use of the letter-forms 'u,v' depended solely on the position in the word - initial 'v', medial 'u' - as was the contemporary practice of most printers/writers. However this left him with no letter for /v/, with the result that, again under Latin influence, he suggested resurrecting the inverted digamma (like an inverted capital 'F') first mooted by the Roman Emperor Claudius.

As Sexagius is on the whole a phonetic speller (cf. chap.5), it is interesting to note the way he uses this letter, and in particular the fact that he wishes to use this letter, representing a voiced consonant, at the end of a word. Goemans (L.B. IV.113) pointed out that the words spelt by him with '-F' (as it will here be represented for typographical reasons, though it should be inverted) correspond to Middle Dutch forms with '-ve', whereas those spelt with '-F' correspond to a Middle Dutch '-f', suggesting a still somewhat
voiced final consonant in the former words. Against this it must be borne in mind that Sexagius quite rigorously only adopts his new spellings after he has discussed them; this means that the letter 'F' does not appear until after he has suggested it and defended it, which, being almost at the end of the book (fol. D5) leaves all the '-f' spellings before it, with very few exceptions, and '-F' spellings after. The exceptions are "liif, lof, volf" in the vocabulary, for which words Goemans's statement is applicable.

In view of this the forms "gaaF, haaF, raaF, graaF, beeF, keeF, lggF, nggF, screeF, kg1F, Fg1F, zg1F, looF" (the only examples with final '-F') should not be thought of as gelijkvormigheid spellings, though they are certainly the first instances of '-v' forms (with 'F' = 'v'), and may have influenced some later users.

He certainly got a reaction from De Heuiter: "hou wel t'Sestich die zelve ('F') gaerne weder in tliht zoude breingen, zorge dat hij niet mere dan Keizer Claudius zal verwerven". It is possible to read a certain amount of sympathy in this sentence, but no concrete results were to come of Sexagius's idea.

The first grammar ever to moot actual '-v' spellings is Dafforne in 1627, though he only does so tentatively: "V is de verlenging Letter in 'Graef, schreef, blyf, schoof, druycf': als blykt in 'Grave, schreve, blyve, schove, druycf': Nochtans en schryft men gheen 'graev, schrev' etc. end' zo zulx in ghewoonte ware, 't en zoude zo vreemde niet zyn, als het in uyterlyke gedaente schynt" (p.98). To Dafforne belongs the honour of being the first to realise that the use of the gelijkvormigheid spelling so eagerly defended before him by the Twe-spraack and by Van der Schuere demanded, for consistency, the use of final '-v'. He also does right to point out that the unfamiliarity of any new spelling is a major factor against its adoption.

It was to be a further eight years before another instance of the use of '-v' where modern spelling has 'f' is to be found, this time in Montanus. The intervening statement of the Bible translators that "V, consonans nunquam in fine vocis scribendum" does not imply that they had seen such spellings. Montanus's motivation is different from Dafforne's however, as are the results. As he is not concerned with a gelijkvormigheid but with a phonetic spelling system he does not use final '-v', but does use '-vde', as in "ik vertoef, ic
vertevde" (p.59), and in the poem on the title page "Letter op wat vreemde vruchten/ Dees' gedeeldt Fouch hier geeft". On p.25 he gives as misprints in the text "'f' voor 'v' ... als in 'ic leefde'... voor 'leewde'", and in his section on "Letterwisseling" (p.122) he lists the change '"v' in 'f'" 'Lijf, lijven; geef, geve, leef, leevde; lof, lovicht'"—clearly phonetic spellings having little connection with gelijkvormigheid. These are therefore not equatable with '-v' spellings, but are just as significant, also being helpful in reducing contemporary unfamiliarity with any other '-v' spellings, thereby laying open the path for later final '-v' advocates.

The first of these begin to appear, rather haphazardly, not long after this. One of the earliest users was Huygens: "ick derv" rhymes with "kert" in Cogentroost line 651 (1647), "slaev" appears in Matroos, line 39, "derv ick" in Zeestraat lines 83, 174 (1667), "om roov en sold" in Matroos line 12, "erv, derv" in Dagwerk line 162-3, and "kuyv, druyv" in Kostelick Mal, line 243-4. "Blijv, ontsehrv, geloov, derv" etc. also appear in the many smaller epigrams (see for example "Spiegel van de Nederlandse Poezie" ed. Van Vriesland, vol I, p.263,268, 276, 280). Some of these examples (e.g. "derv ick") could be due to assimilation, some may be merely due to the omission of an apostrophe after eliding the final syllable for the sake of the line length (e.g. "gaev" for "gave" in Dagwerk, and "geloov ick" alongside "(het)geloof" loc.cit.). They are far from common, let alone consistent, yet they do occur.

A few examples are to be found in the contemporary anthology "Klioos Kraam" (vol II,1657), in the works of Sanderus: "gestoovt, lievt, belooovden, gelooov" (pp.253,259,357,358). Normally he uses '-f' however, including all his poems in the first volume of the previous year. It is certainly not a spelling of the editor (Rintjus), but whether it is Sanderus's own or that of the printer of the work from which Rintjus extracted the poems is a different problem.

Much more eminent examples of this usage can be found in the works of Hooft and Vondel, - at least according to Nil Volantibus in their Verhandeling, dating from the early 1670's but only published in 1728. First they mention (p.5) the change of medial 'v' to final 'f': "wy spreeken 'staf, graf, graaf, slaaf, lyf, wyf, lief, grof, doof, kloof, droef, slaeuf, turf', enz. in de
plaetse van 'stav, grav, graav, slaav, lyv, wyv, liev, grov, doov, Hooov, dreev, sleuv, turv" despite the inflected forms "staven" etc. They then go on to point out (p.12-17) examples from those writers just mentioned, together with Huygens, of '-v' spellings rhyming with '-f' spellings, thereby showing that '-v' and '-f' represent the same sound (which is the subject of their discussion, not spelling per se). The examples they give are "Hov/stof", "hoofd/geloovd" (Huygens in Hofwijk and Oegentroost respectively), "af/grav" in Hooft's Baeto (line 537-8), "Stav/af" in the chorus of act II of Vondel's Palamedes, and "hoofd/geloovd" ibid. act I.

Unfortunately the writers do not indicate which editions of these various works they are using, nor even if they are using examples from before 1672-3 or (less likely) 1728. An extensive, but not exhaustive, search through texts earlier than 1675 (Hofwijk 1653; Korenbloemen 1658, 1672; Baeto 1626, 1636, 1642, 1644, 1658, 1671; Palamedes 1625, 1626, 1630, 1652, 1660, 1662, c.1675) failed to yield the sources of any except the Huygens (see above, also to be found in the collected works ed. Worp). Assuming that the published text of the Verhandeling was unaltered between the time of writing and 1728, then these examples probably date from at the latest the mid 1670's.

It cannot be ruled out however that they are not referring to actual but to potential spellings, their meaning being that, for example, a word with final '/-f/' from an inflected form with '/-v-/ can rhyme with a word with final '/-f/' from an inflected form with '/-f-/. This would explain the difficulty in finding the sources, but not their placing of such spellings on a par with "hebt/schept, ach/dag" etc. and with the common (relatively speaking) '-v' spellings of Huygens. That they had actually seen '-v' spellings in Hooft and Vondel must be regarded as probable.

In 1681 a few more examples can be found in Lodensteyn's "Uytspanningen" of that year, though he himself died four years earlier. The examples, especially in "Het jonge en onbezemmet leven" include "geev" (penultimate line, cf. "geev" line 7), "blijv" (line 70) and "Die Jesum liev niet liev en heeft" (line 92, elsewhere "lief, e.g. 4 verses before).

So far only isolated examples have been located, but they must be much more common, for they are certainly frequent enough to annoy WInschooten
intensely in 1683: "soo de uitspraak een F vereist, maae het niet een groote slofrigheid zijn deese Letter te veranderen in een V? en soo ook een V te schrijven in de plaats van een eF? wel aan dan schrijft altiyd, soo giij spreekt: en derhalve en schrooemd niet te schrijven 'vijf, lijf, liefde', want ik en weet niet wat viesigheid ik mij inbeeld te hooren, als ik lees 'vijf, lijv, lievde': dewiyl de krage van deF (sic) in al sulke woorden niet dan al te klaar gehoord werd". This is a strange argument from one who felt that "sommigen zijn soo dom, dat sij een T gebruiken ... in 'lant!'" (see chap.5), and is typical of the inconsistency of most writers, whose main motive for rejecting '−v' is, basically, tradition. Few are honest enough to admit (like Dafforne) that unfamiliarity breeds contempt as far as spelling is concerned.

It is not long after Winschooten's tirade that the first counter-comments are to be found, expressly defending the use of '−v'. Of these the earliest comes only three years later, in the preface to Mattheus Gargon's Nut Tijd-verdryv, of 1686: "De 'f', werp ik uit alle woorden, die van zelvs een 'v' hebben, als 'geven, leven, dryven, roven' en zo voorts, die schryv ik altyd met een 'v', als 'ik geef, gij leevt, hy dryvt, hy roovde', en zo voorts". Examples from the text of the book include "geev, dievstal, blyvt, drivt, stervb're, givt, heevt, durvt". He later seems to have modified his opinions and all his later works, including the 2nd edition of the Nut Tijd-verdyf (sic) 1696, have the normal '−f' forms. When Poeraet discusses Gargon's spelling, in the "Boekzaal" of February 1722 (p.229) he does not even mention such usage.

Such increasingly common occurrences could scarcely be ignored by contemporary grammarians, whatever their sympathies, and one by one all the major influential works were to react to these forms, invariably rejecting them. Sewel was the first, in 1691: "F wil ik liever gebruyken in 'Brief, lief, schryf', enz. als V; hoewel 't laatste van eenige geschied, want V uyt de Klinkletter U eenigains spruytende, komt heel wel om een Sillaab te beginnen, aefor niet zo gevoeglyk, myns oordeels, om die te eyndigen". He quotes English "wife, wives" as a parallel, but this is not accurate since the 'f' is not final in English. This is a moderate condemnation in its tone, but the English version is more forceful: "to use (V) instead of F, at the end of a syllable, and to write 'slov, lov' for 'slof, lof', I shall never allow to
be good”. Probably he felt it more important to guide foreigners away from such a usage, thinking natives better able to judge for themselves.

In fact, despite Sewel's opposition, for the next few decades the 'v' spelling was to become quite common. One of the earliest instances elicited a comment from Rabus, the editor of the Boekzaal in 1693: "P.v.Hove, woonachtig binnen Dordregt, heeft op zijn kosten een boekje laten drukken, waar uit een nieuwe spel-konst te leeren is. Te weten, dat men 'di' voor 'die', 'd'instig' voor 'dienstig', 'niit' voor 'niet', 'ziit' voor 'ziet', 'waakhid' voor 'waarheid', 'liivhebber' voor 'liefhebber', 'jonge' voor 'jonge' enz. moet spellen" (July, p.171). This is not a spelling work, as might at first be suggested by the wording, but merely a book with an unusual usage. Rabus does not specify which book, though it is probably "Tafereel uyt het Hov van Eden" - a religious work against the teachings of Dr. Bekker, written by a further unidentified P. van Hoven (sic), listed in Van der Aa's bibliography (p.1359), likewise printed for "eigen rekening", but given the date 1695. This book seems untraceable, but there is a "Verklaringe over ses voornamte Texten ... (door) Paulus van Hove, Hoedemaker binnen Dordrecht" published in Dordrecht in 1682 (in the collection of Amsterdam University Library). This must be the same person, though the latter book has a normal spelling.

One year later (1694) I. Sibranda wrote a poem "ter Lov en Roem van ... Aeschinus Saagman", containing such spellings as "beev, lov, hov, gaeve, heevt, hoovd, beevt, givte, devtig, lievd". His far-reaching use of 'v' for 'f', where there is no question of gelijkvormigheid ("devtig" for example, cf. also his spellings "twiivlen, riivlen"), may be influenced by the usage of his native Frisian pronunciation, where the two are more nearly alike in sound, thus inhibiting less the substitution of the one for the other. Although other Frisians used this '-v' spelling throughout the period of its currency, it is by no means restricted to them. One of the contemporary Frisian '-v' spellers was Hilarides, both in his Phaedrus translation of 1695 (selv, selvde, bleev, kolv, proev, braav, wolv) and in his Taalgronden of 1705. There is the suggestion in his usage of something approaching the situation in Sexagius's system: Hilarides makes a consistent distinction between the types exemplified by "briev, proev, bleev", where longer '-ve' forms exist, spelt by him with
"v", and such as "hoff,loff, gaff", which he always spells with '-ff'.

The earliest full grammar to defend the use of '-v' was Duikerius's Schouburgh of 1696. On p.34 he writes "(F) word kwaalijk agter aan deese woorden gevoegd/ 'Zalf, Kalf, Half, Zelf, Elf, Dolf, Wolf, Dol, Stijf, Wijf, Gerijf'. Om dat hier het meervoud niet door F, maar door V, alleen kan aangewezen worden". This is his ideal, but as he states in the introduction that he will avoid strange new spellings to lessen confusion for young readers, on the whole he uses the standard '-f' forms, though '-v' spellings do slip in, e.g. "Leev, halv-luydende, zelv, zelvs" (p.6,28). "Zelvs" can also be found in his Voorbeeldzels of 1693 (e.g. p.581) though it is infrequent and no other words show '-v' except this, and the related "zelvde". In fact this forms a distinct sub-system: several writers, as will be indicated, used '-f' as normal, but '-v-' in "zelvs, zelvde" (rarely "zelv").

Just as three years earlier the '-v' spellings of Van Hove inspired comment from Rabus in the Boekzaal, so did another work in 1696. This was the Wijsen van Oosten, by Van der Linden (see chap.13). Amongst other odd spellings of his condemned by Rabus were "heevt, oudwijvze, selv, believd, Gray". Van der Linden reacted in the introduction of his next book, and in a pamphlet titled "Rabbelary van de rabbelende Rabus", defending his system, and some of his small circle of supporters wrote other pamphlets against Rabus using the same spellings: e.g. "Lof-Reden op Piet Rab" (beheov, zelvs, zelv, halv, briev, Golv, schrijv-wijz, beloovt) and the two-part play "Zeeuwse Wedergalm" (liev, etc.)

A book published the following year by Andries Voorstad (who seems to have had an inclination towards books with strange spellings, cf. Van Alkemade chap.11), the Scheepsbouwkunst of Van Yk, contains such forms as "drijvd, zelvs, Graav, ophev (?!), roov, geloov, onbeschaavd, roovde, geevd", but '-f' in "heeft". Amongst 'v' spellers the use of "heeft" or "heevt" varies greatly; some felt that as there are no parts of "hebben" with final 'v' that "heevt" was correct, others (e.g. Van der Linden, Rabbelary p.50) argued from older forms such as "hevet" that 'v' in "heevt" was essential. Much the same happened for "hoofd, hocvd" (cf. "hovevt"). It did not really affect their theories concerning the use of final '-v', except that when "heevt" was used
It formed a neat parallel to "geevt, heevt, lieevt" etc.

Other users, not always consistent, of '-v' in the 1690's include Kuyper's Stichtelyke Rymen (bleev),- his spelling books have '-f',,- and Van Rusting in a few sections of his Volgeestige Werken, such as his Homer travesty (p.381ff), e.g. "... Belooov Apol terstont/ Een offer, zo 't gelukt,
\[\text{en geev hem niet een stront} \] (page 417), "waar blyv' je" (434), with the apostrophe showing omission of 't' not of 'e', and "geloov" (682) in the confessional poems. None of the poems included before the Iliad have '-v'.

In 1700 a work of considerable repute appeared using these '-v' spellings, the Index Batavicus by Adriaan Pars, a bibliographical dictionary, with such forms as "naneev, uitgav, gav, brief, drav, liev, selv, selvs, lievhebbers, geevd, helvd", even referring to the society "In lieyde bloeijable" (p.354).

Some of Pars's earlier works also contained such spellings, e.g. "Cypressen op het Grav van de Heer Rumoldus Rombouts" c.1691, "(De) gevallen van (de) kerk en desselvs vijanden" of 1683, and the "Catti Aborigines Batavorura" of 1697 (listed by Van der Aa). Pars thought his system of spelling in no way inferior to any contemporary alternative: "Het tegem/oordige boek (gebruikt) geen geheel onsuivere Duitse stijl, spreek- en speelwijze" (Index p.9).

At least one schoolteacher at this time is known to have taught Dutch spelling with the use of '-v'. Klaas Najer, author of many "bekentmakingen" in the Amsterdamse Courant about his school and pedagogic methods, came in for much criticism, notably from H.Doedyns, editor of the Haesche Mercurius.

The anonymous 'M.S.' writing in 1711 in defense of Najer, only really defends his freedom to employ a personal system, and not the individual spellings.

Najer did indeed have an unusual (though not unique) system, in which he seems to have been strongly influenced by Duikerius (see the spelling "sgool" chap.13).

The only surviving printed work of his is a refutation of a recently published mathematical proof of a system for squaring the circle: "Eenvoudig vertoog brief-wijs geschreven aan Jakob Marcelis" 1702 (against "De eerst en eenigste Uytvindinge van de Circula Quadratura Uytgevonden door Jacob Marcelis" published posthumously 1714. Both pamphlets are to be found in the Utenhove collection in the Utrecht University Library). This book has an interesting usage: the first 20 pages use almost exclusively '-f', after which '-v' is
used to the almost equal exclusion of '-f' (briev, neev, desselvs, believd, halv, geev, beleevd, geevt, blyvt, Graav).

A few years later (1704) Boon published his "Heidense Grootheden"; although this uses the '-f' system there is an introductory poem by Willem den Elger which has '-v' in such as "zelv, gewelv". These are clearly not Boon's own but Elger's, though in the latter's "Zinnebeelden" they are hardly to be found ("Lievde" p.9), only "zelv" being relatively common, placing him in the same category as Duikerius's "Voorbeelzels", as discussed above.

For the next few years '-v' spellings became a little less common, or were at least relegated to the status of uncivilised. Six grammarians came out in opposition to this system in a very short period of time. Moonen felt that "wy (kunnen) niet goetkeuren de hedendaagsche nieugesmeedde spelling, waardoor, om quansuis de afkomst en verwantschap der woorden nader te koomen, de welluidendheid ten hoogsten benadeelt wordt, en in plaatse van 'graf, staf, hof, brief, gerief'; geschreven wordt 'grav, stav, hov, briev, geriev'; gelijk ook voor 'huis, gruis' gevonden wordt 'huiz, gruiz'". This is part of his overall condemnation of the gelijkvormigheid system, and is consequently a consistent argument. This too is the case with Nyloë, who finds "geloov, leev, en meev,... wyz, pryz, huiz ... waarlyk een grote misspelling"(2nd edition p.39); for the '-z' spellings mentioned here see chapter 11. P.H.P.

- Poeralt - (p.30) supports Moonen and comes to the same conclusion. For these three, rejecting gelijkvormigheid in toto, the argument is consistent, in contrast to Sewel and the others who say that 'f' becomes 'v' in inflection, but 'd' must be used in final position because it is present in inflected forms.

E.C.P., using '-dt' in other words, is consequently just as consistent as Moonen and Nyloë when he claims that 'v' "moet ... om eene silb te eyndigen, de F ter hulp roepen; soo dat het een openbare misspelling is 'geloov, diev, briev, lôv, volv', enz. in plaatse van 'geloof, dief, brief, lóf, wof' enz. te schrijven". An inconsistent argument appears once more in Snids's Schatkameri alongside his usual '-d' forms he writes (under the rubric "Taal") that "het is jammer, dat de Taalgelerde niet eens syn, ... in de spellingen; settende deese 'hi' voor 'hij', en die verder 'schryvt' voor 'schryft' &c."

Some of the supporters of the gelijkvormigheid system, as seen above,
also opposed the use of '−v', though with less consistency than those who opposed all gelijkvormigheid forms. Others were more impartial: Halcvoord wrote that "wy volgen egter die spelling tot nog toe niet na, dewylze maar weinig in't gebruik is, en dieveneg de menschen heel vreemd voor komt. En ons dunkt ook dat 'er waarlyk word gemist in de uitspraak; want 'wolv, vvy' enz., met 'v' gescald, is veel te slap, en schynd de vereiste klank niet te voldoen". This is in his "Nieuwe Nederduitse Spel-keanst", of which the earliest located edition is 1746, though as M.S. mentions it in 1711 the first edition must date from before that time. His "Opregt Onderwijs" (1st edition 1702) is different in content.

One of the more literarily humble users of the '−v' system in this second decade of the 18th century was Van Riebeeck in his Dagregister. The entries for the dates 3.9.1711 to 13.9.1712 all use '−v' in a few words, notably "halv, deselvs, twaalv", though he is far from consistent. Outside the period covered by these two dates he usually uses '−f', and often '−ff' (see chap.17); as no grammar had appeared within that period defending '−v' it is interesting to speculate what inspired this short-lived '−v' usage from him.

The first defense of '−v' in the 18th century comes from Heugelenburg in 1714: "Nu zoude het wel noodig zijn nog iets van het plaatzen der F. en V. te spreken, waar also bij de meeste Lievhebbers, daar in, tot nog toe, geen vasten voet gehouden en is; so wil ik mijn selve ook gants niet aannemen, om iemand dies aangaande, weten voor te schrijven, waar uit een groote twist zoude kunnen gebooren worden. Egter wil ik niet ontkennen, dat mijn toestemming meest overslaat de uitspraak deselven, aan de gezonde reeden meest hebben ter onderzoek gegeeven. Het gebruik van de Ve. dunkt mij dat in de volgende Woorden doorstrael'd, en uitblinkt, als in 'Graav, Schaaav, Slaav, Zalv, Kalv, Kleev, Zeew,...' ons. Omdat de voorgaande Woorden ´haar meervoudigheid word gemaakt door de Ve. ... als in de volgende Woorden klaar word aangetoond: 'Graaven, Schaaoven, Slaaven, Zalve,...'" (p.26-8). He also uses 'v' in "leevt, blijvt, stervt, geevt; lievde, beschaavde" but not in "heeft".

Only two years later a further defense of '−v' appears from De Vin: "dewyl ik ider zijn meugje gunne, zoo hebbe ik ook geern het mijne." Over zulke
woorden, die met eene 'v' verlengende zijn; en die met eene 'v' ofte met een 'f' worden geschreven: als bij voorbeeld 'schriven', is met een 'v' verlengende, zoo ik nu eens een schriv-panne zegge, zoo moet na mijn oordeel in deze eerste zilabe geen 'f' maar een 'v' worden gesteld voor de sluitletter, zoo mede in deze Woorden 'hof, lof, erffenisse, graf, wijf, wijf, duif, druif' &c. gelyk die doorgans bij veele worden geschreven. Maar ik ben van oordeel, met andere schrijvers van onzen tijd, datmen deze, en diergelijke woorden, behoorde te schrijven aldus: 'hov, lov, ervenisse, grav, wijf, wijf, duif, druif' ".

Exactly the same usage is to be found in his "De Gezalvde Christen" of 1722, and 1737: "schrivten, geschrivje, gezalvden, blijvt, leevd, draav, zelvs, Hov, geevd, loovd (heeft)".

After 1720 the number of '-v' spellers begins to diminish, and no new grammar defended it for many years. Haugelenburg was, however, twice reprinted by 1719, and again in 1727, undoubtedly being of substantial influence in maintaining the spelling. One of the works of Van der Schelling has '-v' in the poem on the title-print (Hollands Tiendregt, 1727): "briev, Graav, zyns Hovs, Kerv, geevt" etc., though not in the text itself. His father-in-law Cornelis van Alkemade's "Beschryving van de Stad Briel" (1729) has a few instances of "Graav" (only). Whether it is significant that both were friends of Pars is impossible to say. A treatise by the world-famous doctor H.Boerhaave, written in 1724 and contained in the Nederlandsche Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde, gives more instances of '-v' - "hovstad, vvv", and Jacobus Leydakker uses "verderv, sterv, hov, lov, bovenhov" in a dedicatory poem in Tuinman's "Nederduitsche Poëzy" of 1723. His other works have only '-f', as does another dedicatory poem in the same work, by his son.

Tuinman himself and Ten Kate both reject this system. The former, in his "Fakkel" (in the section "Gude en nieuwe spreekwijze" §1.127) wrote: "ik zoude, zoo veel mogelijk is, de wortelletter liefst behouden. Evenwel 'ik gav' voor 'ik gef', van 'geven', enz. heeft myne goedkeuring niet. ...Het gebruik schryft daer in de wet voor". Ten Kate similarly felt that "gebruik" should be the final arbiter in this matter (I.127).

Between 1720 and 1750 users of '-v' are extremely elusive. A few isolated examples have just been mentioned from the earlier years of this period, but
more consistent usage is rare. The printer Simon van Hoolwerf uses "geloov, zely" in the foreword "Den drukker aan den Leezer" in Eikelenberg's history of Akseer (1739), and Boomkamp has a less consistent use of "zelvs" ("deszelvs" on the title page) in his similar work of 1741; both were fellow-historians and friends of Van der Schelling. Gerard van Steyn in his "Liefhebbery der Reekenkunst" (1743) has such usages as "Nyl nu nog overblyvt, dat om die weinige veranderingen alleen geen uitgaav waardig zou zyn...". It is noticeable that such forms are apparently totally lacking from the writings of the major literary figures, who at this time, it must be admitted, cared less for the regularity of their spelling system than for the eminence of whomever had used the system in the past.

It does seem, however, that there was a fashion for these spellings among theological writers. Johannes van Eerbeek spelt "Lievden, gelievde, desselvs, halv" in his "Intre-predicatie gedaan te Bueren..." (1736). Of great influence for such as Van Eerbeek was Joan van den Honert Thz., who used these forms in his many authoritative works, including "Het geloov der vaderen ... in het elvde hoofdstuk van den brief aan de Hebrewen" (1753), and "Kerkelijke Redenvoering" - the latter with "proev, brief, geeft, beschryvt,(heeft)" etc. He was a writer of considerable reputation and authority and his adoption of the '-v' system was certainly influential, as was to be seen in later years. The copying of a system on the grounds of the user's eminence rather than intrinsic merit is therefore not restricted to literary fields.

The major grammars continued to oppose the use of '-v' and '-vde'. Van Belle, who in 1743 says merely that 'v' is "te zagt aan 't einde eens woords te stellen" (p.15) is more extensive in 1755: "Hoewel nu sommigen schryven 'Grav, Diev, Hov', omdat men in't meerv: schryft 'Graven, Dieven, Hoven',... zulks wettigt niet genoeg die nieuwigheid"; he thinks Sewel's parallel with English "wife, wives" irrelevant (p.10). Later on, in the discussion on verbs, he inserts a further comment: "N.B. 'V' en 'Z', ten einde eener Lettergreeze komende, of tegen eenen Medeklinker aansluitende, Veranderen naer de gewone Spelling by ons, in 'F' en 'S', zo als hier in 't Werkwoord 'Leeven'. Ik 'leef, LeefDE, GeleefD' En 'Raazen' ik 'RaaS, RaasDE, GeraasD', enz: Dit zy eens vooral gezaid" (p.49). His apparent impatience at having to say this may
be thought to be due to a contemporary revival of such spellings, until it is realised that he has borrowed the whole comment from Ten Kate, writing 30 years earlier, just after Heugelenburg and De Vin had defended '-v' (Ten Kate, I 544, writes: "'V' en 'Z' ten einde eener Silbe konende, of tegen een Consonant eenstuitende, veranderen na de gewone Spelling by ons in 'F' en 'S', even als hier by 'leven' en 'Razen'. Dit zij eens vooral gezeid!").

This by no means implies that Van Belle was not reacting to a contemporary revival, he may merely have thought that Ten Kate, who he often refers to in footnotes, expressed the thought in adequate form. For in fact there was a moderate revival after the late 1750's. Whether this had already begun when Van Belle was writing is a different matter, but he must have had some reason for inserting a comment in his second edition absent in 1743. Certainly he may have known Van den Honert's current at that time.

In 1753 another defense of the '-v' spellings appeared, in the spelling book of Léonard van Rhyn: "Aangaande het zetten van de F, of de V, op 't Eind van sommige Woorden, hebben vele een verschillende stelling; Doch het zal genoeg zijn, dit maar eens in 't voorby gaan aan te haalen, zonder het te beslissen, laatende de Liefhebbers hier in yder zyn eigen zin opvolgen. ... Sommige schryven de volgende aldus: 'Diev, Briev, Kolv, Graaf (sic), Slav, Werv', Om dat (gelyk zy zeggen) het Meervoud der zelve niet door een F, maar door een V moet gespeld worden. ... Hier kan men van den eene kant zeggen, dat de algemene Regel van de Spel-konst zynde, dat men op 't eind der Woorden in 't Eenvoud, moet plaatsen die Letter waar mede de selve meervoudig worden, ... zo is 't stellen van de V ... goed en gegrond"; whereas the softness of the 'v' may (the doubt is his) be grounds for rejecting such a spelling (p.13).

His usage is '-f', but his sympathies are with '-v', which he evidently considers a flourishing contemporary alternative.

In 1760 outright support for the '-v' is found in the Taal en dichtkundige Bijdragen. It uses '-v' in "heeft, geeft, schreven, briev, zelfde, bliev, schrieve, lievehebbere, zelvden", and also defends the usage in an article in the first volume (p.213). The editors call for consistency in spelling, as could be found either in a system with consistent gelijkvormigheid, or one
recommending the user "wep, lant, graf, zach, huis" to schrijven. ... By voor ons daarom hebben verkozen vast-te-stellen, dat de zachte B,D,V,G,Z, zeer wel daer 't pas geevt een silb mogen sluiten, en over al gebezigd worden, daer de aert der sprake het vereischt. ... Men lese (Sewel) na, en passe zyne bewyzen (ontrent 'd' en 'g') ook op de V en Z toe". Either consistent system is acceptable, but they prefer the latter.

Possibly influenced by the usage of this widely circulated periodical several new attempts arise to reintroduce the '-v' system, or rather to have it once more accepted by the public at large, for it had never really died out.

In 1765 an article appeared in the Boekzaal entitles "Eenvoudige aanmerkingen over het gebruik der V", and signed "Philologus", defending the spelling to be used in a forthcoming work of his. It undoubtedly refers to an article in Verh. Hollandsche My. 1767, identifying the author as Petrus Versluys, especially since the latter uses the same spelling and declares that "hoo zeer ook voorheen in eenen vasten toeleg, om mynen naem...te verbergen...veranderde ik egter...dat myn voornemen, en noem nu vrymoedig mynen naem, zonder egter in de schryvwyze, naar voorgaanden toeleg gehouden, enige verandering te maken". The religious content of this article explains the appearance of a linguistic treatise in the theologically orientated Boekzaal of that time.

His usage, he writes, found its basis "in de Schrivten van sommige geleerde Lieden, en onder anderen in die van den hooggeleerden J. van den HONERT", and he anticipates and refutes possible objections: "'Dat dit gebruik niet voldoet aan den klank en de uitspraak', waar op ik aanmerke, dat men zich in het spellen geenzins kan schikken naar den klank en de uitspraak der woorden" - since there are too many cases where doubt is present, mostly in cases of assimilation, such as "ontvangen, afvragen, opvatten, afbreken, afdoen, afwachten"... en nochtans zal niemand deze woorden dus spellen, 'ontfangen, affragen, opfatten, avbreken, avdoen, avwachten"...despite the "klank en uitspraak". "Ik voor my zie geene andere Regelen dan deze, namelijk (1) 'De betekenis, of de afleiding van het woord', en (2) 'De buiging van het zelve". The first demands that derivatives of verbs with '-v-' should have '-v-', such as "geloov, schrivt, belovte, ervgivt, drivt" etc.. Derivation also demands the use of 'v' in "hoovd, heevt", because of the forms "hovet, hevet", and on similar lines demands that "ontvangen, ontvonken" etc.
preserve the 'v' of the basic word. The second rule demands 'v' in adjectives and non-derivative nouns such as "braav, briev, doov, grov, hov, slaav".

He sums up the consistency which his rules bring into the system he proposes: "De redenen nu, die my toeschynen dit gebruik der 'v', zo niet ten uitersten noodig, ten minsten veel beter dan dat der 'f' te stellen, leide ik af uit dezen grond; 'Het is ontegenzeggelyk, dat het verband tusschen 'v' en 'f' het zelvde is, welk er is tusschen 'b' en 'p', 'd' en 't', 'g' en 'ch'"; waar uit ik meen, met het volste recht, dit gevolg te mogen trekken, (1) zo veel reden er is om te schryven 'gy, hy kraeft, gy, hy slaft', en niet 'kraeft, slaft'; 'gy, hy biedt, gy, hy houdt' en niet 'biet, hout'; 'ik vraag, gy, hy vraagt, ik weeg, gy, hy weegt, ik voeg, gy, hy voegt', en niet 'vraag, vraacht, weeg, veegt, voegt'; even zo veel reden is er ook om in de Werkwoorden in 'ven' eindigende de 'v' te gebruiken; ... (2) Zo veel reden er is om te schryven 'raad, bloed, voedsel, stad', en niet 'raat, bloet, voetsel, stat'; en 'dragt, klagt, gewigt', en niet 'dracht, klacht, gewicht'; even zo veel reden is er ook om 'geloov, schrivt, belovte' &c met 'v' te schryven". If any should then say that 'v' is too soft, he answers that 'b, d, g' are also soft, "zo zoude men dan al zo weinig een woord mogen sluiten met 'b', 'd', of 'g' als met 'v'". This article offers one of the most thorough, and probably the best argued defenses of the use of 'v' to be found in grammatical writings both up to this time and after it. The writer realises the strength of his arguments and declares that he will use 'v' "tot ik beter onderrecht word", though his tone suggests that he thinks this unlikely.

It was to be three years before any took up his offer to be re-educated, and even then Pieterson, who did so, only answered because he had become impatient waiting for "een bedreeveen vermuth" to answer. His pamphlet "Aanmerkingen over het misbruik der letter V" (1768) is hardly a credit to his abilities. It is often inconsistent, sarcastic, and superficial. His usual argument is that /f/ is heard where Philologus spells 'v'("Wie hoort hier; in 'ik schuif, gy schuift, hy schuift', het geluid van de V?"), an argument which the latter had already refuted. Pieterson does not mention the use of 'b' for /b/ in "heb, slabt", 'g' for /ch/ in "draag, draagt", or 'd' for /t/ in "bid,
bidt". He claims to be able to discern clearly the sound in "ontfanger, afvragen, afbreken, afdoen", though admits "ontfanger" as the best spelling for that word only. He ridicules Philologus for saying that "'v' met het geluid der 'h'... overeenkomt", whereas the lower-case italic 'h' in the original (Boekzaal) text is a clear and obvious misprint for 'b'. If "schrijt" should have a 'v' because of "schryven", he argues that it should also have 'ij', and similarly "geevt, belooft" should be written for "givt, belovt" because of the vowel in "geeven, beloven". This is by most standards nonsense. Against "braav, briev" etc., he can only state that it "tegen de schriften der beste Taalkundigen aanloopt", and does not attempt to examine the latter's writings for consistency of argument. He also quotes the arguments of Moonen and Poeraet against '-v', but forgets that they were also opposed to '-d' and '-g'. He also denies that 'v' and 'f' (as also 'g' and 'ch') are as closely related as 'b' and 'p', or 'd' and 't'. Throughout his reasoning, the only valid argument, and the only really valid opposition comes on p.21: "het sy met dit verband (van V en F) hoe het wil; het gebruik verbiedt ons de V daar te gebruiken, en het zelve heeft die magt en dat gezag, ... Het gebruik is de dwingeland der Taalen". If that is the best defense he can find, and his very words suggest that he himself felt it stronger than the preceding weak arguments, it might have been better if Pieterson had left the answering of Philologus to the "bedreevener vernuft". His contribution is of interest however, in that it shows the weight of "gebruik" in contemporary spelling arguments, to the exclusion of consistency.

Final '-v' was still in active use at this time, e.g. in the anonymous "Zonderlinge brief van een voornaam Heer" (1767), and others besides Philologus were attempting to encourage its use. It may not be insignificant that Heugelenburg was reprinted in 1768, the same year as Pieterson's "Aanmerkingen" (before or after?), and also the same year as Zeydeelaar's "Grammaire générale raisonnée", a comparative French/Dutch grammar. In this he uses the '-v' forms, but declines to defend it; after giving a long defense of '-d' and other consonants he writes that "op dezelfde wijze zou ik handelen kunnen om mijn spelling met de 'v' in plaats van met de 'f' te staaven. ... Niemand echter is gedwongen, deze spelling te volgen".
He did defend it however in his Spelkonst of the following year (p.293-6), although he realised that "deesse mijne spélling zal sékerlijk Antagonisten vinden". He repeats the arguments of Philologus, resulting in the forms "briev, lijv, bedrijv, schreav, beachaad" etc.. Unfortunately he mars his accurate defense by calling on '-v' forms to be found in Ten Kate "in 't 2de Deel zijns Wórks,... 'Blijv' pag.125. 'braav'. 153. 'briev' 138. ... 'daav'. 145, 'dêlv' 146, 'dârv' 147", and in Tuimman's "Rijmoeffeningen" (="Rijmlust" 1729), p.100 - "Dat hij vrij grooter dan een kalv is/, Al is het dat hij noch maar halv is".

Here he shows that he is either trying too hard to find such forms used by eminent writers, or possibly just does not realise the function of these '-v' forms. For in neither case are they caused by the gelijkvormigheid arguments put forward by himself and Philologus. In the case of Tuimman, he has been writing experimental poems, every line of each ending in the same word, giving double rhymes. The poem in question has as its key word "vis", and all the lines except the two mentioned by Zeydelaar end in "vis":

"Vrage:
Ei zeg, wat rymt gy op een Walvis?
Antwoord:
Dat hy vry grooter dan een kalv is,
Al is het dat hy noch maar halv is.
Het geen daar aan is, is niet al vis"

- the '-v' is used only for the visual rhyme effect, and Tuimman, as seen earlier, did not approve of '-v' spellings normally.

Ten Kate was discussing the root elements in words, e.g. "briev-en, bedrijv-en", and is not condoning a '-v' spelling; in fact he is not discussing spelling at all, as Zeydelaar should have realised since some of the instances he gives are not words at all, e.g. "daav". This lack of thoroughness on Zeydelaar's part weakens the argument, and no doubt did not pass unnoticed by his readers. One respect in which he differs from his predecessors is that he used '-vt' only in inflected forms such as "schryvt, leevt", leaving 'ft' or 'fd' in such as "heeft, hoofd, schrift". It is possible that Zeydelaar may have been influenced in his adoption of this system by the article in the Bijdragen, for he mentions it during his discussion.

Several grammars now react to Zeydelaar. Bastiaan Cramer writes that
"Sommige Liefhebbers schryven 'gaav, graav, grav,...'", but will not come down for or against it: "die reede die se 'ar voor hebben is niet onbondig", but he will leave his pupils to their own inclinations,- "gebouwende begrippen volgen hun lunt". Van der Palm, in the same year (1769), rejects such forms outright: "De spelling met V ... hoewel by eenigen gebruikelyk, strijd tegen den aert der uitspraak" (I.16). He at least is consistent since he makes the same criticism of the '-d' spelling (see chap.5). The grammar of the society "Kunst wordt door arbeid verkregen" (1770), influenced by Zeydelaar in other respects, declares that "wij verwerpen dan vooral de spelling van ZEYDELAAR in dit geval", and Ballieu (Byvoegsel, p.11) expresses the same reaction. In fact Zeydelaar was almost the last grammar to actively support the use of '-v'.

The use of these forms continues outside the bounds of grammars and spelling books. Mestingh uses "zelv, kyv, geloov, dreevheid, gelooovden, blyvt, begaavd, geleevd, schrivten" (with a few '-f' forms) in his "Verhandeling" of 1771. Consistency in the system is probably his justification for this usage, since he also uses the doubled '-chch-' spelling (see chap.4). Wassenberg wrote a "Noodigh Antwoord aan ... J.H. van Swinden ... op den Briev aan hem gerigt" (1773), but only uses '-f' in the "Aenmerkingen" of 1730 attributed to him, in his "Bijdragen" of 1802-6 he declares that he has followed the Siegenbeek/Weiland system.

Some grammars, though not all, expressed a (usually muted) sympathy for the theory behind the forms: Van Bellegem & Waterschoot (p.32), discussing the gender of nouns, say that nouns ending in '-ve' are feminine, whereas those without the '-e' are masculine or neuter "gelyk in 'roov, diev', onzydig 'geloov, verderv' enz., ... en deze spelling en is niet zoo nieuw dan sy schynt". They seem to expect some surprise on the part of their readers at such forms, underlining their relative scarcity. This is especially true of the Southern audience for which they are writing: all the examples noted so far have been from the North, and '-v' spellings may have been totally unknown in the South.

This comment is closely followed by one in another Southern grammar, that of Janssens in 1775, who condemns "diev, duiv, briev", - "die schryfwyse is verworpen van alle de beste Schryvers". He then goes on, however, to give
some very useful information on the geographical distribution of ' -v ': "Wat aangaat de woorden 'geloven, beroven, verdoven', immers alle die uitgaen in 'ven', zomige zijn van gevoelen, bezonderlyk de Dichters van Belle, dat alle de tyden daer deze woorden met de 't' sluiten, ééne 'v' zoude moeten voor hebben". There was thus a group of writers defending such forms as "geloovt, beroovt, verdoovt" etc (not "geloov" etc.?). Unfortunately it has not so far proved possible to identify who are the members of this circle of poets in Belle, - now lying in France to the west of Lille.

One of the voices in support comes from the "Nuttig en Noodig Speldboekje" (3rd edition c.1775, - the same year as a further reprint of Heugelenburg): "Indien iemand de woorden 'boef, schroef, schrift', wil spellen 'boev, schroev, schriff', met 'v' op 't einde; om dat men in 't meervoud speld 'boeven, schroeven, schriven', ik zal daer niet tegen hebben" (the reason as stated does not hold for "schriven"). Klaas Stijl was not wholly opposed to these forms either: "de spelling van de 'v' achter aan in 'wijv, wolv, stov', enz. is tot nog toe weinig in gebruik, en nog weiniger van de 'z' in 'huiz, muiz, prijz' enz.; maar men schryft ze doorgaans met 'f' of 's', ofschoon het meervoudige de 'v' of 'z' vereischt". Bolhuis's footnotes add that "'v' en 'z' zijn echter al te zacht, dan dat ze zouden kunnen sluiten" - despite his defense of gelijkvormigheid spellings for final '-d'.

On the other side Kluit could find no justification at all: "men zal, naar mijn bedunken, dan eerst recht hebben, om er van (: de spelling met '-f') aftegaan en te schrijven 'wijv'... wanneer der geheele Analogie der tale de bodem zal zijn ingeslagen, óf dat men bijzondere uitsonderingen van den taalregel maken wil". He will not accept that 'v/f' should, or even could, be treated in the same way as 'd/t' in the normal gelijkvormigheid system. As he elsewhere defends the phonetic '-t' system (see chap.5) his use of '-f' is consistent, but in the context of the discussion of 'f/v' it is not. In his revision of Van Hoogstraten's gender list (1759), when discussing the difference of 's' and 'z' (see chap.11), Kluit inserts a plea that 'f' and 'v' (and also 'd' and 't', 'ch' and 'g') be treated just as logically. This too is consistent with his later defense of final '-t' and '-f' spellings.

Although opinion was now hardening against these already disappearing
spellings, some persisted in their use of '-v'. Zeydelaar in his "Spraakkonst" (1731) writes that even he has thought deeply about his "gebruik der 'v' aan het einde der woorden". He is unrepentant however, and when discussing the use of '-d' in gelijkvormigheid (p.122), adds "wat wonder dan dat veelen, en ik ook, om der afleidings en der verbuigings-wille geschreven hebben en nog blijven schrijven met V en niet met F" (though again he excludes '-ft' in certain words).

H.J.Krom, in an answer to a "prijsvraag" set by the "Zeeuwsche Genootschap" in 1731, felt that the use of '-vt' was one of the unsolved problems of contemporary orthography: "moet men schryven 'hy looft, hy lieft', enz. of 'loovt, lievt'? het laatste zal iemand zeggen, want het werkwoord is 'lieven, loven'; zulken, die zoo zeer voor 't gebruik van de 'v' zyn, dat zy zelfs schryven 'hy heevt', schoon 't werkwoord niet is 'heeven', en men nergens heeft 'wy, zy heeven'; neen, zegt een ander, dit is groote dwaasheid, de 'v' komt op 't einde van een lettergreep niet te pas, al is zelfs 't werkwoord 'lieven, loven', enz., onze taal is ryk aan letters, wy hebben daar de 'f' voor, en het past ons, die in zulke gevallen te gebruiken" (the same argument could be used to defend '-t, -ch, -p', and often was, though rarely by those who, defending '-f', wished to use '-d' etc.). In the same volume D.C.van der Voorst uses "zelvs, zelv, deselvde, zelvde" (only), putting him in the special class outlined earlier.

One factor which possibly should not be ignored, is that '-v' is a spelling also used in contemporary Low German. It is used, for example, in Dähnert's "Platt-Deutsches Wörterbuch" (1731) - "doov -taub; deev - dieb; breev - brief; hövt - haupt" ("hövd-" in compounds). No Dutch grammar mentions this parallel usage, but influence should not be ruled out automatically, especially in view of the contacts between the Netherlands and North Germany, and particularly of the use of Dutch in reformed and baptist schools and churches (see De Vooya Geach,1952 p.125). Dähnert's dictionary has other usages which are sometimes found as minority spellings in Dutch, see for example 'qw-' (chap. 10).

In his grammar of 1783 Winkelman commented on the use of the '-v' that "de meeste en beste schrijvers keuren dit af". It is noticeable how often the "best" writers agree with a usage defended by a particular grammar; in this case Winkelman is correct in that no major literary figures seem to have used
the '-v' system, though this is not in itself a guarantee of merit. The defining of "major" writers is somewhat easier than defining "major grammars", since the small school books such as that of Heugelenburg had many more printings than scholarly grammars such as Moonen's, and probably had more influence as well, since they imparted their usage at an earlier stage in a person's education.

The "Inleyding" of 1785 is more sympathetic: "Sommige schryven: 'Lov, grav, briev, gaev, leeft', enz. om dat het Meertal met de V gemaakt word, B.V. 'Geev', met byvoeging van 'en' en 'er', is 'geeven, geever'. Op de zelwe wyze zou men de 2 voor 3 konn'en verwisselen, als: 'Lees, lezen, leeer', enz. Schoon ik my voorstelle dat de gegrondheyd van dezen Regel met er tyd zal gevolgt worden, dunkt het my nog te vroeg, hem vast te willen stellen, om dat hy te sterk tegen de gewoonte zoude kanten, te strydig wesen aan de spelling aller Schoolboeken (not all: Heugelenburg had just been reprinted once more c.1730), en by gevolg den Leerling te veel verwarring bybrengen". One thing stands out in this comment: not only does he agree with the motivation, but he thinks it an ideal with a potential realisation in the future. He does not refer to any older use of this system, as had Van Bellegem, which may be explained by the Southern provenance of the book (printed at Dendermonde). His hopes were not to be realised, though '-v' spellings continue haphazardly for many years.

One of the best known contemporary spellers of '-v' is the young Staring. He only used these spellings in the first edition (1786) of "Mijn eerste proeven", e.g. in "Emma en Adolph": "Hij liet zijn trouwe liev te rugge Vol bittre pijn, Waarom ook moeste hem krijgeroom zoeter Dan leerde zijen!

Hij luistert,- roept,- geen menschenstemme
Die antwoord geevt";

and in "Ada en Rijnoud": "Eens leevde er in den ouden tijd....". Other examples include "liev, lievje, grav, beroovd, geevt, blijvt (hoofd, heeft)" etc. in the poems "Na een sware krankte" and the two just mentioned. In the later editions these spellings all changed to '-f', and Staring does not mention such forms in his "Schetsen: iets over onze spelling" (1816), though he does criticise the editors of "De Recensent" of that year for claiming...
that "liefde" was not pronounced with /v/.

After Staring users of '-v' are very scarce. Chalmot is to be counted amongst the limited-user class, writing "zelve, zelvde" and, the only other word, "Graav", - p.113 "Gedurende deze twespalt stierf in 't jaar 1299 Graay JAN van Holland", - p.414 "Albert, Graev van Nassau ... Albert, Graav van Wallburg". This is exactly the same usage ("zelve" + "Graav") as to be found in some of Van Alkemade's works, as mentioned above, and it may not be coincidence that Chalmot writes that the former's "lettervragten ... zijnen naam altoos net eerbied en dankbaarheid zal doen denken".

Only two more grammars recommended '-v' before Siegenbeek's system was introduced. One is the last reprint of Heugelenburg in 1798, - not at all insignificant, since if '-v' were a totally rejected spelling his book would not have been reprinted so often and so late. The other work is the grammar of Schwiers in 1799. After giving the usual reasons for using '-v', he adds "I would, however, not press, what I ... observed, upon everybody, as a fixed, though certainly a good rule. At all events it is the best to be uniform, and adhere to one or the other". He himself is uniform in using "briev, liev, geelov, keev, schreev, vreev" etc., for the same reasons as using '-d' in "woord, land" etc. and '-g' in "dag, zeg". It is not clear, however, if this comment reflects any great continued use of '-v', since Schwiers is merely copying from Zeydelaar. It must also be noted that he was writing for an English audience (cf Hasendonck below).

Siegenbeek, like most before him, does not wish to treat 'v/f' (or 'z/s') in the same way as other voiced/unvoiced consonant pairs: "Dit gebruik (van 'f') is door alle tijden heen waargenomen. Wel is waar, dat, vooral in latere tijden, enige weinigen hier van zijn afgeweken, schrijvende ook in het enkelvoud 'grav, hov, wijv', doch deze spelling, als aan de uitspraak geenszins voldoende, heeft geene navolging gevonden, noch zal dezelve ligterlijk vinden, zoo lang deze, even ware als eenvoudige, grondregel der spelling, dat men daarbij die klanken moet afbeelden, welke bij een onverbasterde uitspraak worden waargenomen, niet geheel wordt uit het oog verloren". He fails to explain why this "basic, true and simple rule" can be ignored with impunity for final '-d', '-g' and '-h'. 
The acceptance of Siegenbeek’s system marked the end of the ‘-v’ spellings in the North (‘selv’ in Bilderdijk’s “Nieuwe Uitspruitwaels p.155 et al. may be a misprint, or may be a relic of the 13th century restricted ‘-v’ system). But in the South a minor revival, as prophesied by the “Inlayding” was to be seen. Van Daele (Tydverdyf No.56), commenting on the continued use of ‘-v’ alongside ‘-f’, decides that “het een is soo goed, als ’t ander, ... men mag dan schryven ‘lov’ en ‘lof’, ‘gav’ en ‘gar’, ‘lévt’ en ‘léft’, ‘beschaeveden’ en ‘beschaeveden’ en ‘beschaeveden’ ens.”. De “eckere, follower of Van Daele in most things, echoes this: “Wy souden nae het schynt tegelmaetiger syn indien wy schreven ‘Grav, Graven; Slaev, Slaeven; Hov, Hoven; Wyv, Wyven’, etc., ‘by Lévt, Géevt’ etc.” (p.59), though he thinks that ‘v’ possibly “als te flat schynt”.

Forms with ‘-v’ also appear in the contemporary grammar of Hasendonck, published in England but written by a “former member of the University of Louvain”, and in which the reader can find “then ost modern orthography adopted, notwithstanding the best Luthors do not exactly agree” (sic!): for example on p.25 “geev my de pen”, p.26 “Karel, geev my water”, p.126 “geev my eenige goede”. This usage, in both editions contrary to his rules, only seems to allow “geev”. It may be this usage which earned the copy consulted a contemporary manuscript note from the owner to the effect that it was “about the worst grammar I have”, though the quality of the typesetting may been included in this comment. The spellings mentioned in chapters 4, 6, & 11 may also have contributed to this condemnation.

A much more consistent user is recorded by De Simpel in 1827. After he (in the person of one half of the dialogue referred to in the title of the book) has given the standard (Siegenbeek) rule for ‘-f’, the questioner asks “Zoude het niet regelmatiger zijn, en beter met den regel der afleiding overeenkomen, van met De Rot te schrijven: ‘ik lez, gij lezt, hij lezt, ik blijv, gij blijvt, hij blijvt, gevest’ voor ‘geweest’ ens.” (p.106). De Simpel does not agree that ‘-v’ is adequate, but at least records this contemporary variant. He does not rate highly those who deviate from the norm in this way: “Degonene die later hebben willen ‘Grav, hov, wijv’, schrijven, hebben, soo als vele eigendunkelijke Taalopbouwers, een bijzondere spelling voor hunnen persoon alleen gevormd; dwijl zij aan de beschaafde uitspraak
geenszins voldoende, geen navolgers gevonden heeft" (cf. Siegenbeek's comment above: it is a slight exaggeration). Just who this De Ré was is difficult to establish, as De Simpel always refers to him by name alone (e.g. page 5, 13, 101, 106, 107, 140, 147). It seems to have written some sort of grammatical work, as De Simpel makes comments such as "De Ré noemt de aantoonende wijze: de toonende wijze..." "ik aanmerk nog dat... de Taalopbouwers... Des Roches, De Ré, Henckel, ja Moke zelf, drie personen in die wyze (stellen)..." "Vlaamsche taalleeraren als Deneckere, De Ré, Henckel, enz" etc. Such a work defies discovery. The only work traced are one by "M. le Curé P.J.D.R." entitled "Élémens de la logique (Roulers 1817, - the name is given as "D(e) R(é)" in the catalogue of Amsterdam University Library), which contains only three words of "utch: "Redenkaveling, redenering, beredenering" as translations of the French terms (why included?); the other work is "Den Roomsch-Katholyken en de Défense van Lammenais" (Roeselare z.j.) by De Ré "pastoor van Oost-Nieuwkerke" recorded by De Potter in his "Vlaamsch Bibliographie" 1830-90. The latter work has not been located, and post-dates De Simpel's comments; no other works of his are listed by the Royal Library in Brussels, the National Library in Paris, the British Museum London, the Union Catalogue in The Hague, or the National Union Catalogue of America. His spelling book seems to have disappeared without trace, and no other grammar refers to it.

A contemporary work published in the North ("s Bosch), but written by the "gewezen Voogd der Koninglijke Studien te IFEREN" - A. Smits - is the last to defend the use of '-v'. The use of '-t' and '-ch' instead of '-d' and '-g', he claims, "is door het algeméén gebruik rééds verbannen: men zegt niet meer dat deze te zacht zijn om één lettergreep te sluiten. ... Aangezien dan dezelvde regelniet regelmaat plájt voor grondletters 'v' en 'z', is het ongerijmd deze nog tegen de algeméne taalwet, in 'f' en 's' te verwisselen, onder voorwendsel van te zeggan dat 'v' en 's' te zacht zijn om één lettergreep te sluiten. Wil men dan het grondwoord onvervalscht behouden, zo mag men ook op zulk ingebeeld voorwendsel de medeklinkers 'v' en 'z' niet verwisselen in 'f' en 's' in 'grav, hóv, briev, liev, lievde, ik beev, beevde, gebeevd; ik geev, ik gav, gij gaavt" (p.26). The same rule demands the preservation of 'v' in derivatives "gelijk als b, d, g, ... in ...'schrivt,... begaavt, givt, begivtigen,..."
vergeev, vergivnisse,... drivt,... zivten" (p.57). To write "schrift" is as illogical as to write "hij dupt ... in de plaats van ... hij doubt" (p.56). Calling also on etymological derivation he defends "heevt" and "hoovd". This is essentially no different from what Te Winkel later did with his long vowel and '-sch' spellings (see also below).

In a brief mention in a footnote in "Magazijn voor Nederlandsche Taalkunde" III,24, Bomhoff expresses his belittlement of the theories governing Sraits's system by adding that "of de 'Gewezen Voogd' navolgers heeft gehad, is my niet gebleken, doch ik twijfel er aan". In this he was correct. No-one after Sraits seems to have used the '-v' system, apart possibly from some lower elements of civilisation referred to by Beets in his "Verscheidenheden" (1853,1,6) on the subject of the knowledge of the mother tongue amongst the lower classes: "mijn keukenmeid obstineert zich nog altijd mij 'briefport' met een 'v' ... in rekening te brengen". Van Lennep has a similar comment (Verra. Spraakkunst p.8).

Yet some did realise that it was inconsistent to use '-d', '-g', '-b' and not '-v' (and '-z') if gelijkvormigheid were a worthwhile rule. David, writing in "Belgisch Museum"II "over de regelmatighed in de spelling" felt that "de Ouden waren daerin veel consequenter dan wy" in their final consonant system. Most writers, such as Bomhoff and Te Winkel, felt that 'v' was really too soft for use in this way, but Oosterzee, in his "Uitspraakleen" (1343) put in one of his few comments on spelling that "de tegemoordige tijd van 'leven' en 'lezen' eigenlijkmoeten zijn 'ik leev', en 'ik leez'; were it not for this softness.

L. te Winkel was forced to introduce the idea of "false letters" to justify the use of final '-f' and '-s': "Het onderscheid tusschen de altijd zeer zachte uitspraak der 'v' en 'z' aan het begin van een lettergreep, en de verscherpte aan het einde, is zóó groot en in het oog loopend, dat de laatste meer op de gewone uitspraak der 'f' en 's', dan op die der 'v' en 'z' gelijken. Daaraan is het toe te schrijven, dat de 'v' en 'z' aan het einde eener lettergreep steeds door 'f' en 's' vervangen worden, b.v. in 'dief' en 'huis' voor 'diev-dieven, hûiz-huizen'. These sharpened 'v' and 's' form the "onesch 'f' en 's'". The same argument, mutatis mutandis, could be used on '-d' (in "woord/woort") '-g' (in "dag/dach"), '-b' (in "heb/hep"), but is not.

To be true there are no cases of homonymy in words ending in '-f' or '-s' on
a par with the familiar "rad/rat, dag/dag(ge), slap/slapp" where the uninflected forms are identical in sound, but the inflected forms differ. But that is not an adequate reason for using a different rule to govern the spelling of final ' -f' and ' -s'; a rule which breaks the basic tenets of gelijkvormigheid because it offends against the pronunciation, though no more than do the ' -d', ' -g', ' -h' in the words indicated. In the Middle Dutch and later phonetic systems the 'b', 'd' and 'g' also had an "altijd meer zachte uitspraak" compared to their unvoiced counterparts, but that did not inhibit the development of final ' -d', ' -g' and ' -h' spellings. It seems that Te Winkel was seeking rules to justify existing usage, rather than construct a logical system from a set of rules, though this may be overharsch, as he was not trying to "reform" spelling, just to remedy some of the faults of Siegenbeek's system. Later works, such as Schönsfeld, did not use this argument.- "men pleegt bij de in de ausl stemloos geworden 's' en 'f' fonetisch, bij de 'p' en 't' analogisch te spellen; analogisch schrijft men dan de 's' en 'f' ook in vormen als 'raasde, laeifde', waar man een 'z' en 'v' spreekt" (p.53).

Te Winkel's explanation was accepted however, though Van Ginneken introduced a new rule: "Maak in geschrifte onderscheid tusschen den aan- en afloop van een phoneem, en schrijf dan afloop altijd 'v' en 'z', en dan aanloop altijd 'f' en 's'" (p.37); the terms "aanloop" and "afloop" must not be confused with "anlaut" and "auslaut", since the former refer to when the sound comes at the end or beginning of a syllable respectively, i.e. when the syllable "runs on to" or "runs off from" the sound in question, so that "aanloop" is parallel to "anlaut" and "afloop" parallel to "auslaut". Van Ginneken's rule, like Te Winkel's, only applies to 'f/v' and 's/z'. He is correct in pointing out that 'f/v' and 's/z' are never found in phonemic contrast, though that being so, the logical consequence should be that one of each pair is totally unnecessary, not that the two have different functions. This downgrades the contrast between 'f' and 'v', and 's' and 'z' to that of the obsolete long 's' and round 'r' (see chap. 12), where the choice of graphical form depends only on the position in the word.

The same rule, put slightly less accurately due to over-conciseness, is given in the 1954 "Woordenlijst"- "De tekens 'v' en 'z' worden alleen aan het
begin van een lettergreep geschreven. Waar volgens het gelijkvormigheidsprin-
cipe 'v' of 'z' op het einde zou moeten worden geschreven, worden deze door
'f' en 's' vervangen" (p.xliii); "lettergreep" should be "phoneem", as this
rule seems to allow the spellings "opheven, klasse".

All post-Woordenlijst spelling reformers (Klück, Rombouts, V.V.S.) have
been in favour of rejecting the gelijkvormigheid rule, so that no suggestion
of '-v' can be expected. This does not mean that it went unconsidered; J.C.
Pauwels, in his review of Rombouts in the "Duitse Warende" (1958, 433), writes
that "(hij) vindt dat de regel 'lezen - lees; brieven - brief' zijn
bruikbaarheid heeft bewezen en stelt dus voor dezelfde regel toe te passen op
de parallelle gevallen: 'dage - dach; baden - baat; krabben - krap'. M.i. is
het volstrekt niet vanzelfsprekend de behandeling van 'g, d, b' aan te passen
aan die van 's' en 'v', zoals R. voorstelt. Het kan ook anders, met
inachtneming van de regel van de gelijkvormigheid. Er kan niet meer bezwaar
zijn tegen 'lezen - lees; brieven - brief' dan tegen 'dagen - dach' enz.. M.i.,
eigenlijk minder, want wie de stemloze vorm van een consonant in de auslaut
wil schrijven omdat men die hoort, kan moeilijk ontsnappen aan grafieën als
'het fenster, lach foor', want daar hoort men even goed een stemloze consonant".
Apart from the final non-sequitur (sandhi-spellings are by no means implied by
a phonetic auslaut spelling, cf. the comments of J. te Winkel given in chapter
3), the comment is valid, though a little unjust to Rombouts.

For Rombouts had indeed considered, however briefly, this alternative
possibility. The lack of discussion about it shows greater confidence in his
own system rather than absence of thoroughness. He adopts his phonetic system
firstly because he believes it to be superior, and secondly because it involves
less unfamiliarity on the part of the readers: "We hebben schema I en II als
norm genomen voor de andere drie, omdat de 's-z'- en de 'f-v'-regeling sinds
lang zonder tegenspraak aanvaard en ingeburgerd zijn" (p.37). However, in the
adoption of a fully phonetic system he finds himself in a dilemma, in that
given the "absolute regel: aan het eind van een woord of stam wordt nooit 'v', z,
b, d, g' geschreven, ... we zo in konflikt raken met de grondregel: schrijf
wat er klinkt. Wij zeggen niet: 'leefde, vreesde, toepde, zaachde', niet
'geleefde, gevreesde, overtopde, gezaachde', maar 'leevde, vreezde, topde,
.
zaagde, geleadje, gevreezde, overtoedje, gezeade". A phonetic spelling such as these latter demands a qualification of the basic rule, permitting the changing of the two final consonants in inflection ("gezecht - gezegde; geleefd - geleevde"), which is inconvenient and undesirable, taking away the simplicity of the rule governing final consonants. He has no objection to '-v' or '-z' appearing in syllable division, as in "vreez-de, leev-de", as it is already impossible to avoid voiced consonants appearing in similar positions in "bid-den, tob-ben, zeg-gen" etc. His personal preference is for the fully phonetic system, with "vreez-de, leev-de", - "ze wordt echter in deze verhandeling niet doorgevoerd". Thus although he has considered and rejected the consistent gelijkvormigheid system involving final '-v' and '-z', he finds it necessary to use '-vde' and '-zde'. This is exactly the same system as that used by Montanus 320 years earlier.

Nor did the V.W.S. adopt the phonetic spelling system uncritically. Paardekoper, in his "Syntaxis" (1965, §20.4.2.3), writes "dat de analogie een rol in de taal speelt, wordt terecht algemeen aanvaard. Maar hoe groot is die rol? Ik heb de indruk dat we hier nogal eens overdrijven om ons conservatieve sentiment te geriefen. Hoe komt het immers dat niemand voorstelt om 'bons' te gaan spellen naar analogie van 'bonzen', 'braav' naar 'brave'... Kennelijk omdat we van zulke analogie-gevoelen- niet de minste last hebben". Although he rejects gelijkvormigheid spellings, he realises that consistency would demand "bons, braav" etc.; his comment only applies to the post-Siegenbeek period however, for, as seen above, many have indeed made the suggestion he mentions.

It is a strange fact that in modern times (post-Siegenbeek) nearly all gelijkvormigheid spellers have found reasons for not making 'f/v' and 's/z' spellings follow the same rules as 'd/t, b/p, g/ch', but that convinced opponents of the system, such as Rombouts and Paardekoper (indeed this applies to grammars since Moonen!), feel free to point out the inconsistency in not allowing final '-v' and '-z' spellings. Only Pauwels amongst modern defenders of gelijkvormigheid moots the use of '-v' and '-z'.
defenders of '-v, -vt, -vde': (Sexagius, Dafforne), Gargon, Duikerius, Najer, Heugelenburg, De Vin, Van Rhyn, "Bijdragen", Philologus, (Van Bellegem), "Inlayding", Van Daele, (De Keckere), De Ré, Smits; (Oosterzee), Pauwels.


users of "zelv" (and sometimes "Graav") only: Duikerius's "Voorbeeldzels", Den Elger, Van Alkemade, Boomkamp, Van der Voorst, Chalmot (Bilderdijk?).

defenders of '-v, -vdej of '-vt' in verbs but not in derivative nouns: Zeydelaar, Nuttig en Hoödig speldboekje, (Krom), Schwiers.

defenders of the phonetic '-f, -vde' system: Montanus, Rombouts.

- o - o - o -

Chronology:

Middle Dutch - 1600 final '-v' unknown, except for Sexagius's inverted 'F' system.

1600 - 1640 '-v' mooted by Dafforne, exceedingly rare.
1640 - 1670 '-v' isolated and usually inconsistent appearances.
1670 - 1680 '-v' becoming quite common (cf. Winschoten's comments).
1680 - 1690 the first defense of '-v' system.
1690 - 1705 '-v' relatively common, opposed by all "major" grammars.
1705 - 1720 '-v' gradually fading out, but given new strength by the often reprinted Heugelenburg.
1720 - 1730 '-v' very unusual.
1730 - 1750 '-v' hardly found at all in literary works, though found in some theological writings.
1750 - 1770 '-v' revived by Van Rhyn, "Bijdragen", Philologus, Zeydelaar.
1770 - 1785 '-v' uncommon, though still used.
1785 - 1800 '-v' first mooted by a Southern grammar ("Inlayding").
1785 - 1800 '-v' gradually dies out in the North, but now used and defended in the South. "zelv, zelvs" still in use.
1800 - 1825 '-v' now dead in the North, still in use in the South.
1825 - 1958 '-v' not suggested by any, though some realize the inconsistency in not using it alongside '-b, -d, -g'.
1958ff '-v' mentioned by Pauwels as possible, and by Paardekoper as improbable; neither mention actual historical instances.
Chapter 8: 'g'  

'gh-' before 'e, i, y'
- before other letters at the beginning of a syllable
- 'gh' in final position and before 't'

'g' used for /ʒ/
- used for /ʒ/

'zj' used for /ʒ/ and other spellings of this sound
'sj' used for /s/

Initial 'gh-'  

The use of 'gh' before palatal vowels (e, i, y) is a well-known feature of early written Dutch, but there were several variants of the basic system, some of which were in fairly widespread use. The development of the normal system will be discussed first.

With the adoption of the Latin alphabet for Dutch one significant difference between Dutch and the romance languages caused a major modification in the spelling. In the romance languages (be it French or medieval Latin) used by those who committed early Dutch texts to paper, the historical 'g' coming before a palatal vowel was consistently palatalised. The letter 'g' therefore had two pronunciations in the medieval alphabet: the one before a palatal vowel, the other in the remaining positions. No confusion occurred because the difference was non-phonemic, - 'g' before a palatal was always palatalised, elsewhere never.

In Dutch however such palatalisation had not occurred, and the same sound was heard in all positions. But as the medieval scribes would automatically palatalise any prepalatal 'g', a means had to be found to indicate that this was not to be done. The means chosen is that which also occurred in Italian, namely the addition of 'h', as in "gheest" with a normal Dutch 'g' as against "geeste" from French "geste" with the palatalised sound (cf. Italian "ghiotto" with /ʒ/ and "Giotto" with /dʒ/). It cannot be known from the available material whether the use of 'gh' in both Italian and Dutch is the result of influence from contemporary Italian on Dutch, or if it is merely a case of parallel development.

The primary use for the 'gh' spelling was therefore to prevent a palatalised realisation of the letter 'g', and it can be seen then that the
only place where 'gh' was necessary was before a palatal vowel; in any other position ("dagh, vraaghde, ghaan, nogh") other factors are at play, which will be dealt with later. It can also be seen that the addition of 'h' was imperative wherever 'g' was used before a palatal, thus also in words such as "jonghelinghen"; such forms therefore do not necessarily imply that a fricative was heard after the 'n' (/qch/).

In earlier Middle Dutch texts the use of prepalatal 'gh' is fairly rigorously consistent, though the use of the simple 'g' is by no means uncommon. This basic usage was still followed in later Middle Dutch printed books, such as the Boecius translation ("gewerke, dinghen, ligghen" etc.) and the Exercitium. But now one new factor is of importance: in printed books the fixed letter-width often caused difficulties in fitting words onto a line, a problem relatively easily overcome in manuscripts by minor cramping of the letters and/or words. This being impossible with fixed type the only answer was to omit certain letters: the superscript 'n' (daghe, zinghe, etc.) is very common, but so too is the dropping of the 'h' from 'gh'. This occurs quite frequently in the Exercitium, where it can be readily identified as being due to this cramping.

One important implication of this seemingly innocuous typographical expedient is that the use of 'h', to show that prepalatal 'g' was not palatalised, could not have been functionally indispensable: if the simple 'g' was adequate under enforced dropping of the 'h', then 'g' was adequate per se. In this can be seen the embryo of the later simplification of 'gh' to 'g'. In later printed works, in the 16th and early 17th century such dropping of the 'h' became exceedingly common, so much so that it is often difficult to decide whether the 'h' has been dropped from some words to save space, or inserted in others to fill up the line.

This was then the underlying scheme for initial 'g-', - 'gh' was used before palatals, elsewhere the simple 'g'. This scheme is applied by Lambrecht, Van der Werve and Kilian, though Van der Werve's book frequently has the space-saving 'g-' spelling. By this time, - the mid 16th century, - the dropping of the 'h' in initial 'gh' was becoming very common, and some writers adopted the simple 'g-' in all cases. Kilian was aware of this and
includes for such people a cross reference "GI vide GHI". Certainly he will have been aware of such forms in the dictionary of his employer Plantijn, for the latter has no entries at all beginning with 'gh', apart from a cross-entry, the complement to Kilian's, "ghi voyez gy". Occasionally 'gh-' spellings slip into the secondary entries, where they escaped attention, such as "liggen, ick ligghe, het light", some participles, and several instances of "ghy". This is one notable case in which Plantijn may be considered more progressive than Kilian. Kilian however had no wish to improve established usage, for he writes in the preface that "communem Brabantici seremonis dialectum, & orthographiam typographia maximè tritam, sedulò observavi, necque tenere quicquam mutavi". Plantijn's immediate successor as writer of French/Dutch dictionaries, Sasbout, likewise has not a single entry beginning with 'gh',

In 1576, the same year as Sasbout (though the latter's approbation is dated 1572), Sexagius became the first grammarian or orthographist to argue against the use of 'gh'. "Ga", he writes, is pronounced with the same /g/ sound as in "ge", quod frustra apud nos plurique ... scribunt per aspirationam 'gha". The 'h' is useless as far as he is concerned, and he consistently drops it. It is possible that this pronouncement of his influenced De Hauiter, who knew of Sexagius's work, and who also thinks the 'h' superfluous: "(in) 'ghelijke' wat douter 'c, h, ij'"? - it should be "gelike" (p.33). And as to the function of the 'h' to prevent palatalisation, De Hauiter thinks nothing of it: one should write "'gij' ... zonder d'onnootelijke 'h', want niemant spreeckt 'ij, jeven, jejeven" (p.47). Common sense is in his opinion the best guard. (This comment that "niemant spreeckt 'ij" (voor 'gij')" argues against the theory that the personal pronoun "jij" is often hidden in the spelling "gij", - De Hauiter certainly knew nothing of it.)

But the use of initial 'gh-', despite the arguments of Sexagius and De Hauiter, and the dictionary usage of Plantijn and Sasbout, continued to be the norm. The lost work of De Berd seems to have had definite views on this 'gh-' spelling, as reported by Dafforne (p.104):"Pieter de Berd schryft inde G, dat de Kinderen haer zullen wachten t' eenigher plaatsen H terstont na G te schryven", though he does not elaborate on his exact ruling.

It was to be thirty years more before the use of the simple 'g-' was
again proposed, this time by Van der Schuere: "Dat nu vele, oft meest alle Nederlanders in sommige woorden de 'h' aende 'g' koppelen ... dunkt ons een ongegrond gebruuk te wezen; ofte daer moest bewezen worden, dat de 'g' van haar selven niet krachts genoeg en hadde, om alleen en zonder hulpe haar plaetze ofte aupt te bedienen" (p.22). In other words, if 'g' was adequate elsewhere, it was also adequate before palatals.

In the next few years there is a moderate but definite tendency for the 'g-' forms to become more common, and by the 1620's such usage is fairly common, though still rarely applied with full consistency. Amongst grammarians this new form is used by De Hubert, Van Heule, and Ampzing (cf chap.3), but not by Smyters, Van Gherwen or Dafforne. It is important to note that of these the most important all support 'g-', whilst supporters of 'gh-' are all of distinctly lesser stature. The mood of influential writers is thus firmly in favour of changing to the simpler 'g-' spelling. Van Heule in fact does not even mention the possibility of using 'gh-'

Ampzing felt the 'h' to be superfluous, as the Dutch 'g' always had the same pronunciation; he was moreover intensely annoyed by the misuse of the letter 'h' described earlier: "veele en konnen niet eene 'g' aen enige klinker hechten, of de 'h' moeter tuschen staen pronken, dat een lelijk misbruyk van dese letter is: ja onze druckers misbruykense in plaetze van humne 'spatien', ofte plaetz-vullingen, ende stoppingen der regelen. ... So heb ikze dan over al den voet gelicht daerse maer druck-beswaerster, ende heel en al onnut ende overtollig is" (p.24).

The majority of grammars supported this view, including Plemp and Montanus. But probably the most influential of all statements came from the Bible translators. The majority of their resolutions for the letter 'g' concern dropping the 'h' of 'gh' in certain positions, e.g. "GE, in omnibus temporibus et participijs, in principio sine 'H., placuit scribi, cum 'H. non sit necessaria, nec multiplicandae otiose literae. ... 'Ick vrage' in presenti, sine 'H. den 'H' aftakeuren ende uijt te laten soo veel doenlijk, conclusum" (Nos.4 & 9). Why they wished to keep the 'gh' in "songh, vraeghde" is not clear, though their retention of "ghy" reflects contemporary usage. This word in fact preserved the 'gh-' spelling long after other words adopted 'g-'.

which is the cause of one theory that "gy" and "ghy" might have been pronounced differently (cf. De Haulter above, and also the double entries of Kilian and Plantijn). Revius, for example, as might be expected from one of the signatories of the Bible translators resolutions consistently uses 'g-' but "ghy"; and Vondel only changed from "ghy" to "gy" in about 1670. In 1675 Van Helderren still has "ghy" (only) with 'gh-' in his dictionary. Whether or not the forms represent different pronunciations is not of relevance here, except insofar as it might explain the undoubted tenacity of the spelling "ghy".

After the appearance of the Resolutions very few works defended the use of prepalatal 'gh-'. Rodriguez uses 'gh-' in his dictionary of 1639, as do Binnart (very inconsistently) in his dictionaries, and the spelling works of Kok (1649), Van Engelen (c.1650), Niervaert (1676) and "Laconis..." (1666); the latter writes that "G. Nunquam in teutonicis ponitur nisi hoc modo cum subsequente 'h' ... ut in 'hanghen, singhen' (ghy, taghen segghen, lagh, kreegh)". The earlier editions of Neijer's Woordenschat (e.g. 1688) also regularly have initial 'gh-' (see also below).

Usage lagged a little behind theory however, and the use of initial 'gh-' in printed works continued to occur well into the second half of the 17th century, especially in the Southern writers, such as De Swaen. E.C.P. still feels the need to condemn it in 1713.

After the mid 17th century by far the predominant usage is the simple 'g-'. Van der Weyden favours this system, and Van den Ende and Bilius condemn 'gh-' in similar terms: "De overvloed van lettren heb ik geschoude, zoo veel my mogelijck is geweest, alsoo 't onvogelijck is, veel letters te gebruyken daer 't weynige doen kunnen; Derhalven spelle ik bondig en kort: Aldus 'Ik, Gy...'
ende niet na ouder gewoonte 'Ick, Ghy..." etc. (Van den Ende 1654); "De maniere van schrijven of van spellen sa... wesen ... met sparing' van de Letteren ... by exempel: 'Daeghelycxsche, Opghetoghentheydt' (worden) ...
'Dagelycse, Opgetogentheydt' (Bilius 1661). All other works produced thereafter support or use the simple 'g-' spelling: Nil Volentibus, Van Atteveld, Winschooten, Van Helderren, Sewel, etc..
The change in theory behind the 'gh-' spelling, and the consequent extension of its use in initial position.

As was described above, the original function of the 'h' added to the 'g' was as a diacritic to prevent palatalisation. This is shown by the fact that 'gh' was originally used only before palatals. However it is easy to see how the view could arise that 'gh' was a special sign to show that a Dutch fricative /g/ was to be pronounced as opposed to the French, German or Latin plosive or palatal. From there it is a short step to regarding the 'gh' as a diagraph representing the Dutch fricative per se. Several quite eminent writers fell into this understandable trap. Lambrecht for instance writes that "ge werd ghepronucieerd tweasma, te weten voor a o u, ghelijc offer en h tusschen stonde ... Maar voor e, enle i, zo medeluwdes ghelijc h consonant voor de vocalen doed". Thus /j/ was the basic sound before a palatal, and elsewhere 'g' was pronounced "ghelijc offer (a)en h tusschen stonde". This amply indicates that he felt the 'h' to be a sign of fricativeness. This too was the view of Sexagius: "scribunt per aspirationem ghe" - 'gh' is used to show the aspiration.

In the opinion of Spiegel in the Twe-spraak 'gh' was the voiced companion to the unvoiced 'ch'. He was not concerned however with distinguishing the fricative Dutch /g/ from the palatalized sound, but rather from the plosive /g/ which he hears in certain positions. The question of whether or not he did know a plosive /g/ is not relevant here, except insofar as his belief in its reality influenced his 'gh' spellings (see below). Spiegel's view was borrowed by Dafforne in 1627: "Andere bemerkende dat dit geluyd (van 'g' in 'zing, tang ... ...) al te schraal na de 'k' klinkende was, hebben een 'h' by ghevoeght". Here the 'gh' is unambiguously presented as a means of showing the fricativeness of the 'g'. Hillenius wrote later: "To expresse 'g' more gutturall they write it with an 'h'" (see the examples he gives quoted above in chapter 5).

More expert writers were not confused however. Montanus argued that if the 'h' in 'gh' were a sign of fricativeness, then all fricatives ought to have an 'h' added, giving "vheel, zheer". This reductio ad absurdum reasoning validly shows the superfluity of the 'h' in 'gh'. Most writers realised that
this was the correct view, and that 'gh' was no better than 'g', so that the 'h' could safely be dropped.

It can be seen though that once 'gh' became viewed as the sign for the fricative Dutch /g/, it was a logical step to proceed to the use of 'gh' in all positions where a fricative /g/ was heard, thus not only before palatals. Such forms, though not common, can be found from later Middle Dutch to the second half of the 17th century. It is first recorded as being common in certain of Maerlant's work, before the vowels 'a, o, u'; W.N.T. gives the examples "ghare, ghone, gha, ghalike" etc. (see also p.374 of the Obreen & Van Loey texts). No examples are given by these sources of 'gh' before consonants. Such a usage was known to Lambrecht in 1550, for he expressly condemns it: "gha, gho, ghu, en hebben hier geen dagh, want datmen kan spellen met twee letters, daer en zalmer geen drie toe nemen". This applied to the use of initial 'gh' at least, though as can be seen from "dagh" other factors were at play in other positions. In initial position he only felt 'gh' to be necessary before a palatal.

One of the most important users of this system condemned by Lambrecht was Spiegel. In the Twe-spraack he writes that "het geluyd van gh (na myn ghevoelen) zo wel voor als achter klinkers komende, in gheklanck met ch verscheelt, zo wel in 'ick lagh' dat van 'leg' ende 'ick lach' daar van 'lachen' komt, als in 'gharen' ende 'Charon', 'ghy' ende der Grieken 'chi". 'Ch' was the "dick ende zwaer geluid" of 'ch', - i.e. the normal Dutch /g/-, and was to be used wherever this /g/ was heard, with only one exception.

Spiegel was not merely following an older usage (though as noted it did exist), but was consciously formulating a system of his own: "de 'g' maakt ghestelt heeft by ons het zelfde geluyd ende de kracht als 'gue' der Fransoyzen. ... (Onze 'g' heeft) een blazend geluid,... d'welck (wij) over al met een 'h' uyt beelden; hoe wel 'vele nu de 'h' hier malatende de 'g' zelf het blazend geluid toe-eighenen: van welck ghevoelen ick ook gheveest ben, maar de zaack wel na spuerende, bevind' ick dat de 'h' by ons ouders hier niet te vergheeds ghebruycckt is; doch alsze over de 'l' ende 'r' valt, heefmen om de veelheyd der letteren te myen de 'h' naghelaten, hoe wel datse alslan het blazende geluyd behoud, als in 'glad, groót', etc. t'welck wy in sulx őock
(kommende hier van zekere reghel ghaven) also volghen" (p.52-4). His "zekere reghel" is thus always to use 'gh' for the fricative /g/ except before 'l' and 'r'. On p.42 he actually uses "ghlad", but this is abnormal, for elsewhere he abides by his system: "gleed, glom, gryp" etc. on p.33-9.

This system, under the influence of the Twe-spraack, was still in use at the beginning of the next century. Some, however, took Spiegel's argument further and did not allow the exception which he made for 'gh' before consonants (in effect before 'r' and 'l'). Thus Van der Schuere mentions that "meest elk (i.e. not all) de 'h' ... aflaat, schryvende 'gaef, god, gunst, gloet, groeyen'" - i.e. there were those who did use 'gh' in these positions. Users of this combination are not overabundant, though the practice must have been fairly common as it is still to be found a considerable time later.

The Bible-translators know of the spelling, and reject it: "G.2, 'Graa^v, grys, groen, graen, glants!', sije 'h': nunquam 'ghroen' cum 'h' et sic de similibus. G.3, 'Genade, gunste, goot' absque 'h'". Amongst users are five language works: Dafforne uses 'g' and 'gh' in (more or less) the normal way, with 'gh' before 'i' and 'e', but when discussing the Twe-spraack's use of 'gh' before other vowels and consonants, he himself uses "doorghaans, ghoeden", - "want also behoorde menne te schryvene en! die sulke doenste na-doen, doen 't op goeden giroen, zonder teeghen reedelykheyts wetten te verbuuren". Apart from in the vicinity of this comment such spellings are rare ("gha" p.110).

Van Gherwen uses such spellings as "ghaer, ghaerne, ghaerden", with 'gh' before all vowels in the manner of the Twe-spraack, though he does not defend this usage. "Ghaen" occurs (once) in the Dutch Schale-master of 1639 - at least the typesetter was acquainted with this system. Kok in his Letterkonst is one of the more radical, possibly emulating the Twe-spraack (reprinted the same year), and using "ghoeoe, ghirondtreeghelen, hoeghroothaid, ghrof, letterghreep, ghaat" etc., as for example also in the verb conjugations - "ghaan, ghing oft ghong, ghe-ghaan" (p.25).

The fifth of the users referred to above is Meijer in his Woordenschat. In the 1688 edition, for example, can be found such forms as "ghaat, girooteedigh, vergirooottghlazen". Later editions amend these examples to conform to the normal 'g-' system (e.g. the 1745 edition). As the preface
to the 1669 edition mentions Kok's work, it is conceivable that this had encouraged the adoption of these 'gh-' spellings in the dictionary. Van der Weyden may be referring to Kok, the Twe-spraack, or both, when he writes in 1651 that "(sommeige) vele overtollige letteren, tot verlenginge barer schriften, gebruyken, als ... 'h' achter 'g' in 'ghij, leegh, ghangher'". Hillenius gives "ghod, ghodt" as contemporary variants in 1664, as mentioned above.

This usage did not last much longer than these dates, and even in 1688 may well be nothing more than a relic of earlier editions.

Other extensions of 'gh'

The other major use of the digraph 'gh' is in gelijkvormigheid spellings such as "dagh, vraagde". This must not be confused with the use of initial 'gh-' described above, for the two are totally distinct, not only in who used them, but also in the period of their application. The users of 'gh-' by no means always use '-gh'; nor vice versa. The use of 'gh-' lasted from early Middle Dutch until roughly the mid-late 17th century, whereas '-gh' and '-ght, -ghde' began in later Middle Dutch, taking over from '-ch', and did not finally die out until the mid-18th century, especially in the South. After the mid 17th century a tremendous number of writers use '-gh' who would not have considered using 'gh-'. Something approaching this usage did exist earlier, for example in Van Beaumont's "Grillen", but was rarely consistent.

The use of '-gh' as a final spelling has been discussed above in the chapter on 'ch' (chap.3). But it is here in place to mention one of the underlying theories governing the use of 'gh'. After the demise of 'gh-' and with the continued use of '-gh' in a position where Dutch has only unvoiced consonants (at the end of a word), it is understandable that the combination 'gh' came to be seen as having a different pronunciation from the simple 'g', namely that normally attributed to 'ch'; this is an exact parallel to the rise of the notion that initial 'gh' was the sign of the fricative, as described above. In both cases an incidental effect of the usage of the digraph has become the main reason for its use, in the minds of some at least.

The prime mover in the propagation of this theory was Moonen: "De H wordt van sommigen achter de G in het ende des woorts, daer sy van ous plagh
Naar zy is noodigh en brengt den Woorden in de uitspraak hulp toe", final 'gh' was thus not the same for him as 'g'. Here Moonen misunderstands the nature of the historical forms which he had seen. Originally the use of ' -gh' was a gelijkvormigheid spelling on a par with ' -d' or ' -b' (e.g., "dagh - dagh"). As mentioned above, the ' -gh' may later have acquired the pronunciation of /ch/ for itself, but that was not the original motivation for its use. The rise of the ' -gh' spelling, which coincides with the rise of ' -d', cannot be adequately explained if it is other than a gelijkvormigheid spelling.

Van Gaveren, in his resume of Poeraet (Boekzaal 1703a,359) is even more explicit: "'Dagh' (verwerpt) in het Meervout de H om de hardigheid ... gelyk ook de T, F en S ... veranderd worden in D, V en Z", - i.e. 'gh/g' is on a par with 't/d, f/v, s/z'. Moonen himself realised a difference between 'ch' and 'gh' (see his comments quoted in chap.13), and thus shows himself pray to autosuggestion in hearing three different sounds in 'ch/gh/g'.

One possible important effect of this view that 'gh' was pronounced /ch/ may have been the evolution of such spellings as "laghen, kaghel, lagghen" etc., for "lachen, kachel" etc., and especially the very common "lighaam" form of the 18th century (see chap.4). In response to Moonen's comments on 'gh' having a pronunciation of its own, Sewel amended his own use in the 1708 edition of his dictionary, changing '-chg-' in "looghenen" and the like to "looghenen", where it can be clearly seen that the 'gh' represents the sound /ch/. His reason for rejecting 'ch' in this position is purely orthographical, not phonetic: "hoewe1 de meesten hiertoe 'ch' gebruyken, echter kan ik niet goedvinden een sillaab daarmee te beginnen, zo lang my een andere uytweg openstaat", - for him there is no difference in the pronunciation of 'ch' or 'gh'.

Whether or not this theory was in fact the cause of the "lighaam" spelling, it was really unavoidable that the use of 'gh' in this position, accompanied by its use in "dagh, vlagh" etc. in Moonen's system should associate it with the pronunciation /ch/. The other major use of 'gh' - to distinguish homonyms such as "dagh (dies)... dag (een dolk)" is discussed in chapter 18.
The use of 'g' for /j/ has its early origins in Middle Dutch. It is possible that the dialect alternation between /g/ and /j/ before palatals may have influenced this. This alternation affects such words as "geeste, gicht, Genever", the name "Jillis" (twelc men Gillis plachte te schrijven) (Van Heule 1633), and possibly the pronoun "gi/ji". This phenomenon is recorded by several early grammarians, indeed Lambrecht felt that "voor e, ende i, zo medeluudse (viz. the 'g') gelijc i consonant voor de vocalen doed. ... g, voor e, en i, veranderd in j consonant". This was for him the standard pronunciation of 'g' before palatals. From his other comments it is seen that by "j consonant" he means /j/, not /ʒ/.

The principle use of 'g' with the sound /j/ is not in this position however, but in the diminutives. Such spellings as "twintgien, Bockgien, dichgies, tuytgie, schuytgie" are very common in the earlier 17th century; these particular examples are taken from Huygens. Opposition to this habit came, among others, from Leupenius: "De 'g' komt met eenen sterken aassem uit de keele voort, niet als een 'j', gelyk dat seer gemeen is: soo schrijft men 'meisgen, viertgen', en spreekt nochtans de woorden uit 'meisjen, viertjen'".

A slightly different phenomenon, but also one in which 'g' represents /j/ is in French loan words containing the combination 'gn', e.g. "Spagnen, Craigne". In the course of time a tendency arose to change this spelling to the less French combination 'nj', e.g. "Spanjaard, Oranje". Such forms are already known in the 17th century (e.g. "Brittanje" used by Anolo in Klioos Kraam II,14). These 'nj' spellings may have their origins in statements such as Van der Weyden's that "'accompagneren, compagnie, compagnon', als 'accompaenjeren, compaenjie, compaanjon' (luyt), 'Oragne' of 'Oraigne' als 'Oraanje', 'Spaigne' als 'Spaanje'".

A transitional form, not found frequently, has the 'g' after the 'n', as in "barselonge, syngoer, congongeren" and even "spaeyngaen" all used by De Ruyter. A spelling such as "Spangjen" used by Heemskerk may also be such a transition form, though the 'ng' may indicate a /ŋ/ pronunciation before the /j/ (see Weijnen p.15). It can also be found used by Jonctijs in Klioos Kraam (I,94).
Since the mid 17th century there have been successive efforts to give the
"-nj-" spelling to more and more loan words. In the early period such forms
as "Montanje" were used by De Brune (in "Banaket-Werk"), in the 18th century
Langendijk uses "Germanje", Wagenaar uses "Britanje", and "Spanje, Oranje" are
frequently found. In this the influential usage of Wagenaar may have been
central. De Vries and Te Winkel allowed such spellings to remain, but resisted
attempts at further extending their use: "kompanje" was acceptable, but not
"kompanjon" (Grondb.8:599). Thijm, however, pointed out that certain of Te
Winkel's rules (given below) should have allowed the spelling "odekolonje"
etc.; he personally was not attracted to such forms.

The official "Voorstellen" of the Kollewijn movement did not press for any
reform in this field, though certain of the more radical amongst them did use
such forms in practice. Wille picked on these and other non-official
idiosyncrasies in an attempt to ridicule the whole movement: "men kent de
frasalheden nog wel: faljiet, minister, justietsie, ofsier, ideesoot,
korloozje, pasiënt, miljoenen, koepje, konvokaatsie, odekolonje, sijfer,
aantsie, sent, brosjure, maatsjene, buro, kado, reeks, enz. Ik neem deze meest
op uit een overvloed in romantisch werk van Kollewijn en lezingen van Van den
Bosch. ... Consequentier (ironic?) ging Buitenrust Hettema te werk: nasie,
nasjonaal of naatsjonaal, vernasjonalieséren, biblieoteek, zjenie, diekonie,
dieskeisie, sosieteit, serzjant, sienjaal, ordieneër, kasjot, koersaze, straik,
konntributsie, pollesie, sosiealist, fuiston of fuiljeton, ofsier of offsier,
mielesbez, ... staasjen, insienje, portefuie, ... prinsiepes" (Wille, Taalbederf
p.94-5, 109). These and other such forms did not find great support.

Up to and including the 1954 Woordenlijst, little expansion was made to the
list of words for which 'nj' was an acceptable substitute for 'gn';
"castagnetten" for example is preferred to "kastanjetten", but "sinjoor,
kampanje" et al. are acceptable ("campagne" is also listed, without a cross-
reference). The opening moves of the new pressure for reform came from Rombouts: "tot
(deze) woorden behoren zeker de volgende: kampanje, kompanjon, komanjie,
sjampanje, sinjaleren, sinjalemt, insjenje, bezonje, sinjaal, swanjeren,
majiriek, assinjesie". For words with alternative pronunciations /nj/ or
Dutch /g/ + /n/, e.g. "dignitaris, stageneren, magnifkat, magnaniem" - the latter being a spelling pronunciation, the 'gn' spelling should be kept: "alleen 'nj' schrijven, waar aan de nj-uitspraak geen twijfel bestaat" (p.107).

Verschueren voiced similar thoughts in his dictionary: "'gn' gespr. nj = nj: KAMPAINE, KASTAIJTEEN (allowed by the Woordenlijst). Dus ook sinjaal enz."

A moderate move to accede to these progressive pressures came in the Rapport: "De commissie stelt voor 'nj' te spillen na 'a' en 'o'; dus 'banjo, kompanjon, bezonje', so ook 'lornjet, sinjeur', maar 'beignet, soigneren, konzigne, signeren'" (II,§.30), the latter were still felt to be too radical. Since the appearance of this report the "Aksiegroep voor Vereenvoudiging" continued to press for full acceptance of '-nj-' along the lines of Rombouts and Verschueren.

Similar to this use of 'g' or 'j' in the sound /nj/ is the appearance of 'j' in loan words where the French original has a combination such as '-aille'. In Dutch this suffix is usually pronounced either /alje/ or /all/, and this shift in pronunciation has often produced changes in spelling, some spontaneous and some the result of progressive pressures. The spelling "galjoot" is already recorded in the texts used by Salverda de Grave, and can be found in Bontekoe. This word is more prone to a '-lj-' spelling as it is derived from "galiote" which already contains an 'i'. Bontekoe however also spells "Ilje" for the Portugese "ilha" with the same palatalised 'l' as in the French suffix '-aille'.

Possibly due to the use of 'g' for /j/ in 'nj' described above, it is by no means unknown to find spellings with '-lg-' for this other sound. De Ruyter makes frequent use of this combination, as in "gelgoen, batalgons, cycylge" (=Sicily), and, from a more literary source, Bredero uses "gefalgeert" (Sp.Brab.). This particular usage was never very widespread.

The other alternative Dutch spellings continued in standard usage: Kramer in the 18th century records that "Die Franzésische Sylbe -aill, -ll (&c) ist allie oder ali (llj- &c) als Canalie (Canalje)". On p.240 he also gives "Valjant &c, Bilet oder Bilet &c". This would seem thus to be a fully acceptable spelling, though Kramer is not always infallible as a guide to
contemporary majority usage.

Since the 19th century this spelling (-alje) has had much the same fate as that of '-nj-' described above. Te Winkel disapproved of too radical forms such as "patroeljeeren" as departing too far from the original, although with the majority of "woorden dezer soort - die meest in de uitspraak eene veel sterkere verandering hebben ondergaan - is de regel niet meer toepasselijk, het gebruik schrijft ze, zoveel doenlijk, op Nederlandsche wijze, b.v. ... 'travalje (hoefstal)... biljart, ... biljet". "Millioen, medaille, failliet" on the other hand were still the only accepted forms, though "Kanalje (ook Cansille), rapalje, vermiljoen, bataljon" were acceptable (W.lijst 1866/1893 §.73) ! The dividing line is very subjective.

Again some of the Kollewijners wished to see reform in this: "faljiet, miljoenen, fuliljeton" are amongst those ridiculed by Wille above. The view of the Woordenlijst (1954) was similar to that of Te Winkel: 'll' wordt 'lj' in de woorden waarin alleen of vooral 'lj' wordt gesproken (biljart, biljet, vermiljoen enz.), maar blijft overal elders" (page L.). "Kanalje, rapalje" of Te Winkel revert to '-aille', but "miljoen" is now acceptable. Rombouts felt that if these were approved then there was no valid reason against "faljiet, giljotine, patroelje, ravitaljeren, troevalje, kanalje, vanilje, vrilje enz."(p.108), in which Verschueren agreed with him.

The "Rapport" of 1967 was very conservative: "De commissie stelt voor geen wijzigingen aan te brengen, behoudens 'kanalje' en 'rapalje'". As these were already approved by Te Winkel this is no great concession. The "Eindvoorstel- len" took an even more conservative step, and decided that "kanalje" was, after all, unacceptable. The net result of this is that very little has changed in this spelling since the early 19th century.

The only further use of 'g' for /j/ is one of very limited use. This concerns the abnormal substitution of 'g' for a normal Dutch /j/, and may well be influenced by this usage in the diminutives, in "gicht", in "gefalteer" etc.. The best examples of this anomalous usage are to be found in De Ruyter's writings, in which he uses 'g' in many positions where there is no historical basis for its presence; for example in "guytiant, gornaels, magoor, buygych,
copygeerde, questygen, doeygen, koejgen, groeygen, fraeyge, moeyge, don jan d'oustryga". In the interests of clarity the "normal" spellings would be "Jutland, journaal, majoor, buig, opisferde, kwestiën, doen, groeien, koeien, fraaie, mooie, Don Jan d'Austria". He also spells "roeijhen" for "roeien" - of "Spaynghen" mentioned above - a clear indication that not only did he consider 'g' and 'j' to be interchangeable, but also 'g' and 'gh', even to the extent of using 'gh' for 'j'. In his opinion they were merely typographical variants. This usage of his can only be explained by the humble nature of De Ruyter's scholarship.

The use of 'g' and other letters for /ʒ/.

As was described above, this palatalized form of /g/ is not native to Dutch, and consequently in the many loan words in which it occurs it has often been thought desirable to replace the French 'g' and 'j' by a different letter (or letters), in order to show that it is not the Dutch pronunciation which is expected. The most convenient of discussion is a chronological survey of the main alternatives, followed by notes on the less-used variants.

But one important point must first be noted. The spellings 'g' or 'j' are per se no guide whatsoever to the pronunciation involved: 'g' can be either the Dutch fricative, the French palatal, or /ʒ/ (as in the previous section), and 'j' can also represent either of the last two, or /ʒ/ or /ʒ/. A French word like "majesté" can thus be spelt "magesteit" by Meurier without necessarily indicating any change in the pronunciation; nor, conversely, indicating that the pronunciation was unaltered. Even a spelling like "gornael" noted above from De Ruyter is not an unambiguous guide to the pronunciation. Only when some combination other than 'j' or 'g' is used can any judgement on the sound be made. What sound was used when and by whom is of lesser relevance here, except insofar as it affected the spelling. Some words even have alternative pronunciations, not always reflected in the spelling. Two tendencies are noticeable however: those French words with initial 'j' (=/ʒ/) tend to adopt the Dutch /j/, and French 'g' (=/ʒ/) tends to adopt the Dutch fricative. These are both spelling pronunciations. This phenomenon is rarely carried out consistently: cf. "oranje/ orangist", the
latter with /z/ (syllabic stress may play a part here).

For the sound /z/ in initial position three basic spellings are known: originally French 'j' or 'g' where appropriate was kept unaltered. For long this system went unchallenged, but from the 19th century onwards there has been pressure for the adoption of 'zj' to show this sound in both cases. It must not be thought however that 'zj' was a newly discovered letter combination for this sound, as this is far from being the case. Sexagius and Van der Schuere both regard 'zj' as representing the sound of French 'j' and 'g': Sexagius uses it in the names "Ziacop, Zian, Ziazon" (D3v'), and Van der Schuere criticises this sound when applied to the name for the Dutch 'g': "Eenige noemensen 'zje', gelijk de Francoyzen". It can be seen thus that 'zj' (Sexagius's 'zi') was even as early as this established as a digraph capable of representing /z/. But it was to be long yet before this was suggested as a possible practical spelling. The single 'z' was sometimes used also, e.g. Plantijn's entry "Zeloers, ofte ialoers".

Whilst 'gh-' was the standard spelling for the Dutch fricative /ʃ/, it was convenient to retain the simple 'g' for /z/. Many early writers make just this distinction consistently: whenever Kilian, for example, uses 'g' before a palatal vowel, it almost certainly represents /z/ otherwise he uses 'gh-', even in loan words, as in "Chierlande, Chieraffe, Chisarme/guisarme" cf. "gendarme, genereren, generatie, generael, geste". As noted in the previous section Plantijn had not made this distinction.

Amongst later dictionaries to keep the 'g-' and 'gh-' fairly consistently separated in this way were those of Snyters and Binnart. The Twe-spraack distinguished 'g' (= /z/ and plosive /g/) from 'gh-' (Dutch fricative /ʃ/) in any position (see above). Snyters has for example "Geneverboom, Geneveoys, genoffel, Geryon" in his Epitheta, otherwise only 'gh-', and Binnart has only such loan words as "bagagie, generael" with 'g', in theory at least, for 'g' often slips into the Dutch words as well. In fact most consistent users of 'gh' would automatically make this distinction, and for them there could be no confusion, since their use of 'gh' was a direct consequence of the use of 'g' for /z/ (see previous section). Bolognino had an original idea for avoiding the problem: if /z/ was consistently spelt 'j', as in "lojeren,
lojic", it would render the spelling with 'gh' totally superfluous, since
the simple 'g' would be unambiguous (though this apparently results in an
ambiguity for 'j').

When the use of initial 'gh' died out, there then arose the possibility
of confusing the pronunciations of the French and Dutch 'j' and 'g': E.C.P.
for example used this as a reason for restricting the use of the letter 'j'
to /ʒ/, and using 'i' in Dutch words such as "iagen, Ian, immer". This may
have long influenced the use of 'i' for the semivowel /j/, but was not
widespread, and certainly not at the time of E.C.P.'s writing (1713). Similar
confusion probably caused De Ruyter's spelling "gornaal" for "jornael".
Sometimes the French /ʒ/ yielded to a Dutch /j/, possibly as a spelling
pronunciation in some cases, but by no means always; this cannot be the case
for example in "loyeren, looye, orloy" in Middle Dutch for "logeren, loge,
horloge", since here the /ʒ/ was spelt with 'g'. The same applies to "Jenever".

Up to the time of Siegenbeek the retention of initial 'g' and 'j' in
French loan words went unchallenged, though Siegenbeek possibly acts against
his better judgement for he feels that such a spelling as "genia" attributes
to the letter 'g' "een uitspraak, welke die letter in onze taal geenszins
heeft".

But reform tendencies were being aroused. De Neckere felt that "men zou
kunnen voorstellen van hier de S.in plaats van G. te gebruiken", were it not
just as inaccurate as the 'g' spelling. So he suggests adding an accent,
"waar toe niet beter dienen kan dan dat men de G. boven merke met het hard
aenblas-teken (Spiritus asper) der Grieken" (p.81).

Among more orthodox radical lines Bomhoff, who "geenszins gerekend (wil)
worden tot de zoodanigen, die gaarne nieuwheden invoeren", was one of the
first to moot the change from 'g' to 'zj'. Although he felt that a perfect
spelling was impossible, he was not satisfied with the Siegenbeek system in
general, and with this spelling in particular. The 'g' in French loans, he
records - as had many others before him - is pronounced as if it were a Dutch
combination 'sj' "als in sjeu, stellasje". But unlike his predecessors he
did not stop there: "over deze letterverbinding zal menig een den neus
ophalen: de klank bestaat intusschen en laat zich door 'sj' afbeelden"(f/vMT.I).
He repeats these views in his 1854 work: "Om eene verkeerde uitspraak voor te komen, zou men beter doen, in zulke woorden 'zj' te bezigen, en b.v. 'stellazje' in plaats van 'stellaadje' te schrijven" (p.27). He did not adopt it in practice, but at least he had broken the ice, as it were, for future radicals, in pointing out that it should be quite acceptable.

This was not the view held by Te Winkel (§599), who opposed such as "zjenie, inzjenieur, serzjant" as not accurately representing the sound. The conflict of opinion here between Bomhoff and Te Winkel is due fundamentally to a different approach to the desiderata of a spelling system. Te Winkel felt that 'zj' was not an exact representation of /ʒ/, and so should not be used. Bomhoff on the other hand, like the later "phonemic school" of spellers, felt that an exact reciprocity between the sounds heard and the letters used was not a sine qua non of a spelling's acceptability. For Bomhoff 'zj' was adequate and therefore acceptable, no other alternative being available. Of considerable importance for Te Winkel also were aesthetic considerations: "horlozje of horloozje, dilizjanse, maasjine zouden al te wanstaltig zijn" (Wlijst 1866 §79). Even Thijia was opposed to such spellings, though his conclusions are inconsistent: he approves of "sjerp, ansjovis" but not "zjenie, sjocolaad".

Just as was the case with the introduction of 'j' in "faljiet, odekolonje" etc., some of the Kollewijn followers were more radical than others in their demands for the use of 'zj'. In the examples given by Wille above can be seen some of Kollewijn's and Hettema's individual usages, including "zjenie, horloozje, serzjant, koerasszje". Van Deyssel also spelled "stellazje, zjum, zjeuig, zjoernalistiek" (Daman 13). This reform was, however, no part of their official "Voorstellen". Consequently no moves were made to change this spelling in the Marchant system. Nor did the Woordenlijst make any change: "G, en even zo 'j', beide = 'zj', blijven (horloge, rage, vitrage enz., journaal, joviaal enz.)" (p.xlviii).

The renewed voice of reform came again from Rombouts: "In 'n groot aantal woorden klinkt 'g' als 'zj': razje, stazje, blamazje,... zjerant, zich zjeneren, serzjant, zjenie,... zjiraf (cf. Kilian's "Ghiraffe" with a fricative!), lozjeren,... etc.. Door (spelling-uitspraak) aan en aantal
zj-woorden gelijdelijk verminderen. Men kan nu al horen spreken, met de Nederlandse 'g' van 'Gerrit': generaal, genealogie, religie,... Van de meeste deze woorden kan men zeggen, dat de 'g'-uitspraak gewoon is of van liverledes zal worden. Wherever /xz/ "bealst vaststaat" there was no reason for not writing 'zj'. The same holds mutatis mutandis for 'j', giving "zjoernaal, zjoviaal" etc., where "letter-uitspraak aan et werk (is)" causing "jaloers, joviaal" etc. with /j/ (p.106-7).

Rombouts's view was supported by Verschueren: "g, j gespr. zj = zj; MOEZJIEK; Dus ook bagazje, zjoernaal, zjoviaal". "Moezjiek" was allowed in the Woordenlijst (hence its distinctive typography by Verschueren), not because of reform pressure, but because its origin in Russian rather than in French gave no justification for using 'g' or 'j': only 'zj' was possible.

"Moejiek" is not unknown, however, being included for example in the "Prisma Vreemde Woordenboek", possibly influenced by French "moujiek".

But no concession to this pressure was forthcoming from the Rapport of 1967 or the Eindvoorstellen two years later, and the status quo was confirmed. Criticism of inconsistencies thus preserved in the official spelling comes also from Mulisch, who asks why, if "Makkiavelisme" is acceptable, "oranjist" is not also allowed.

The suffix '-age' and similar forms.

Unlike initial 'g' and 'j' described above which have a singularly straightforward development - the norm never having deviated from the original French spelling - the spelling of the suffix '-age', and certain words where '-age' occurs not as a suffix, has undergone several different transformations. There is some evidence that a different pronunciation sometimes occurred here, namely /dʒ/ as in English "John, George". For this '-age' suffix there are three main spellings, -'-aadje, -age/-agie, -azje'. It is the former, supported by Middle Dutch forms such as "staedsie, lamoetsie, staetge, loetgieren" which suggest the /dʒ/ pronunciation (which occurred in Old French at the time when these words were borrowed, cf. English "lodge, stage" with the same sound).

Until the mid 17th century '-age' was the only normal spelling, but some
time before 1635 the alternative spelling '-(a)adje" had arisen, for Montana's records such forms as "pluzaadje, stelladje" (p.31),- having, he says, the same sound as in French "Dieu", which might suggest /dz/ rather than /z/. At this time, however, these forms were not overcommon, but they were soon to become so. For they were adopted as the normal form by no lesser person than Vondel, as in "personaadjen" used above the character list for many of his plays. Because of Vondel's eminence, many writers emulated his usage, including this spelling: Brune uses "personaadje", Meijer has "timmaadje", though "personage, bagagie" are his normal forms. The older pronunciation lived on however, and Van der Weyden comments in 1651 "dat 'agje' in 'cieragie, fruytagie, personagie, pluymagie', enze in diirgelijke, klinkt als 'aasje'; ende dat 'logeren', luydt als 'loosjeren', 'logis' als 'loosjiis". He does not recommend a spelling change however.

In the next century, with the revival of many of Vondel's spelling practices under the influence of Moonen, the '-aadje' form once more became common: Langendijk has "personaadjen", Steven writes that "Bosschagie, cieragie" should have '-aadje' instead, and Zeydelaar prefers the forms "boschachaadje, personaadje, pluimaadje, vrijaadje", and even "Arkaadje" – maar (ik) zou dit liever uitspreken Ar-kaad-je", rather, that is, than with the sound which he normally heard in '-age' (see below re '-azje'). This form was also adopted by Siegenbeek; the edition of Cramer's Trap der Jeugd adapted to Siegenbeek's spelling (1894) comments for example - "Timmeragie, stellagie, schenlagie' enz., waarvoor men ook beter zegt 'schenkaadje' enz.". Cramer knows of the two pronunciations (nb "zegt", not merely "schrijft"), for he goes on: "in de Fransche bastaardwoorden, die veel onder het Nederduitsch gebruikt worden, spreekt men de 'g' als 'zje' uit, gelijk de Franschen doen". What is not clear is why he hears a different pronunciation for the first mentioned words as distinct from French loans! Thém records a contemporary pronunciation variation, which may be alluded to by Cramer, when speaking of Amsterdam dialect usage: "De Dames ... brachten in 't Hollandsch nooit iets anders dan 'timmerazie' en 'bagazie' over haar lippen".

But now pressure began for the adoption of '-azje' for this suffix, just
as it did for initial 'az-'. Te Winkel at first preferred the '-aadje' of Siegenbeek's system, but, because it no longer accurately represented the sound (once more!) he later felt that a change was needed: "in den bastamduitgang '-aadje', die nagenoeg als 'aazje' luidt, komt nog eene andere samengestelde letter 'dj' voor, die dagteekent uit den tijd, toen men 'paadje, bagaadje' enz., ontrent als 'pa-dzje, baga-dzje' uitsprak. Nu men de 'd' niet meer laat hooren en de genoemde en alle dergelijke woorden op de hedendaagsche Fransche wijze uitspreekt, moet 'dj' als vervallen worden beschouwd, en door de 'g' (in de spelling), uitgesproken als in 'horloge, manege, slijtage, stellage' (§.603),—thus bringing this spelling into line with the normal "manege, logement, genie, horloge" which had always had 'g'. The spelling adopted by the WNT was this original French '-age', since '(aadje) buiten alle verhouding met de uitspraak geraakt (is)".

There had already been criticism of Te Winkel's original support for the retention of '-aadje', e.g. from Roorda and Van Vloten: the latter (in the "Navorscher" 13,1863)wrote that "ik zou TR's spelling van den uitgang 'agie' boven die van ZIEGENBEEK en TE WINKEL (aadje) verkiesen, omdat laatstgemelde meer dan de eerste tot wanspraak verleidt",—namely /-aadze/. This was in answer to a comment by "Een Vraagaf" on Roorda's review of Te Winkel ("De Nederlandische Spelling" in De Gids 1862 II,33) asking "ZIEGENBEEK schrijft 'vrijaadje, plantaadje', en zoo doet ook dr. TE WINKEL. T.R. wil geschreven hebben 'vrijagie, plantagie'. Wie heeft het aan het regte eind?".

And so once more '-age' (not Roorda's '-agie') became the accepted spelling, which did not please Kollewijn, Hetteema, Van Deyssel and others, writing '-azje' (though this should have had a double 'a': "staazje, bagaazje"). From this time on the development of '-age', and the pressure for '-(a)azje' went hand in hand with that of 'zj-', which has already been described: Rombouts and Verschueren pressed for 'sj', and the Woordenlijst and official reports made no concessions.

Other spellings: (few of these are very common, others may exist).

dg: is used by Coster in "redgeren" (Teeuwis,1413), possibly to show a /dʒ/
pronunciation. It is also recorded as normal in Kramer's grammar: "Die (Französische) Endylbe -age, -ege, -ice &c ist -agie oder aadgie &c als Avantagie &c". He actually only uses 'agie' in the examples, and it is possible that he may be confusing 'agie' with 'aadje'. This also constitutes a further example of the interchange of 'g' and 'j'.

dg: A fairly common Middle Dutch spelling: Salverda de Grave records "staedsie", and the WNT mentions older spellings such as "pelgrimaedse".

gi: This was often used in the suffix form '-agie' and represents a variant pronunciation /a:zi/; it is known from Middle Dutch to the early 19th century. De Grave records "avantagie", the Gent Boecius has "pelgrimagien" etc. See also Kramer's comments on 'dg' given above. On the other hand it is possible that some users felt 'gi' to be a digraph for /zi/, and pronounced '-agie' in the same way as they would '-age'. Also possible is /a:zi:/—cf 'zie' below.

s & z: These too represent variant pronunciations, complicated by the use of 's' for /z/. Middle Dutch knew such forms as "Kalensierde" from "chalenger" (Van Loey), "avontasie, koerszie, tresie, visazie, rasie, barsie" (De Grave). "Cierasie" for "sierage" occurs in some editions of Kiliian (e.g. Kiliianus Auctus), and De Ruyter uses "resamenit" for "regiment". A common dialect form is "sponsie" (De Grave), which is one of the forms advocated by the Bible translators: "G.16. 'sponsie' et 'spongie', utrusque licet"; and for some reason the "Reviseurs" preferred yet another form,—"'sponsie' potius 'spnie'".

In the 18th century a pronunciation with /z/ or /s/ is often recorded. Van der Schelling uses "privilezie", and Zeydelaar comments that "-dje'moet uitgesproken worden als 'zie' (=zie) in 'boschschadje'". The grammar of Schwiers seems to have borrowed once again from Zeydelaar (cf. chap.7): "'Boschadje, personaadje, pluimaadje, plantaadje' &c. In all these words the 'dje' is pronounced as 'zie': Some write 'plantagie, personagie' &c.". Some of the Nvt works claim that "als de woorden eindigen in 'dje' of 'gie' moet men dit einde als 'zie' of 'sje' uitspreken, of de 'd' of 'g' eene 's' ware" (Trap der Jeugd 1793).
As late as the mid 19th century Van Vloten, after the comment given above, adds "juister nog dan deze (sgie) zou ik echter 'azig' achten". This diaeresis raises the question of minor relevance here,—whether '-gie' was pronounced /zi/ or /zi:/; both are known (cf. Winschoten's spelling "bagaglj"). This pronunciation with /z/ is sometimes thought vulgar, as when Beets deliberately spells the name of one of his characters as "Zorsetje" for "Georgette". "Lozeren, passazier" etc. may still be heard in certain manners of speech (De Grave), and at some times it has been recognized as a definite local variant (see Thijm's comment given above).

-sg: used by De Ruyter in "geloosgeert", though possibly more common than this single example might suggest. De Grave also records "besaesge, braesge" which he thinks may represent /s/ rather than /z/, though this need not be so.

-sj: was used for 'sj' to describe the pronunciation of /z/, by those who normally use 's' for /z/: Leupenius comments on "de Fransche maniere, die 'sjean, saques' seggen", and Winschoten, who opposes the French name commonly given in Holland to 'g', abhors the pronunciation "also wij seiden 'sje'". Neither of them proposes adopting this spelling, any more than did Sexagius or Van der Schuere who use 'sj' or 'zi' in the same way. Similarly the appearance of 'sji' and 'sgji' in Ten Kate (I.149) are merely attempts to formulate a phonetic transcription for French and German 'ch',—they are not suggested spelling changes.

-sy: occasionally this stands to 's' as '-gie' does to '-ge', but it is used as a separate digraph by De Ruyter, possibly by analogy with his 'sg' spellings, e.g. "bagasye, equaesye" (bagage, equipage—sic).

-z: this is evidence of the change in pronunciation from /z/ to /j/, which often happens in Dutch (cf. "jaloers, joviaal, joker" etc. with /z/ or /j/). Examples, already quoted, include "loyeren looye", and also the following line from the Middle Dutch "Beatrijs": "Binnen dien was die nacht ghegaen/ Dat dorloy begonste te slaen" (845-6).
The spelling 'sj' for /ʒ/.

This spelling, despite the superficial similarity to 'zj', has a significantly different history. The digraph 'sj' has long been accepted whereas 'zj' is still officially acceptable only in "moezjiek". There are very good reasons for this: the use of 'g' or 'j' for /ʒ/ has a sufficient history in French loans to remain in normal use, and very few loan words from other languages contain this sound; the spelling 'g' or 'j' is therefore acceptable. For /ʒ/ on the other hand there is no obvious single way of spelling a sound which is found in a great many languages. In French loans 'ch' could remain in the same way as 'j' or 'g' for /ʒ/, but from other languages another spelling had to be found, especially for those using a non-Latin alphabet, notably Russian, Yiddish and Malay. The Yiddish spelling 'sch' was to be avoided because of its potential mispronunciation, though it can certainly be found. However there was within the Dutch spelling system an already existing standard letter combination for this sound, in 'sj', to be found in the diminutives such as "zusje, kusje". What could be more obvious than to use this accepted spelling for the same sound in loan words (nb. the sound /ʒ/ does not naturally occur in Dutch).

For a long time these foreign words were not considered part of the native Dutch vocabulary, or if they were, they retained their foreign spellings. But by the time of De Vries and Te Winkel some words had established a rightful place. In the spelling system of the latter the following were recognised: "Sjaal (ook châle), sjalot, sjamberloek, sjappetouwer, sjees, sjerp, sjofel, sjopper, sjerrie, sjouw, ansjovis" and their derivatives; "schacheren" on the other hand retained its 'sch-'. Of these words some are French (sjaal, sjalot, ansjovis), some Malay (sjappetouwer), some Frisian (sjeur, sjouw). It is perhaps surprising that Te Winkel allowed "sjaal" alongside "châle", when he so strongly opposed other spellings such as "sjerrie, sjokolade, masjine" (§.599). Here is a probable case of the sheer weight of a very common usage overpowering a theory.

The more far-reaching spellings of Kollewijn and Hettema have been noted above (brosjure, masjiene, vernasjonalieséren, kasjot) together with the reaction which they aroused in the person of Wille, here typical of a
great many others. No great concession was made in the Woordenlijst of 1954: 
"'ch' wordt 'sj' in woorden waarin deze spelling reeds vrij algemeen is (sjerp, sjoes en derg.)." Many of these words had not been accepted by Te Winkel, e.g. "sjabben, sjabloon (ook schablone), sjabrak, sjachelaar, 
sjacheren, sjak, dervisj" etc. Some were moderately radical, including
"sjagrijn, sjilbolet, sjiek, sjintoisme" all of which retained their 
conservative spellings "chagrin, chic, etc.). On the whole this extension 
reflects enlargement of the everyday vocabulary rather than changes in the 
official view on the acceptability of 'sj'.

Rombouts was in part pleased by this extension, but wanted "die (lijst)... 
weer aanvullen met de rest, om tot 'n echte regel te komen", including now
"sjarevitsj, ransjen, sjarteren, slijk, sjerif, sjerrie, masjine, sjantazje" etc. - in short all the words containing the sound /sj/. Some extension to 
the official list was made by the Rapport: "hasjee, kapusjon, kasjot, 
marsjeren, sjagrijn, sjampetter, sjapieter, sjiek, sjimpansee, sjofeur, 
sjokola(de)", some of which already existed as alternatives; all now became 
the preferred forms.

But the Eindvoorstellen retracted, possibly under the pressure of 
conservative opposition, and all these words reverted to 'ch' except 
"sjagrijn, sjampetter, sjapieter, sjiek, sjimpansee", of which only 
"sjapieter, sjimpansee" were not already to be found in the Woordenlijst.

It would seem than the well established use of 'ch' for /s/ in French 
words such as "machine" inhibits the acceptance of the digraph 'sj' in 
French loans, as far as most of the Dutch writing public is concerned, even 
though 'sj' is fully accepted in a great many other loans.

Summary:

GH: in favour of prepalatal 'gh' becoming 'g': Plantijn, Casbout, Sexagius, 
De Heuiter, Van der Schuere, Van Heule, Ampzing, Plemp, 
Bible translators, Montanus, Van den Ende, Bilius, etc.. 
defenders of prepalatal 'gh-': Kilian, Binnart, Rodriguez.
users of 'gh' before any vowel: Maerlant, Twe-spraak, Van Gherwen. 
opposed by Lambrecht, Van der Schuere.

users of 'gh' before any letter: Kok, Meijer. 
opposed by Van der Schuere and Bible translators. 
rejected by Twe-spraak only on grounds of convenience.

final '-gh', '-ght' etc. see chapter 3. 
medial '-gh-' see chapter 4.
'g' = /j/ in Diminutives: common up to mid 17th century (bockgien etc.)
intervocally: known from 17th century usage (koeygen etc.)
in '-nj-': known from 17th century onwards; supported in the 18th century by the influential usage of Wagenaar; extended slightly in turn by Te Winkel, Woordenlijst 1954, Rapport.
in '-gn-': the normal spelling until the 19th century.
in '-ng-': hybrid spellings, not common (17th century)
in '-ngj-': known from late 17th century onwards;
"galjoot" is known from very early date, but not quite the same phenomenon.
From 19th century onwards as for '-nj-', uncommon, though known in early 17th century, e.g. in Bredero and De Ruyter.

'-adje': used by all official spellings except Siegenbeek;
used in almost all grammars, even in the period when '-aadje' common.

'-(a)adje': known from early 17th century onwards, especially under the influence of Vondel in the 17th and 18th century; used by Siegenbeek.

other spellings known in this suffix and similar positions:
dg, ds, gi, j, s, sg, (aj), sy, tg, y, z; with varying sounds.

'sj' for /s/:
unlike 'zj', adopted since early 19th century. List of accepted words extended by successive official spellings, but French 'ch' resists the change.
radicals:
Kollewijn, Hettema, Rombouts, Rapport (not Eindvoorstellen).
Chapter 9: 'h'

'ph' in loan words
'rh' in loan words
'th' in Dutch words: for 't'

from 'teh-' in loan words: 'thee'

other loans.

This chapter concerns the use or omission of 'h' after certain consonants. The omission of 'h' in initial position before vowels is not discussed, being a matter of dialectal divergence and not the result of any difference in spelling theory. The letter combinations concerned are 'ph', 'rh' and 'th'. Due to the nature of these spellings the only source for words containing these combinations is in loan words from Greek, with the exception of 'th' formed by the contraction of 'teh-' in the Dutch words "thuis, thans", and a now obsolete system involving 'th' for a normal 't' in Dutch words.

PH.

This is the only one of the three combinations where reform involves the replacement by a different letter, rather than merely dropping the 'h', - a fact which has occasionally caused 'ph' to be mispronounced as /p/ by analogy with 'th' and /t/, and 'rh' and /r/. Since the vast majority of Greek loan words came to Dutch via Latin (sometimes additionally via French), the Latin convention of spelling 'ph' was automatically followed. Not until the mid 17th century was this spelling questioned.

Once more, as with all loan word spellings, the question arises of when is the word concerned naturalised enough to be allowed a Dutch spelling. This usually comes down to assessing the frequency of use, and with words originally containing 'ph' few are very frequently used, e.g. "profeet, nimf, triomfe, filosoof, fenix" and their derivatives. Most of these are moreover only common in literary use, not in the everyday language.

In Middle Dutch spellings with 'ph', such as "prophete", were the norm; the Exercitium has "propheeten" and Boecius has "philosophien". In the next century 'f' spellings begin to become more common: Plantijn has 'ph' in all words except "triomfe", but Kilian, who often shows himself more progressive than his predecessor, has "Profete, profetéren" as well as "triomffe, triomffant" in the list of loan words. Sexagius on the other hand
spells "triumphereerde", Pontus de Haulter has "Philosooph", Valcoogh has "Propheten", Van Beaumont and Van der Hoot have "Himph, Nympeh" respectively, etc., etc..

One of the earliest comments on the alternative 'f' spelling is in Kelmans's dictionary of 1587, where the following is noted: "les dictions qui ne se trouvent on F se trouveront en Ph, comme 'phantasie, fantasie, phantosme, fantosme, Francvord, Vrancvord (?), diaphragme, diafragme'". This covers quite a few more words than observed before. The note, included in the 1591 and 1602 editions, was later dropped.

Van der Schuere does not consider 'f' a plausible spelling for 'ph' in loan words: "over al waer dat 'ph' aan een gehecht in een Sillabe komt, als: 'Pharoa, Naphtalim, Kaphernaum, Propheten, Philosophie' ende dergelijke ('twelke al uyt-hénsche woorden ofte namen zijn) daer moeten de 'ph' als 'f' lesen: Ende nochtans en gebruycten niet zulke woorden met 'f' te schryven, want sy uyt-hénsch ende onze Nederduydsche Spellinge niet onderworpen en zijn".

This view was to last for several decades more, and is echoed by the usage of most contemporaries, both in grammars and in literature, e.g. in Bredero, Starter, Anna Visscher, Amzing. Smyters, although using only 'ph' in his Epitheta (Nymph, pharao, philosophije -sic), felt contemporary opinion to be more varied: "wy (hebben) tusschen ... 'f' ende 'ph' weynich onderscheysts gemaect ... on dat zomighe Nederlanders oock kleyn onderscheyt maken". Van Heule does recognize that 'f' is possible, though he does not like it: "...'Propheet, Nazareth, Philosoph, Conscientie' daar wy volgens onze tale, zouden konnen schrijven 'Profeet, Nazaret, Filosoof, Konsciencie'" (1633, p.144). This too is the opinion of Montanus: "De Stofmerking der uitheemse woorden geschiet schier altijt nae den Oorspronge: als 'Pharao'... voor 'Paaaro'"(p.25).

But in 1644 came an occurrence of vital importance for this spelling, not from a grammarian or orthographist, but from a leading literary figure. In this year Vondel decided to adapt Greek and Latin names as far as possible to the Dutch spelling system. Not only did this apply to such as "Cezar, Merkus", but also to such words and names as 'Polofeem, Febus, Faeton;
nyafen" etc. This could hardly fail to induce similar spellings amongst his emulators, e.g. De Brune (in Banket-work), though as yet not among grammarians. The majority of these could not agree with this radical step, or at best were dubious: Pels concedes that he "op het voorgaan van de beste Schrijvers Petrus, en Fauston, zou kunnen spellen", yet he does not prefer it to the traditional 'ph'. Neijer is of like mind: in his dictionary (all editions) he uses 'ph', but has some cross-references such as "Profeet ziet Prophæst" for the benefit of more progressive users. Most grammarians, such as Nockaert, Binnart, Leupenius, to name but three of many, preserved 'ph'.

Unashamedly conservative and puristic is Winschoten's view in 1683/4: he would like all loan words to be clearly earmarked as such by their spelling. He is not at all impressed by the eminence of Vondel's example: "dewijl wij bemerken dat 'er sulke covergroote Liefhebbers van de Neederduitse spellkonst zijn, die niet en souden kunnen dulden, dat men 'Philosooph', of 'Prophæst' soude schrijven met een PH, maar dat zij gewoon zijn te schrijven 'Filosof, Profeet': deze sullen wij alleenlijk dit te gemoed voeren, te weeten, dat wij oordeelen, dat men uitsaamse woorden met haar uitsaamse spelling behoor te laten pronken, op dat het klaarlijk blijken mag, dat het uitsaamse woorden zijn".

Duikerius had similar doubts about the rejection of foreign letters in foreign words, in that those who change 'ph' into 'f' (and 'q' into 'kw') "beroven hierdoor de zelve woorden alzoo het uitsaamse zijn, van hen Natuurlijke klank (?), en eygen letteren, en daarom is die wyze van doen ten eenmaal verwerpelijk".

But only a few years later come one of the major turning points, when three influential figures, later to be joined by a fourth, came down in support of Vondel's 'f' system. These are Van Hoogstraten, Nyloë, Hoonen and Huydecoper.

Van Hoogstraten allows in his list an 'f' in all words in common use, though his criteria are not all that might be desired: "Van deze letter beginnen vele woorden, die schoon al meest van onduitse afkomst, echter door het gebruik zijn aangenomen, en in het getal der Nederduitse ingelijft. Het onderscheit van beide kunnen luiden van letteren aenmerken". Apart
from Germanic loans with 'f-', this comment also covers Romance words such as "filosoof, fenix".

Moonen argues that Dutch should abide by the Latin precedent: "Met de F worden, naer de wyze der Latynen, die Anfion, Fryx, Hierosante spelden, de woorden geschreeven, die van uithoensche taelen afkomstigh, de Ph gebruikten; als 'Pamiël, Parno, faam, filosoof, Stefanus, en andere". Nyloë (second edition p.40) agrees, but is much more extensive, bringing new factors to light: "De 'f' wort met reden gebruikt in eigen namen, die wy uit het Grieksch of Latyn in onze tale overbrengen, ... als in 'Filosoof, Filippus, Filadelfus', voor 'Philosooph, Philippus, Philadelphus', volgende hierin de Grieken en Latynen, die de eige namen uit andere talen in de hunne overbrengende, die naar den aart hunner tale buigen. ... Als men 'Filosoof' met een 'f' schrijft, kan 'er niemant 'Filosoop' uit lezen, gelyk ik wel gehoorde hebbe van zulke die geen andere als de Nederduitsche taal verstanden. ... Zodat 'er geen de minste reden is waarom wy die woorden met 'ph' zouden schrijven".

Huydecoper (I,§,44-1) refers to Vondel's and Van Hoogstraten's use of "Tifeus" and other spellings (see below under 'th'), though he concedes that "F ... kan voegelijk in vreemde Namen behouden worden" (note in the Index). These influential figures, especially that of Moonen, caused many writers to adopt the 'f'-forms, for example Langendijk, Hooyvliet, Poot and Rotgans.

Some grammarians disagreed however, such as E.C.P. who discusses the use of 'ph' or 'f' in "Philosoof, Philippus, Philemon" and declares "ik houde het zonder waggeling met de eerste spelling"(='ph'), firstly because of the Greek origins of the words, and secondly because the pronunciation of 'ph' as /f/ is universally known (Nyloë would disagree with this!). This may be influenced by his Flemish nationality, since Southern spelling was often more conservative than the Northern forms around this time. Throughout the 18th century Flemish orthographists, with few exceptions, continued to prefer 'ph', e.g. Des Roches, Verpoorten, Ballieu, "Letterschik", Van Daele.

In the North many grammarians, possibly encouraged by Moonen's success (in this field), pressed for 'f'-spellings. Sewel's revision of La Grue notes that "le 'ph' se prononce comme 'f', c'est pourquoi quelques-uns
écrivent 'f' au-lieu de 'ph'" (Cuno wrote: "Das 'ph' spricht man als 'f'
aus, dahero viele ... ein 'f' vor ein 'ph' schreiben"). Van Belle regards
the replacement of 'ph' by 'f' as a fait accompli in 1748: "men beezigt ze
ook voor de oude Phi, aldus: in 'Filozoof', in 'Par'co, Stefanus" (similar in
1755). The Flemish "Shoeijmes", one of the few Southern radicals, wishes to
avoid all foreign letters, and declares that Dutch needs no "grieksche 'ph'
(cm) de moedertale te verzieren". Others expressed similar feelings
throughout the century (e.g. M.S., Van der Palm), though yet others disapproved
(e.g. Lincken, Holtrop, "Inleyding" and the "Kunst..." grammar).

From the mid century many grammars accept the use of 'f' in certain words,
though the choice often varies. Zeydelaar is quite radical: "mén behoort den
F doorgaans voor Ph te gebruiken. ... Hét was reeds de gewoonte van den
grooten Vondel". Stijl and Bolhuis allowed 'Filozoof' and "Profeet", and any
other word which would not be rendered unintelligible by the change, - a
very subjective criterion. The "Nuttig en Noodig Speldboekje" had a spelling
more practical than theoretical: "Om ligtsheldwil, heb ik de 'f' dikwils
voor 'ph' gebruikt".

The elementary books of the Nut are of interest here insofar as they
list "Woorden van drie lettergrepen ... Fi-lo-soof, Phi-le-mon ..." in
alphabetical order, with 'ph' coming between 'f' and 'g'! Schwiers (1799)
records a moderately radical use of 'f' even in names: "The 'f' is frequently
used instead of 'ph' in ... Potifar, Filosoof, Farao, Jefts, Filadelfia,
Filistijn, Filosofie, Memfis, Stefanus".

Van Daele, however, presents a strange picture: In line with his
substitution of 'ks' for 'x' (i.e. two letters for one) he moots the
substitution of 'ph' for 'f' (sic). However he discarded this when he
realised that it would involve the spelling "hephphen" for "heffen", or
possibly "'hepphen' ... gelyk men 'lacchen' schryft". It is not unusual
to find eccentric spellings mooted by Van Daele.

Siegenbeek allowed such words as "feniks", but not proper names such as
"Phebus", in accordance with the "gebruik van vele achtbare schrijvers".
This view was consequently adopted in the later Nut works: "Het schrijven
van 'feniks' voor 'phenix' heeft geen zwaarighheid", as also "'nimf', seraf..."
(maar) tussen 'filosof' of 'Philosof' behoeft nauwelijks een keuze gedaan te worden, daar wij hiervoor een eigen Nederduitsch woord, dat van 'wijgeer' namelijk, bezitten" (Nutt "Sprakkunst"); this is a remarkable case of begging the question.

During the reign of the Siegenbeek system the several criticisms of it also covered these 'ph' spellings, and from both angles: Smits thought Siegenbeek too conservative, - "het schrijven met twee letters, 'ph' ... (is) onzer tale gansch oneigen" (p.46), and Carlebur on the other hand thought Siegenbeek too radical, - "men (schrijve) de 'ph, th', in alle de bestaardwoorden, waarin deze letterscombinaties oorspronkelijk behooren, en bij gevolg 'triumph, seraph, philosoph, nymph, thron', ja zelfs 'Phillip, Cathrijn'" (p.36). The weakness of this argument is that the Greeks used 'ph' no more than they used 'f', so that an "oorspronkelijk" spelling would strictly speaking involve the use of Greek letters!

De Vries and Te Winkel also thought that little concession should be made to 'f': "Voor het gebruik van 'f' ... is geene enkele verdedigbare reden aan te voeren. Dat 'ph' als 'f' ... uitgesproken wordt, is van het beschaafde publiek genoegzaam bekend, terwijl het volk zelden Grieksche woorden bezigt. De mogelijkheid om 'ph' als 'p' uit te spreken kan niet als eene geldige reden voor hare vervanging door 'f' beschouwd worden. Het Nederlandsch toch maakt geene uitzonderingen op algemene regels, wanneer die uitzonderingen alleen het vermijden eener verkeerde uitspraak ten doel zouden hebben" (§.613). This is a very strict definition of his general rule that in determining spelling, derivation should overrule pronunciation. Their Woordenlijst made a slight concession in allowing "nimf", because of its established use by poets, who, being part of "het beschaafde publiek", had made this spelling respectable.

Later editors of the WNT were a little more moderate, possibly in the light of the increasing number of everyday words (such as "telefoon") in which a 'ph/f' was used; "het volk" was thus indeed now using "Greek" words. G.J. Boekenoogen writes in WNT that "hoe langer hoe meer aan de vernederlandschte schrijfwijze de voorkeur wordt gegeven. Aan het einde van een woord wordt tegenwoordig steeds 'f' geschreven; verg. 'nimf', philosof,
ontijs werd ' -ph' als slotklank meermalen als 'p'
uitgesproken, blijksens vormen als 'Jozep' ... voor 'Jozef', en 'filosofisch'
aan 'filosoof'. "Zij behouden (echter) ... 'ph' waar de Latijnsche en
Grieksche spelling die lettertekens medebrengt. Dat de 'ph' aanleiding kan
geven tot een verkeerde uitspraak bij minkundigen, geeft desen het recht niet
om te eischen dat de geheele natie te hunnen gerieve inconsequent zal
handelen" (this last comment is taken word for word from Te Winkel). The
reason for allowing "nimf" but not "filosoof" is that 'f' occurs in native
Dutch words, whereas 'f-' does not. This gave rise to such hybrid spellings
as "philosoof" (see above). Coijin claimed to know of the pronunciation
/jozep, potograaf/ "bij minder ontwikkelden" as late as 1895!

Again several people were dissatisfied with this situation, and again
from various sides: De Jager felt that 'ph' should, as far as possible,
always be preserved; Van Lennep, although not anti-radical, felt that 'ph'
should be used consistently, thus not allowing such forms as "philosoof";
and Alberdingk Thijm wanted "filozofen". Van Vloten was the exact opposite of
Van Lennep, he was utterly opposed to the replacement of 'c' by 'k' or 's',
which Van Lennep supported, yet he desired "verwanging der 'ph', waar die ook
moge voorkomen, door 'f' (potograaf onz.).". This is a little inconsistent.

But by far the strongest opposition came from Kollewijn. The consistent
replacement of 'ph' by 'f' formed one of their basic Voorstellen: "in
bastaardwoorden schrijve men ... 'f' in plaats van 'ph': 'alfabet,
fotograferen, fysika, fantasie'". This found little opposition, at least as
far as common words were concerned, "maar als datzelve in een wetenschap-
pelijk werk met alle woorden moet gebeuren, waarin een 'ph' voorkomt, dan zal
het op een misdruk gaan gelijken ... omdat in die Grieksche woorden nog wel
meer vreemdsortige letters en lettercombinaties voorkomen, waarbij een
Nederlandse 'f' net zoveel past als een tang op een varken" (Van Dieren,
p.22). This would be true were it not also proposed to simplify these other
"lettercombinaties" as well, to avoid such ugly hybrid spellings as he fears.

Dixi felt the change desirable, on the grounds of potential mispron-
unciation, and even Scharten and Van Ginneken raised little opposition. The
more so then is it surprising that the Marchant spelling made no attempt to
modify the spelling of loan words, even in this well-supported area. No hesitation is shown in the post-war Woordenlijst however: "'Ph' is overal vervangen door 'f'". This move was, as might be expected, welcomed by the radicals: Rombouts wrote that "van de 'p' is alleen dit belangrijk, dat 'ph' steeds vervangen wordt door 'f': één van de zeldzame 'regels' die ook in de Wld. ten ijnde toe, dus zonder uitzonderingen, worden doorgegaan" (p.108).

There was therefore no further need for pressure on this point, though some did not welcome the new spelling on aesthetic grounds. Mulisch, though not at all anti-progressive, much prefers the older spelling in one word at least, though not for very precise reasons: "zelf heb ik ooit eens het woord 'sphynx' neergeschreven. Etymologisch is dat volslagen idioot, maar voor het oog maakte het duidelijker wat ik er mee te zeggen had - d.w.z. duidelijker in zijn onduidelijkheid - dan de spelling 'sphinx', laat staan 'sfinks'" (p.22). It can probably be safely assumed however, that the 'f'-for-'ph' spelling is now fully accepted.

RH.

Only a handful of words are affected by this spelling: "rhetoriek, rhythm, rhabarber, catarrhe" etc., and remarkably little argument has ever been voiced against the replacement of 'rh' by 'r'. For a very long time the spelling was totally ignored, as none of these words is of particularly common use, and all are of blatantly foreign origin.

It must not be thought however that the substitution of 'r' for 'rh' is a purely modern phenomenon, for "rhabarber" is quite a common spelling in earlier times, and is even used in the ultraconservative dictionary of Binnart. One of the first modern radicals to demand the change was Suits in the early 19th century: "het schrijven met twee letters ... 'rh' ... (is) onzer tale gansch onóóijen" (p.46). Carlebur was totally opposed to any move which could result in a "bijna onkenbaar" form such as "rhabarber", and no change was really to be expected from the historical/etymological system of De Vries and Te Winkel.

A new attempt to introduce the simple 'r' spelling was contained in the revised version of Kollewijn's Voorstellen. The first version (1893) had
wished for 'ph' to become 'f', but made no reference to 'rh/r'. As was the
case with 'ph/f' this move found approval from Scharten, one of the main
opponents of Kollewijn, but again loan word spellings were left intact by
Marchant. Dixi (1934) favoured reform, but knew of five possible alternatives
for one of the words in question: the official "rhythme", the French-styled
"rythme", the infrequent "rhytme" (who had used this?), "'rytme' - de meest
racionéle" and "ritme" - the most radical (p.20).

The Woordenlijst of 1954 finally banished this pseudo-Greek spelling, by
decreeing that "'Rh' is overal vervangen door 'r'", thereby, apparently,
settling the matter. This is one of the most peaceful of all Dutch spelling
changes ever accomplished.

**TH. 'th' for 't' in Dutch words**

This is the only letter combination of the three discussed in this
section which affects native Dutch words as well as loan words; and the
Dutch words affected must be further split into two groups,- those with a
derived 'th' and those without, respectively "thans, thuis" etc. (from 'teh-')
and "thien, thoonen" etc..

The last mentioned group comprises spellings with 'th' in place of the
normal 't', a feature which is already well known in Middle Dutch, and is
usually attributed to German influence. No other reason is immediately
apparent, though some form of aspirated /tʰ/ cannot be ruled out altogether -
the more so in that Dutch usage of 'th' is not exactly the same as in German.

In the latter 'th' occurs primarily before or after stressed long vowels
to show the length (e.g. "thun, rath"), whereas in Middle Dutch the intrusive
'h' appears in many positions. On the other hand this may merely show that
the writer had borrowed an orthographical form and had then lost sight of
its original function. Van Loey records in Middle Dutch such forms as "the,
ducenthech, thijt, thune, bethonen, rigtheren, plegh,... de spelling komt
overal voor, van de 13de tot de 15de eeuw" (dh' is also known: Hoebeke
records "dhoek, dhuust", though these are rare).

By the late 15th century the majority of these forms seem to have died
out, remaining only before stressed vowels (not necessarily long), and not
in a great number of words. Some of these words however are found extremely
frequently with 'th', notably "thien, thoonen" and their compounds; others
are less frequently found, but these two especially seem to have long been
the standard form.

The Exercitium has "theren", Van der Werve has "thoonen", Lambrecht's
Naambouck includes "Then, Thénewgck, Thieren", listed as if spelt 'te-
ti-'! He also uses "then" to mean "Net ende", as in "r, er, thee vë der
töge al bene" where there is little explanation for the insertion of 'h'.
Kilian also has several such spellings in his dictionaries: "acht-thien,
thenit, Thins, thoeuerboom", though he lists "tien, thien" as alternatives.
In this he is, for once, more conservative than Plantijn, whose only 'th'
spelling is in the alternative "thian oft tien" and its compounds. "Een
ghetaal van thiienen" occurs on p.47 of the Twe-spraak, and De Heuiter has
"thien, negenthien, thonende, thoont". It is strange that De Heuiter,
usually so meticulous on his spelling, particularly on the subject of
superfluous letters, does not even discuss this usage.

One 16th century writer did make a comment however, and it is this, in
the Voorreden of 1563 attributed to Coornhert, which may indicate some form
of aspiration: "uy spreken (th) in onse tale veel harder dan de enkele T"
(p.14, in the Tijschrift edition), as in "onguesthreckder" (p.11,15). This
may be mostly autosuggestion, but is supported by a statement from Erasmus
some 40 years earlier, when condemning some mispronunciations of Latin by
the Dutch and Germans. Whereas the latter, he says, "'th' subinde sonant,
& scribunt pro 't' ... nos sonamus 't' pro 'th'. Qui crasse docent, monstrant
'G' propositum sonare quod nobis sonant 'ts'". There was thus a tendency to
pronounce 'th' and 'G' "almost" as /ts/, which again may be an attempt to
describe a slight aspiration. Whatever the reason, the use of 'th' in the
words mentioned above continues to be fairly common: Stevin uses "bethoont",
Coornhert has "thiende", and Van Beaumont writes "thiemael".

In the next century such usage continued from a great many writers,
including Roosar Visscher, Cats, the early Hooft (Achilles), Van der Venne,
Bontekoe, Van Borsselen, Bolswert, De Ruyter, and Huygens, all of whom use
"thien" or "thoonen". Such usage was not restricted to literary works, and
The use of 'th' could not go long unopposed in the atmosphere of the early 17th century, and is condemned, for example, by Van der Schueren: "In onze spellinge (kan) ook lichtelijk getoond worden, hoe overtollig van meest elk in een sillabe de C aende K, de H aende G ende aende T ... gevoegd worden" (Intro. p.6). But the final blow to what was already a moribund spelling came when the committee of the Bibletranslators opposed its use: "H.2. 'Vertommen, toonen, tien', mine 'h' — nb the most common words again. It is highly probable, however, that the spelling persisted as a minority usage. Zoet (1675) still uses "thienen" (p.10), and Van Atteveld (1682) comments that "T behoort in een lettergreep geen 'h' achter haar te hebben, ende zonder reden wordt de 'h' gestelt in 'weth, renthen, thiinden, thinzen'" (p.10). Similar comments are still found in Van Geesdalle (1700) and Haegelenburg (1719ff).

Again, as with so many other spellings, there is a definite tendency for this to be a feature of Southern conservatism. As late as 1766 "thonen, thiene" etc. can still be found in the booklet on Aerschot. Janssens (1775) criticises Van Bellegen and Waterschoot for supporting the forms "seventhiende, thien, thoön, throon" etc. (the first mentioned is found in De Neckere p.63, in 1815). In the North such spellings had died out by the mid 17th century.

TH. as a contraction for 'teh-

The other group of Dutch words in which 'th' has been used comprises those where the 'th' is a contraction of the preposition 'te' and a following 'h'. This affects only three words: "thuis, thans, althans", not "nochtaan" which is etymologically distinct. These come respectively from "te huis, (al) te hands". Because of the validity of the historical spelling with 'th', these forms were only comparatively recently attacked, on the grounds that the 'h' is no longer serving any useful purpose.

Of the three "thuis" is probably the most tenacious, as the origin of the 'h' is more immediately obvious here than is the connection between
"thans" and "hand"; conversely the influence of "nochtans" makes "tans, altans" less strange to the eye. Reverse influences causing "nochtans" have sometimes been in evidence, notably in the 18th century (e.g. "nogthans" in De Denker 2, 234; & 3,139). This means that the reform of "thans" to "tans" occurs more frequently in moderate claims than does "thuis/tuis".

Long before the first moves for reform however, forms with only 't' were not unknown. The spellings "tans, altans" are fairly common in the later 18th century, e.g. in Van Belle and Zeydelaar, and Van der Voorst spells "thansch". As far back as 1633 Van Heule uses "t'Uys" (p.147, cf "t'huys" p.134), though this is exceedingly rare. A not inconceivable influence in 18th century spellings was Huydecoper; not all agreed with him however - "in het woord 'thans' dat vy in die afwyking 'tans' schryven zonder 'h'". This was a comment by the society "Concordia...", in their Proeve of 1755. But what is probably more significant than their "afwyking" was their subsequent repentance: this spelling "tans", they claim in the introduction, was an oversight, and only occurs in the first part of the book, the later sections having 'th-'. The form "tans" must therefore have been sufficiently uncommon for public opinion or the weight of Huydecoper's usage to cause them to change their minds.

Siegenbeek disapproved of the dropping of this etymological 'h', yet he has a strangely inconsistent argument. He records that "thansa" is a contraction of "te hands", giving the formerly very frequent spelling "thands", and then goes on to ask "wat nu was natuurlijker, dan dat men de 'd' welke zich niet dan beswaarlijk list uitspreken ... spredig list varen. ... Onmerkelijk intusschen is het, dat men de 'h', welke in de uitspraak niet of nauwelijks wordt waargenomen, in het schrijfgebruik bestendig behouden heeft". He is aware of this inconsistency, where the 'd' is easily dropped but the 'h' clings on, but the only explanation he can think of is the retention of the 'h' to avoid confusion with "nogtans", which is unlikely to occur however. The inconsistency was not of his making.

The use of 'th-' continued to be the accepted spelling, and even Schrijvers, who was utterly opposed to any superfluous 'h' in 'rh, ph, th, gh, ch' (sic), concedes that these words are exceptions, "in welken de 'h' als grondletter behouden wordt, zo als in 'te huiz, thuijs'. Only with Kollowijn did the real attack on
these forms begin. Amongst his Voorstellen was the dropping of 'h' from "tans, altans", but not in "thuis", "omdat daarnaast staat 'tehuis'". The same reasoning was offered by Dixi in 1934. Some of the more radical of the Kollewijn movement, such as Hettema, also wished to see "tuis" adopted, but their opponents Scharten, Van Dieren, Van Ginneken, were all opposed to any of these forms. Neither Marchant nor the Woordenlijst of 1954 made any radical change, though the latter conceded that such an 'h', along with the 'v' in "erw" and the 'b' in "ambt" were "feitelijk ... overbodig".

Once more then the spelling of these three words (thuis, althans, thans) was attacked by the radicals, beginning with Rombouts, who could see little reason for preserving this 'h' when other superfluous letters in 'rh, ph' and 'th' in loan words were being eliminated: "De Wet. geeft twee echte regels, nl.: 'ph' is overal vervangen door 'f', en; 'rh' is overal vervangen door 'r'. Als echter de 'stomme h' achter de 'r' moet verdwijnen, waarom dan niet even goed achter de 't'?". The VWS included the same in their proposals, and in 1967 the government "Rapport" conceded this point, and the spellings became officially approved if not yet officially adopted.

Viewed logically there is no reason at all why the historical 'h' should be preserved in these words, when so many other historical letters have disappeared without any concern, such as intervocalic 'd' in "weer" or the final 'n' of diminutives, or for that matter the 'e' of "tehuis" and the 'd' of "tehands".

TH. in loan words

The course of development of 'th' in loan words follows very closely that of 'ph'. All of these words were of Greek origin, except for "thee", which is also probably the most commonly used of them all. For that reason this word has often been singled out for separate treatment. "Voor de spelling van (thee) met 'h' bestaat er eigenlijk geen grond: zij komt reeds bij BONTIUS (b.v. Hist.Nat. 87) en TULP (Observ.Med. 400 ed. 1652) voor, en is vermoedelijk door invloed van het Fr. 'thé' algemeen geworden"; — this is the comment of the WNT, which also records examples of "tee" from 1672.

In the 18th century Stijl's grammar (p. 59) gives the spelling as "Tee, of Thee", but Siegenbeek and Te Winkel preserved the 'h'. Kollewijn includes this
word with "tans, altans" as a normal Dutch word, as which by that time it could justifiably be viewed, due to its very common use. Even Scharten had no objection to this particular word, even though he objected to "tans": "voor mijn part, laat ons thee drinken en ert en eten" (unlike Van Ginneken, see below). But the 1954 Woordenlijst continued to regard it as a pure loan word, and accordingly granted it alternative spellings, with 'th-' preferred, just as for Greek loans.

As to the Greek loans themselves, especially names, very little was altered by any reform until the latest movements. Some common words, especially "troon", exist from an early date without the 'h', for example in Van den Ende, Dullaert, Van Borsselen, De Swaen. Van den Ende has no 'th-' spellings, and translates "Thym" for example as "Tymis-kraud". Van Borsselen also uses the 'th-' form.

The etymological spelling with 'th-' was long considered normal, and only Vondel dared to challenge it. Van Heule was not totally opposed however, and felt that "Nazaret" was feasible, though less desirable (see above, under 'PH'). But Vondel had struck the first blow against foreign spellings, especially in proper names, by replacing 'c' by 'k', 'ph' by 'f', 'th' by 't' etc., as much as he could. Some followed him in this, Dullaert for example using "Teems", but such are very few.

The majority continued to prefer the traditional 'th-' forms, including Van Hoogstraten and Moonen, though Huydecoper expressed a moderate support for "Vondels gewoonte, die overal de 'c' en 'a' door onze enkele 'e', de 'ph' en 'th' door 'f' en 't' uitdrukt, ook de 'y' door 'i', doch my dunkt dat wy de 'th', en de 'y', mede in het Duitsch zeer wel komen behouden"(I.441). In the index too he adds that "Th ... kan voegelijk in Eigen Naamen behouden worden". This decision may have influenced some writers to consider Vondel's system. Hoogvliet for example spells "Etiopisch",- a Vondel rather than a Huydecoper form. Zgclelaar echoes the same sentiment: "'Th' klinkt als een enkele 't', en wordt bij VONDEL altoos door 't' alleen uitgedrukt; doch ik oordeel1 met Taalkundige mannen, dat men ze veilig (i) in eigen naamen behouden kan". Bolhuis, in his own grammar(1793), allows "troon", but in his Nut grammar (1814), in accordance with Siegenbeek's system, prefers "throon", as do the other Nut works.

Smits, in accordance with his own system, wishes to abolish all superfluous 'h': "het schrijven met twee letters, 'ph, ch, gh, th, rh', (is) onzer tale
gan sch on’d jen”. But Carlebur, supporting Siegenbeek for once, is against any radical move such as he has seen in Swedish spelling, including for example “teologic, rebarber, sfer”: he exaggerates a little when he calls these “bijna onkenbaar”.

De Vries and Te Winkel wished to preserve all these Greek ’h’s, and so too did Kollevijn, though as mentioned above he included “tee” among Dutch words. The general replacement of ’th’ by ’t’ formed no part of Kollevijn’s proposals. The three words for which he did propose simplification (see above) received a mixed response: Scharten welcomed “tee” but not “tans, altans”, Van Dieren thought all three “dvarsdrijvertjes, die hoegenaamd geen gemaakt opleveren en met vereenvoudiging niets hebben uit te staan” (p.243), and Van Ginneken felt “tee” to be one more threat to “de nog steeds uitgroeiende algemene Europese taalsamenhorigheid” (p.60). Gerlach Royen (p.126) answered the latter’s opposition to “tee” by pointing out that “niet alleen vertonen het engelse ’tea’, het duitsche ’tee’, het deense en zweedse ’te’, het italijansche ’to’, het spaansche ’te’ enz. een groter saamhorigheid dan het geësoleerde fransche ’thé’, maar ze sluiten ook beter aan bij het chinese ’ta’”. Van Ginneken’s European unity is really a convergence with French usage.

When the Woordenlijst attempted to introduce a partially progressive spelling, by allowing either ’th’ or ’t’, it did not receive universal acclaim, partly, one suspects, because neither side was pleased with the move: the progressives may have been dissatisfied that ’t’ was (almost) consistently made second choice, and the conservatives because ’t’ was allowed at all. But probably all were dissatisfied with one basic division: “’Th’ wordt vervangen door ’t’: 1. aan het eind van een woord,... (chrysant) 2. voor een medeklinker (antraciet,...) 3. na ’f’ en ’ch’: difteritis, diftong; autochtoon. In alle andere gevallen... wordt (de voorkeur) gegeven aan ’th’”. There is little to recommend such an arbitrary and complicated division, and it was natural that the progressive faction should press for rationalisation of the situation.

Rombouts, and later the VWS, pleaded the cause of the single ’t’, as did Verschueren in consistently adopting the “toegestane” ’t’-spelling in his dictionaries. The ”Rapport” of 1969 put an end to the confusion by recommending the consistent adoption of ’t’: ”De commissie stelt voor de ’h’ te schrappen”,
and once more the radicals' aim seems to be completely attained.

Some of the less progressive did not totally welcome this move; for example Mulisch feels that a choice of spellings is a sign of advanced culture: "Mijn voorstel is om de anarchistische spellingsituatie, die wij op het ogenblik hebben, te continueren. Geen taal ter wereld kan zich op zoets berocemen. Wij mogen schrijven 'rhythme', 'rythme' en 'ritme'; 'enthoieme, enthoisme, entoesisme' en 'entoesisme'. Waar vindt men zoets nog? Laten wij van onze zwakheid onze kracht maken" (p.76). Were it not for the last phrase it would be possible to think that Mulisch was being sarcastic and really criticizing the anarhic state of the spelling.

Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PH: moderates</th>
<th>radicals</th>
<th>opponents of reform (post 1660):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pels</td>
<td>Vondel</td>
<td>Wunschoten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Hoogstraten</td>
<td>Nylo&quot;</td>
<td>E.C.P.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huysdecoper</td>
<td>Moonen</td>
<td>Carlebur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stiijl</td>
<td>Van Belle</td>
<td>De Jager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolhuis</td>
<td>Snoeijmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegenbeek</td>
<td>Zeydelaar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Vries/Te Winkel</td>
<td>Smits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thijn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Van Vloten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kollewijn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scharten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Woordenlijst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RH: radicals: | Smits, Kollewijn, Scharten, Woordenlijst |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TH: in normal Dutch words:</th>
<th>Middle Dutch to 1600: very common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1600 - 1650: more or less restricted to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;thien, thoonen&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1650 - all but extinct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| in "thuis": | t'Uys: | used by Van Heule               |
| in "(a)thans": | À(w)ans: | used by Hettema, Rombouts, WVS, Rapport |
| in "thoe": | tee: | frequently found in all periods |
| in loan words: | "troon" | frequent in all periods from mid 17th century |

other words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>moderates:</th>
<th>radicals:</th>
<th>opponents of reform:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Heule</td>
<td>Vondel</td>
<td>Siegenbeek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huysdecoper</td>
<td>Smits</td>
<td>Carlebur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeydelaar</td>
<td>Rombouts</td>
<td>De Vries/Te Winkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woordenlijst</td>
<td>WVS</td>
<td>(not mentioned by Kollewijn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulisch</td>
<td>Rapport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 10: 'qu'

'qu', 'kv' and variants in Dutch words
'qu', 'kv' and variants in loan words.

The change of spelling from the original 'qu' to 'kv' is one of the few reforms affecting a large number of words, which occurred irrevocably and within a fairly limited period. Unlike some spelling reforms, this has caused relatively little argument, and at any given time the form prevailing was usually accepted by the majority of users. There have also been comparatively few variants.

When the Latin alphabet was adopted for use with Dutch, the digraph 'qu' was taken over, apparently without question, for spellings other than 'qu' are very rare in Middle Dutch. Hoebeke records the form "van quickelbergh" in 1363, and also the reverse, 'qu' for /k/, presumably under French influence, as in "pleque" for "plek" (such spellings are known in loan words such as "republicq", see below, but are rare in Dutch words).

Whereas in French the /qu/ sound had developed into /k/ by around the 12th century, there was no reflection of this in Dutch, even in the South: Lambrecht in 1550 equates 'qu' to /k/ plus semivowel, "'cu', gelijc 'k', zonder dat se niet staan en mag voor eenige vocale, of daer moet 'u' liquidus tusschen staan, volgende de Latijnsche spellinghe: maar volgende den rechten aard van onzer Ned'landscher spellinghe 'w'", e.g. "qualic". His dictionary contains only 'qu' spellings however (capitalised, as by most contemporaries, as 'QV'). This is fully in accordance with his pronunciation, since being a Southerner he would use 'w' as a bilabial rather than a labio-dental (cf. Schönfeld §.45). Had it been otherwise he would not have equated 'u' with 'w'. This spelling with 'qw' which he moots does not seem to have become in any way established, though it is certainly known. It is for example the normal form used by G. van der Schueren in his Teuthonista, even in loan words such as "quattermeyster"; other examples of his include "qwalende, qwaiden, qwaiden, qwackelen". Verwijs and Verdam also record that it is known in Middle Dutch. Before the standard adoption of 'w' instead of 'vv' or 'uw', the use of a single 'u' instead of 'w' was common in such words as "tuist, zuelgen" (e.g. by Sexagius), and consequently also in "quellen" etc. The development of 'u' to 'w' in the former may consequently have encouraged an analogous change after 'q'! Neither Plantijn nor Kilian have
any other entries than with 'qu-'.

Phonetically speaking 'qu' is not the equivalent of /k/ + /u/ or /w/, since, originally at least, 'q' represented /k/ with lip-rounding: /k^u/, - this is why a different spelling evolved at all. It is fairly common for different letters to acquire the same sound through later sound changes (as so evident in French and English), but it would be very strange indeed for there to be no basis at all in any period of the language for the use of two distinct letters in this way. In time /k^u/ resolved into /k/, still with some lip-rounding, but now more often followed by a definite semi-vowel, which explains why 'q' is always followed by 'u'. It is not that 'q' before 'u' is an idiosyncratic spelling, but that the sound represented by 'q' incorporates some quality of /u/ within it. Strictly speaking, the 'u' is superfluous if /k^u/ is the sound heard. By the time that Dutch adopted the Latin alphabet, 'q' was little more than a positional variant of 'k', being used before 'u' whether or not a historical form had existed with /k^u/.

Pontus De Heuiter clearly describes the Dutch 'qu' as /k/ with lip-rounding, and warns strongly against the French pronunciation with just /k/: "Qu... is een stommen consonant die door hulpe der vocalen 'u' (dieze alleen helpt, anders onvruchtbaar) op de maniere van c. ofte k. bina geboren wardende, maar de lippen nimmer openende ende door intrekkijnghe der kaken wat uitstekende (sic), haer bekent maect". Furthermore he rejects 'uae' as a dipthong in such words as "quaet", which is really "quæt", - "dienende allen 'u' om 'k' en 'q' t'onderschei-\nden en verscheiden geluit te geven" (p.31-2). For these reasons he does not think it proper or desirable to replace 'qu' by the non-rounded 'k' (= /k/) plus 'u' or 'w', since the 'q' is only "bina" 'c' or 'k'. His comments on 'w' make it clear that he is describing a bilabial, not a labio-dental /w/ (cf Dafforne below), but though this is consistent with his description of 'qu' as /k^u/ (p.53), it does not imply that all those who propose 'kw' could only have pronounced a labiodental /w/. The converse,- that those who defend 'qu' probably heard a bilabial /w/ - is more easily defendable (see below).

The Tweespraak remarks solely on the change of 'komen' into 'quam', without commenting on 'qu/kw' at all, but Van der Schuere specifically equates the two: "De 'qu' (hést) zoo vél kracht ende beteekeninge als 'kw' daer staende zoude
kennen hebben". Yet he does not get as far as actually proposing any change in the spelling.

The next few grammarians, - Smyters, De Hubert, Van Neule, all use 'qu' and do not discuss it. Dafforne is the next to do so in 1627. He, like Lambrecht and De Heuiter, hears a bilabial /v/ or semi-vowel after the /k/, but he does not mention any difference between 'k' and 'q': 'qu', he claims, is "een dubbel consonant, gemaakt van 'kw', ofte liever van 'ku'", as in "quale" (p.112). Montanus, the next after Dafforne to discuss the 'qu', regards as wrong the spelling "request", daer de 'u' oovertollich is", but not so in "quaet, queeken" etc.; the 'u' of "quaet" he equates with the "smelt-uw" in "lingua", thus a bilabial. The significant point of this, as mentioned above after De Heuiter's argument, is that a person who pronounced 'w' as /w/ would not consider it possible to spell 'qu', since the 'u' cannot represent /v/. A person who pronounced 'w' as /w/ on the other hand would consider 'qu' and 'kw' to be equally acceptable. The corollary of this is that anyone who ardently defends the 'qu' spelling probably pronounces 'w' as /v/, unless he is convinced that tradition is more important than accuracy, whereas a person who ardently defends 'kw' could equally well pronounce 'w' as /w/ or /v/.

Another 13 years after Montanus were to pass before the first person appeared who actually proposed discarding 'q' in favour of 'k', and this was Leupenius: "(het) komt ons voor, dat wy de 'q' wel souden kunnen missen, die sulke taalen alleen van nooden hebben, die geen 'k' gebruiken. Maar onze Nederduitsche taal kan die seer wel ontbeeren, want sy heeft geen andere kracht, dan die met 'kw' gevoegelyk en volkomenlyk kann uitgedrukt worden. Waarom soude de 'k' niet soo wel een 'w' by sick mogen neemen, als andere Letters van den selven aard? Waarom soudenm soo wel niet mogen schryven 'kwader' als 'swaager'? 'kwaalen' als 'dwaalen'? 'kwetsen' als 'swetsen'? 'kwee peeren' als 'twee peeren'?" (p.10). He draws back from actually using 'kw' however: "dunkt dan noch iemand die nieuwigheid al te groot te syn, wy mogen lyden dat ('qu') in gebruik blijve, willen der selve ook soo lang behouden, tot dat ons gevoelen wordt voor goed gekeurt". Unfortunately he was not to live long enough to see his wish fulfilled, dying in 1670, before the general public adopted 'kw'.

Whether influenced by Leupenius or not is not known, but the following year
(1654) Van den Ende had exactly the same feelings: "Ik hadde Kw konnen stellen, voor QU ... spellende, 'kwaadt, kwijt, knee-apel, kwist, kuispel' &c., maar alsoo het tot op deze tijd in 't gebruyk niet zeer en is, heb ik de gewoone(n) (doch onze taal onnoode) QU. gebruykt". Most important here is the phrase "niet zeer": the spelling with 'kw' was indeed already known therefore (see below). It was to be many years before 'kw' became at all common, and all the major writers still used 'qu'. No change is suggested by Binnart, but as he heartily despised the letter 'k' in all its uses (see chap. 2), and avoided it whenever remotely possible, this is hardly surprising. Bolognino uses 'qu', and his comments on the diphthong 'uy' in "quyt" are evidence of his bilabial /w/.

The honour of being the first grammarians actually to use 'kw' consistently belongs to the society Nil Volentibus Arduum. They banned the letter 'q' from all Dutch words (though not from loan words), in their Verhandeling of around 1673 (7 years after Leupenius's death); and their principal writer Pels, who in the introduction to his Horace translation (1677) writes that "de 'q' en 'x' versmrt ik ... en zet 'er 'kw', en 'ks', voor het welk onze natuurlijke letters zynde, geen andere klank uitbeelden konnen, en nu al veel gebruikt worden", also knows of the spelling in practice, evidently quite frequently.

As Van den Ende already knew of the 'kw' spelling, it is difficult to see where the spelling first arose, unless under the influence of Leupenius's wishes, he was, as noted above, the first to suggest the substitution, or of some other, unknown, radical speller. Some influence may well be due to Van der Schuere and Dafforne, or even De Keuter and Lambrecht, all of whom described the equivalence. Whoever these first users were, they do not seem to have justified their innovation in print. It is still true to say, however, that 'qu' was by far the commonest, and was to remain so for many years after the "Verhandeling" of 1673. According to WNT "de oudste bekende plaats (van 'kw'is in Vincent's 'Gheveinade Doortal' a 1667", though they do not quote the word itself, which is presumably "kwetsing" cited later (column 5025), "dat ... niet als een vreemd woord hankend (was)"). WNT rightly ignores occurrences such as those of Leupenius. There must have been earlier uses than this however, for, as mentioned above, Van den Ende knew of them in 1654. They are quite common in Klicos Kraes (1656-7), though the editor (Hintjus) uses 'qu' himself.
In the meantime Winschooten decided to be cautiously conservative: the Romans had argued long about 'q', and come to no conclusion, and therefore,-

"hobben de oude dit geschil in soo veel Jaaren niet Kunnen slegten, wat behoeven onse tijdgenooten haar mede soo ver in dit geschil te lasten, daar zij dog geen einde van te hopen of te verwagten hebben; wel aan dan, soo last ons hier in een vaste voet boraamen, en schrijven gelijk wij tot nu toe gewoon zijn te schrijven 'quellen, quetsen', of liever 'qvellen, qvetsen' met een V (gelijk Schefferus en andere schrijven). Voor ons wij en kunnen niet zien, dat de aard of de fraaiheid van KW in diergelijke woorden soo groot is, dat wij daarom van de oude gewoonte behoord af te gaan"; his argument for 'qv' is that the 'u' in 'qu' is not a vowel, and so should not be spelt as one (see above), and that if it were ultimately decided to banish 'q', then transition from 'qv' to 'kv' would be easier than one from 'qu' to 'kv', where both letters would be replaced.

He also proposed the similar spellings "dving, svem, twijfvel", "want dat is immers seeker, dat de W bij de Hollanders een afgaande letter is", meaning that he hears a labiodental /w/ and has noticed the decline of the bilabial pronunciation. Later (p.26) he concedes that "de QU veranderd soude Ic kunnen worden in IW, KU of KV". In his dictionary he uses only 'qu' (and 'dw').

His reference to "Schefferus" is interesting, being one of the very few open statements of potential foreign influence on Dutch spelling. However, Johannes Scheffer, a German scholar at the court of Christina of Sweden, published only in Latin, and although his writings were known and admired in Holland (Hugo de Groot has an index to his writings included in his works of 1673), Winschooten is unlikely to be referring to Schefferus himself, but by "Schefferus en andere" probably means contemporary Swedish spelling practice, which was, as he states, 'qv' (and was to remain so until 1920, when it was changed to 'kv'), and merely cites Schefferus as a name well known to many in Holland.

It must also be borne in mind however, that Latin texts were very often printed with 'qv' (e.g. Hilarides's parallel text Phaedrus translation has 'qv' throughout the Latin version), so Winschooten may have been referring to Schefferus's Latin usage. But in this case it must be asked why he would cite Schefferus as his model, when Latin texts abounded in Holland.

Bearing in mind these current trends, and especially the Southern
conservatism of later years, it is a little surprising to find a moderately radical viewpoint expressed in Ph. La Grue’s “Grammaire Flamande” of 1684 (published in the North, but widely used in the South): “nous avons mis le ‘q’ au nombre des lettres contre l’opinion de plusieurs & des plus nouveaux, à cause qu’il y en a encore beaucoup qui s’en servent, & qui s’opposent au changement, qu’en en a fait. J’advoue, que ce n’est pas sans raison, qui rejettent cette lettre, parce qu’ils s’en peuvent fort bien passer, en se servant de ‘kw’ pour ‘qu’, comme en ‘kwaad’, mal; car on joint le ‘w’ avec d’autres consones, comme en ‘Gagner’, Beaum’rere, ‘kwaalen’, errer, ‘twee’, deux &c” (nb the same examples as by Leupenius). Consequently his usage in the grammar show the ‘laam, loaad’ spelling in “kwaad” etc... It is worthy of not that La Grue regards this spelling as fairly common.

In his dictionary of 1691 Sewel shows himself to be on the side of the conservatives mentioned by La Grue: “KW in plaats van QU kan ik juyst niet kwaa^d keuren; maar dewyl ’t veelen, en in zonderheyd vreemdelingen, wat hard voorkomt, en men daar benefens geene letters daardoor uytwint, zo volg ik nog liever de gewoonlykste wyze”, except that he prefers “laam” to “quam” (and despite using “kwaad” in the sentence itself). This sentiment is repeated (with minor text alterations) in the later editions of the dictionary, until it was changed slightly in 1766 (see below). Why ‘kw’ should be more difficult for foreigners than ‘qu’ is not made clear; presumably it is because the digraph ‘qu’ was used in most foreign languages; but then it could also be argued that ‘kw’ would avoid the possible mispronunciation as /k/ in the French manner (as De Hauiler had earlier warned).

Towards the turn of the century the spelling ‘qu’ was certainly beginning to lose a great deal of ground to ‘kw’. Duikerius in his “Schouburg” uses “kwaad” (though ‘qu’ forms can also be found), and in his “Voorbeeldzels” three years earlier also has extensive use of ‘kw’. An intriguing comment appears in 1700 from Van Geesdalle: “Aengaende de Q, daer is eenen Hollandschen Schrijver die-se uyt de Vlaemsche Letter-konste bannen wild, seggende dat het beter is zich van KW te dienen als van QU. ’t Is seker dat hy gelijk heeft” (p.45). Exactly which northern writer he is referring to is not immediately obvious as only Leupenius, Van den Ende, Pels, and Duikerius had recommended this spelling.
La Grue, though sympathising, had not adopted it fully, and was not a Hollander.

Leupenius was certainly known in the South (La Grue seems to have used his work, see above), as was Van den Ende (discussed by Bolognino), and it may be to one of these that Van Goesdalle alludes. "As himself abides by the 'qu' of the 'quadr'' (p. 92).

Van Hoogstraten, in the brief grammar before his word lists, still resists the change, referring to the usage of Hooft, Vondel and Moonen (the latter in his poetry, his grammar was still unwritten, though anticipated eagerly by Van Hoogstraten). In the word list itself he adds in the section 'q': "Hier te verhandelen of men deze letter in onze tale zal behouden, of verwerpen, gelijk eenigen doen, is mijn werk niet". In his Latin dictionary he is a little more brusque, and seems impatient with the reformers, commenting in the section on 'q' that "die deze letter verwerpende voor QU willen spellen KW, op het voorbeeld van enige hedendaagse schryveren, zullen hier de woorden, die ze noodig hebben, moeten komen zoeken, dewyl wy geen deel begeren aan deze bysterheid. Zie ons Geslagtboek".

The "Grammaire plus exacte" of 1701, like La Grue in 1684 (which the author certainly knew since several passages are copied en bloc), rejects 'qu', since "dans l'usage present on l'exprime mieux par KW: comme 'kwellen, kwétsen'".

Nyloë found good phonetic reasons for opposing the new spelling: "De spelling met 'kw' in plaats van 'qu' in 'kwaat, kwullen, kryten', is om de hardigheid der uitspraak niet goet te keuren, en men schryft beter 'quaat, quellen, quyten'" (p. 42). This may indicate a normally labiodental /w/, differing from the 'u' (=/u/ semivowel) in 'qu', cf also Sewel above. Hilarides, in his radically different spelling system, uses 'kw', as too did the other radical spellers Van Alkemade and Gargon, but not Pars or Van der Linden.

Not being a radical however, Moonen prefers 'qu': "wy keuren (kw) als eene onnoodgevleegheid (it was first put forward as a practical spelling 50 years before), met de beste schryveren ten eenen maele af; en zien geene redenen, dewyl men die woorden van outs met de Qu plagh te spellen, om die nu te verschuiven. Te meer, dewyl de Romeinen hunne C en V, in klank en kracht de K en W gelyk, daer voor kunnende gebruiken, de Qu nooit gewraakt hebben, gelyk hy van andere volken, schoon hunne taelen verbeterende, ook niet verworpen is;"
hoewel de dichter Ronsard zyne Franschen al in de zestiende eeuue met zyne 'kualité, kantité' voor 'qualité, quantité' stoutmoedigh voorging. Waer by koont, dat, indien men de spelling met kw volgt, veelaizins dubbelzinnigheid door misspelling en quaede scheiding der lettergreepen veroirzaekt kan worden: als in 'Gek-weak, gek-weest, gek-wel'. En eindelyk, dat de weinige woorden die met de Qu beginnen geene nieuwe spelling met kw behoeven".

Seewel's grammar of 1708, influenced by Moonen and in many ways a reply to it, has the same arguments, whereas the spelling notes in his dictionaries continue unchanged. The entries in his "Guide" for English speakers are the same as those in the dictionary.

Ludolf Saida felt strongly enough about this "new" spelling that he inserted a comment in his "Schatkamer" of 1711, in the section on 'q': "Gelyk gy boven hebt gesien, daer is de Q behouden, alhoewel men deselve met een KW gevoeglyk had konnen uitdrulcken. Naar ik heb dat Jonker Haripon overgelaaten, in het Tooneelspelletje van de Belachelyke Hoofsche Juffers, swetsende in deeser voegen: 'K heb in de Dichtkunst groote greepen; 'K weet waar men è of ó moet streepen; De Q, die ruk ik uit syn ste, Als lubber van het ABC".

The play he refers to is the 1685 translation by Pierre de la Croix of Molière's "Les précieuses ridicules", though such a comment, to be found here in scene 10, does not appear in the French original, nor does any "Jonker Haripon". The spelling in the quotation is Saida's own, not that of the original printed in the Lescailje system (the printer) - with accents, 'd' in weak verbs, and distinctive vowel usage; in the 1685 version "'k Heb, 'k Weet, é, ó, zyn, Lubber" are used instead.

Although E.C.P. has nothing against this spelling with 'kw', he still uses 'qu'. But M.S., De Vin, and Hakvoord used only 'kw' ("bekwaam, kwijt" etc.). Amongst contemporary writers, Rotgans, Langendijk, Foot, and Zeeus all retain 'qu'. Heugelenburg used 'kw' in his grammar, though his earlier poems (1682) had the contemporary 'qu' system.

Only the third person te deviate from both 'qu' and 'kw', Matthias Kramer uses 'qu' for all words in his dictionary of 1719, with the exception of one word, which is listed twice (separately!) as "qualyk" and "qwalyk". The 1768
These 'qw' spellings were also known in Low German, as is shown for example by the usage in Duhnert's Low-German dictionary of 1731, which consistently uses this spelling in the Low-German words. Influence from Low German written texts on Dutch cannot be ruled out automatically (cf. similarly the '-v' spelling in chap.7). Van der Scheuren's 15th century 'qw' forms similarly originate in an area of strong German influence (Cleves). The only literary figure to be inclined towards this spelling seems to be Tuinman, though he does not actually use it: in his Fakkel (§.145) he writes that "Indien 't den oppertaalmeester 't gebruik, of Jan Alleman behaagde, ik zoude voor best keuren, dat men 'qu' schreef 'qx', 'qram' voor 'quam'". This probably implies that he heard 'w' as a labiodental and thus found 'qu' inadequate to express the sound properly.

A single occurrence of 'qw' in "quast" had appeared long before this in Montanus's book of 1635, though it appears for a very good reason, and must not be considered either a printer's error or a reform suggestion. On p.85 he is discussing the hierarchy of consonants as shown by their possible combinations (a traditional part of "spelkunst" taken to greater lengths in Lambrecht's spelling lists). He puts 'k, t, p, s, ch' on a "higher rung" than 'l, r, j, w, r" (i.e. the liquids and semi-vowels), when used at the beginning of a word or syllable ("Tweedubbelde Voorletteren"), - "als in 'groot, glas, zwaer,..."
such combinations are normal and acceptable, but that is not the case with "rgoot, lgas, wzaer... rchsijft" etc. (i.e. the same words with the initial consonant clusters reversed), which he rightly points out are unpronounceable. This proves his point that 'g' etc. may be followed by 'r, l', etc., but not vice versa, hence his hierarchy. This particular hierarchy only applies to the beginning of syllables, other positions have different orders.

For the sake of this argument he has to regard 'qu' as a similar combination to 'zw', and so a spelling with 'qu' would be misleading, suggesting a vowel; the 'qu' therefore shows the equivalence to 'zw'. Later on (p113) he again illustrates the equivalence, when discussing the "Voornaemste Derdendeel" of a word, i.e. the main vowel plus any accompanying semivowel, "als 'a' in 'dat'; 'ee' in 'been'; 'wa' in 'quast, wat, dwang'; 'ee' in 'leewt" etc. He spells 'qu' but clearly pronounces it with the same "x" as in "dwang, wat". This is the only instance of 'qw' located in the 17th century, and no instances outside Kramer have been located in the 18th century, so that such a usage was never common at all.

Unlike many of his predecessors Ten Kate decided that "bij samenvoeging en uitspraak van KW worden de klanken door QU verbeeld, volmaaktelijk uitgedrukt" (I,124) - he finds 'kw' a perfectly satisfactory alternative phonetically.

Mention has already been made of Sowel's conservative viewpoint, yet in his reworking of La Grue's grammar in 1719 he reflects better the contemporary trends: "la bi tre 'q', n'ayant rien de different du 'k' dans la prononciation, est inutile, & quelques-uns ne s'en servent point. Cuno's translation faithfully repeats this in 1741: "Durch die Buchstabe 'q' hat mit dem 'k' keinen unterscheid in der Aussprache, und ist unbrauchbar, ja viele trachen das 'q' niemahls". 'Q' is nonetheless found in his work however, e.g. "quynen, quaseken, quetsen" p.209ff.

But not so progressive was Halma, who, like Van Hoogstraten, felt that there was nothing at all attractive about this new-fangled spelling. In his dictionary he writes that "alhoewel velen de nieuwe spellinge van 'kw', voor 'qu' gebruiken, egten wy onraadzaam hen te volgen, vermits de meeste Nederlandsche boeken alrede anders (i.e. with 'qu') geschreven zijn, en dit gebruik (i.e. 'kw') ook nog bij de minsten doorgaat" (it is not made clear whether this last comment refers to the numbers or to the status of the 'kw'-spellers). This comment is still included in the 1731 edition, when it is totally untrue, though its retention
cannot have been a mere oversight since its presence must have been noted when
the spelling was updated in the later editions (e.g. "veelen, wij" in the comment
given). The exact opposite comment is to be found in Marin's dictionary, again
in the section on 'q': "vermits de Schryver van dit Woordenboek goedgevonden
heeft doorgaans de KW, in plaats van de QU te gebruiken voor alle Nederduitsche
naamwoorden zal men de woorden die men op deze kolom niet vind, op die van KW
moeten zoeken" (taken from the 1763 edition). A certain similarity between this
comment and that given above from Von Moerbeek may be just coincidental.

Northern usage was by now predominantly if not exclusively with 'kw'. This
is the system adopted by Huydecoper, though he conscientiously retains Vondel's
'qu' spellings when quoting, e.g. "'Van het quaet tot erger' - men zegt van
kwad tot erger", where he is not concerned with the spelling but the use of the
article. Some use of 'qu' continued, possibly under the influence of Moonen's
grammar, especially in the dictionary of Corleva. Burman also uses 'qu', but
discusses neither this nor any other spelling in his "Aanmerkingen", apart from
the use of 'ao' and 'aa'.

A slight delay was apparent in the South, where 'qu' continued to be quite
common until about 1750. The Ursulines vocabulary of 1738, Verpoorten, and
even "Aerschot" (1766) still use it. Not that 'kw' was unknown in the South, - it
was used by Steven in his "Voorschriftboek", and, outside grammars, by Van
Lokeren in his school textbook of 1713.

Interesting in this respect is Buys's revision of Sewel's dictionary in
1766, where to the sentence quoted above (justifying 'qu') is added: "uitgezonderd
in zulke woorden daar een 'a' op de 'u' volgt: dan spel ik 'kwaad, kwam, kwaal',
enn. in plaats van 'quaad, quam, quaal'", though "quellen, quijten" etc. preserve
'qu-' (despite the title page of the dictionary which reads "According to the
modern spelling, entirely approved"). The entries are fully in accordance with
his statement: under 'kw-' the entries for all words beginning 'kwa-', kwa-
direct the reader to 'que-', quy-', whereas the words beginning 'kwa-' have the
double entry thus: "KWAAD or QUAAD", with no directive to see under 'qu' (a
minority have only 'kw' spellings, e.g. "kwaab"). Similarly under 'qu-' all words
beginning with 'qua-' direct the reader to "see KN", whereas entries for words
beginning with 'que-', quy-' contain no reference at all to any possible 'kw-"
spelling. No reason is given for this ambivalent approach, nor is any immediately obvious, and it is possible that this failure to reflect the latest spelling contributed to the fact that this proved to be the dictionary's last edition. Wilcocke's edited version has only 'kw' except in a few loan words.

The first grammar to discuss at length, and bring out the inconsistencies of Koonen's arguments was Van Belle in 1748. If 'q' should be kept "om haar oud gebruik,- waarom dan de C (die hy tóg gantselyk verwerpt) om haar oud gebruik méde niet voorgestaan?". And as to the fact that French has kept 'qu',- "ei lieve! moosten de Nederlander nooit verwerpen 't geen van de Romeinen óf andere volken nooit verworpen is?. The possibility of ambiguous syllable division is a worthless argument: "iemand die voor 'gekwel' verstomde 'gek-wel', zou wel gek wezen. Immers om misspelling en kwaade schelding der lettergreepen, ('t werk van onkundigen) letters te verwerpen die in goed gebruik zyn, zou voorwaar een slechte regel wezen, nadien de meeste onze Letteren en Lettergreepen daar voor bloot staan; als by voorbeeld, in 'gek-ooren, gek-raak', voor 'gekooren, gekraak' enz, op dien grond zoude blyken". And finally the small numbers of such words: "behoeft een kelin getal, om zyne kleinheid, geene hervorming: waar zal men dan eene scheiding maaken, om een groote, nóg iets groter, ja allergrootst getal te verbeteren?".

In his 1755 work he remarks merely that 'q' is an "onduitse letter, die geheel uit ons gebruik verbannen behoort te worden". Unique to Van Belle's 1755 book, in the discussion on 'kw', is one aspect of terminology: just as "uit de klinkers worden Twee-klanken en Drieklanken gemaakt", so analogically "uit de Nédeklinkers worden Tweémedeklanken, Driemédeklanken en Viermedeklanken gemaakt ...als: Groot, Eaad,... SPReuk, SPReeken, SCHRift, SCHRyven" (p.2).

By now Southern opinion was also changing in favour of 'kw'. Bincken wrote in 1757 that "my dunkt dat de 'q' geene letter van onzen Ab. behoorde te wezen ... niet-te-min laat de ider syne gezindheid daer in volgen". The Snedéaas' of 1761 asks "wat gaat de afkomste van die vreemde woorden de Vlamingen aan", and calls 'q' (possibly with a hint of Gallophobia) "een vuijle letter...teenemaal onnoedit" which one should "uít don abc schrappen en uít het gezigt der jonge leerlingen doen verdwijnen". More moderate is Des Roches: "Het deèze twee letters (= 'qu') schryven veéle de woorden, die andersins eene 'kw' zouden
vereysschen,...vy keuren juyst deëze spelling niet af, maar derven nochans vel verzekeren, dat... (kw) gegronder en de Tael eygender is". It is noteworthy that he still thinks 'qu' the predominant southern usage.

In 1764 De Haes sees no reason to keep 'qu', except in loan words, "dervyld door 't verwerpen der 'kw' in 'gekwaek', enz., de zwarigheit niet word wegenomen, die 'er uit de misspelling zou kunnen ontstaen; vermits die in de 'kl, kn' en 'kr' altoos overblyft, als blykt in de woorden, 'geklank, geklater, geknot, gekraek' enz.; kunnende, door misspelling, 'gek-lank, gek-later, gek-not, gek-raek' gospeld worden; waarom die reden by ons van geene waerdye is"; this is the same argument as that adopted by Van Belle. Zeydelaar thinks that 'de 'kw' veel eigenaartiger aan die klank (voldoet)"; and agrees that Sewel's (and Noonen's) "gek-well" argument is without basis. The Taal en Dichtkundige Bydragen, eight years earlier in an article known to Zeydelaar (see his Vervolg p.173) had been of the same opinion (I.223).

Ballieu (1772) favoured 'kw', probably influenced by Bincken, and a contemporary grammar which shows the same gallophobic fervour as the Snoeijmes is that of Van Bellegem and Waterschoot (c.1773), who decided that 'q' is not necessary, and give the following rather dubious verses on "de onze k lasterende Waelen" (p.30):

"Weg, weg, gy Fransche 'q', met uw verduyvelt stinken
Tot klank g'eeet op ons 'u', die g'uytschyt zonder klinken"

and "C'achte onze 'kw' een Fransche Katt!"

Dees wel suyver lekt haer gat
Wilt g'uw 'q' zien zonder vlekken (for 'q' read "quesus")
 Gy noogt zelf die suyver lekken".

These were later quoted by De Neckere (see below).

Tame by comparison the "Inleyding" of 1785 would only go so far as to say that 'q' was "eigenlijk overbodig", and that "de Letteren QU zyn billyk door de KW wyt onze Tael gebannen". C.W. Holtrop (1783) still records however that "nog heden eenige weinigen (schrijven) 'qu'."

The grammars of Stijl, Bolhuis, and the various Mut grammars and spelling books in the North, together with Janssens in the South, all agree that 'q' is of no use in Dutch words, and that 'kw' is just as good a spelling, as do later Biegenbeek and De Sijpel. The latter also agree that "'kw'...drukt veel juister
some conservative 'qu' spellers must still have been in existence, probably amongst older writers who had grown up in a 'qu'-world. Von Hoerbeek, writing now in his own grammar of 1304, because Kramer's was "ganz nicht mehr werth", alludes to some such survival: "'q' (is) weinig mehr in Gebrauch" in the Dutch examples given, although "viele schreiben ... dergleichen Wörter noch so". Even so "viele" would seem to be something of an exaggeration.

In the South one grammar was still pleading for the use of 'qu' in 1815. This was De Neckere, in contrast to Van Daele whose spellings he often followed. He writes on the 'kw' spelling (p.43) that "Men heeft sig te verwonderen dat de Hollanders, en naer hun een deel Vlaemingen sig dare ontrent hebben laten misleyden, en soo schadelijke eene spelwyse hebben willen aannehmen". He ascribes this to an anti-French feeling ("hast van Volk tot Volk"), transferred to the French 'qu' letter-combination. In support of this he quotes the "schampere en onbelompe versjens" of Van Bellegem, though he does not give their source (they are probably not original to Van Bellegem), and makes several errors in the transcription, besides using his own spelling system.

One of the last comments on the use of 'qu' in Dutch words falls to Bilderdijk, who does not consider that 'kw' and 'qu' are pronounced the same, being for him respectively /k/ + consonant (presumably he means labiodental /w/), and liprounded /kʰ/ + vowel: "Wel onderscheiden, is de 'q' inderdaad niet het zelfde met de 'k'. De 'k' vormt zich in de volle holte der keel, maar de 'q' zijdwarts van de kieuwen, en zoo zijn ook 'kw' en 'qu' wezenlijk verschillende klanken. ...Men merke ook op, dat de 'w' in 'kw' een konsonant is, maar de 'u' in 'qu' een vokaal, die met de 'q' en volgende vokaal samensmelt, heediane samensmelting tusschen 'k' en 'w', als beide mutae zijnde, geen plaats kan hebben, daar die smelting volstrekt eene semi-vocalis vordert" (Sprakleer p.54). How far he is here being guided (misled?) by the difference in the written forms of 'q' and 'k', and by autosuggestion, is not clear; possibly he was thinking of the English-style pronunciation of 'qu' comparing it to the Dutch /kw/, possibly he restricted the /kʰu/ pronunciation to loan words and /kw/ to Dutch words - he does not elaborate on this, only on the "difference" between the
letters/sounds. This theory however would automatically affect his views on the substitution of 'kw' for 'qu' in loan words.

He was to find one ally in Halbertsma (like Bilderijk a critic of Siegenbeek). But Halbertsma was against all 'kw' spellings: "geen menschelijk spraakorgaan (kan) de 'k', vereenigd met de vaste 'w' uitspreken, en de oude Nederlanders, die even fijn in de taal als in de muziek hoorden, spelden zeer keurig 'quitsten, quaad, quetsen', om later bij betweters en botoren door het onmogelijke 'kwisten, kwaad' en 'kwetsen' vervangen te worden". Although he must be praised for recognizing that the ears of older grammarians were just as efficient as his own (a fact often overlooked by his contemporaries and many later investigators), it cannot be denied that he seems to be arguing "naar de letter", i.e. for him a different letter implies a different sound, and not many would agree with him that "geen menschelijk spraakorgaan (kan) de 'k', vereenigd met de vaste 'w' uitspreken". Presumably by "vaste 'w'" he means a labiodental pronunciation, in which case his argument is basically the same as Bilderijk's, except that Halbertsma also extends it to Dutch words; this may imply that he heard a different pronunciation in the latter to Bilderijk. WNT gives the latest use of 'qu' in a Dutch word as 1769 (Gr. Placcaatboek), though they do not (evidently) count Halbertsma, who in fact normally used 'kw', despite his own instincts (publishers' pressure?).

But 'qu' was now really long extinct in Dutch words, and even Bilderijk consistently differentiates between 'kw' in Dutch words and 'qu' in loan words, suggesting, as mentioned, that he may have been influenced by the English and Italian pronunciation of 'qu' in the latter. In 1870 it was possible for Land to declare that 'qu' was dead, and that therefore a new use could be found for the letter 'q' (it may be assumed then that he used 'kw' even in loan words!). As one of the "overbodig geworden"letters it could fill in the gap where a Dutch sound had ho corresponding letter: "De 'q' (kost) het eerst in aanmerking ... om de 'ng' te vervangen". Such a step would probably have been a little too radical for a generation which found it hard to accept the later Kollwijn proposals, and Land did not really push very hard for his new spelling.
Completely different from the attitudes described above was the treatment of 'q' in the spelling of loan words, and some (e.g. Bilderdijk) do not seem to have accepted it as the same sound as 'kw'. In 1772 H. van den Born had even published a short treatise on the "Historie en taalkundige verhandeling over de letter Q, waer in wordt aangetoont dat die letter met de C en K deselve is", not only the same sound, but also originally the same character; He has nothing to say on the repercussions of this theory on the use of 'k' and 'q' in spelling. Bilderdijk also believed that 'k' was only a 'c' 'maar met den 'standaard', welke uit netheid en om de letters gelijk te maken ingevoerd is". It would appear that Bilderdijk had not read his classical grammars, or disagreed with their findings, for the authoritative Priscian had maintained that although 'k, q' and 'c' have different form and name, yet because they have the same force in both quantity and sound, they must be accepted as one letter ("quamvis in varia figura et vario nomine sint 'k' et 'q' et 'c', tamen, quia unam vim habent tam in metro quam in sono, pro una litera accipi debent"). Van den Born on the other hand may have been aware of this, since he is attempting to show the same thing. Amman, in his Loquela, even more explicitly states that the same mouth position is used "percumpendo k c vel q". As noted in the previous section, this does not hold for all languages.

For those writers who spelled 'qu' in Dutch words there was naturally no problem, since they used 'qu' in loan words too. But as soon as the 'kw' system became at all established some began to propose its use in loan words. Hooft in his "Warenaar" (line 523) writes "Elk nae zijn kalateit, dat tribelt alderbest" where he puns on "qualité" and "kaal" (he may have known Ronsard's spelling of "kalité" which Van der Schuere had described in his preface of 1612, though this is not necessarily implied in the use of this spoken pun). Spellings such as "banket" had existed also in the 16th century, e.g. Coornhert spells "banckquet" in 1564, Van Beaumont has "bancketteert" in 1596, and Roemer Visscher uses "bancketeren". Brune later used "Bancket-werck" as the title of a book in 1657.

Of undoubted influence in this particular word was the popular etymology involving the word "bank", though the replacement of French 'qu' pronounced /kw/ was much earlier than for 'qu' pronounced /kw/ or /kw/, being a much easier substitution,
and not involving any confusion about possible different pronunciation of the 'u'. It occurs already in Middle Dutch, where parallel spellings such as "quartier, cartier" can be found, the first being Latin based, the second showing the French sound. This does not automatically imply that "quartier" was pronounced with /ku/ or /kw/. Montanus also made a comment to the effect that this substitution was permissible (see above). The first instance of 'ku' in a loan word where pronounced /ku/ or /kw/ recorded in WNT is "kwiebus" in "De Verliesde Labbert" by Pluimer (1673), and "kwibus, afterkwartier" in "De Gemeenschap de Geest" by J. Soolmans (1679, p.6).

One anomalous (for Dutch) spelling, which existed for a substantial period of time, was the use if final '-cq'. Presumably based on a contemporary French form, and so regarded as cultured, it was prevalent in the 18th century, though it also occurs as early as in De Castelein, with "publicq" (p.177). WNT also record it in the "Daghregister Bat." of 1641 (also "publicq"). In the 17th century Jan de Witt still spelt the "full" form "republyque", possibly sounding the final 'e'. But when some writers wished to show that they no longer pronounced in this way, they also dropped the 'u', leaving a solitary 'q', as in the forms "publycq, republycq, bibliotheecq" just noted. The latter is also very common in the "Privilegie" of many contemporary books, e.g. La Croix 1685.

The Twe-spraack had recognized '-cq' as a French spelling, in that the Dutch words "Zak, Bank" are derived from "Sacq, Bancq", which same examples were taken over by Van Heule on p.114 of the 1625 edition. Neither record seeing such forms used by Dutchmen in loan words. Meijer's Woordenschat later had many examples, e.g. "Physicq".

In the 18th century Boomkamp, in "Alkmaers Stederechten" (1741) uses both "publycq" and "republycq", as do Onno van Haren (Willem III) and Krom, in his answer to the "prijsvraag" of the Zeeland society (1730). WNT records a late example in the "Bijdragen der Historische Genootschap" of 1787. An odd third choice is found occasionally, e.g. the "Keuren van Haerlem" of 1749 had the spelling "publyqa" (as well as the more normal "publiek"). This would not seem to have been a very common spelling. Defense of this spelling was never forthcoming from grammars, and Siegenbeek brought about its total demise by advocating "publiek, bibliotheek" etc. A short comment on the '-cq' spelling
is contained in WNT, but it rather unhelpfully does not go beyond stating that "voor aanwijsing met 'cq' verg. de geslachtsnamen Fredericq, Lancq, Turcq". This implies that the usage in common nouns was derived from that in names, which is unlikely, and does not explain the ultimate origins of the spelling, nor that nouns using this form were French in origin.

For the majority of common loan words, however, the almost unanimous decision of earlier times was that "in de spelling van vreemde woorden most men den aard dier tale volgen" (Bolhuis p.96), so much so that most grammarians accepted without query not only that 'c,q,x,y' were restricted to loan words, but also that they were the norm there; changing the spelling to conform to the Dutch system simply did not occur to them. For a very large number these spellings were quite consistent, since they also used 'c, x, q, y' in Dutch words. This is true right up to the time of Siegenbeek. One of the few exceptions was Pels (1677), who makes a special case "wanneer de naamnen ... van andere spraakken de onze geworden zyn, als in ... 'Kwieryn'... van 'Quirinus'".

M.S. (1711) decided that since the 'u' in 'qu' was not representative, - i.e. no /u/ was heard,- then 'qu' should be replaced by 'kw' (p.61) in all words.

The many minor grammarians who came after Siegenbeek most often merely reiterated his thoughts, Terbruggen for example writing that "het (zou) onbehoorlyk zyn, Latynsche of Fransche woorden met letters te spellen, welke in die taalen niet gebruykt worden; b.v. als men 'kwestie' of 'ekstrakt'... sclireef". He does not necessarily follow Siegenbeek in these thoughts, as they were generally prevalent at that time, and indeed his system differs greatly from the latter's, being influenced more by Des Roches, Ballieu and Bincken (for example in the use of accents and 'y'). Like Ballieu and Bincken Terbruggen was an Antwerpenaar (cf. chap.3).

De Vries and Te Winkel modified this view somewhat, in a highly suspect manner however: "het verdient aanbeveling in populaire woorden de spelling met 'kw' of 'k', in geleerde echter die met 'qu' te gebruiken" (WNT under the letter 'Q' 8.7, actually written by J H van Lessen in 1949, but fully in line with De Vries and Te Winkel's views). The intention comes out more favourably if for "geleerde" and "populaire" are read "technical" and "commonly used",.
otherwise it suggests two cultural levels in a very adverse sense. Several words were actually changed in their Woordenlijst, "kwartet" for example being allowed the 't spelling.

A few years earlier Thijm had opened the onslaught on the spelling of "bastaartwoorden" (i.e. such loan words as were partly affected by Dutch sounds, thus being neither purely Dutch nor purely foreign in character). He proposed a radical adaptation to the Dutch spelling system for all words of foreign origin now in common use. De Jager on the other hand regarded any such spelling as "rekwest" as a "vanspelling" (Versch. p.32).

Beets (Versch. I,23) in 1853 ridiculed Thijm's logical arguments. In a dialogue with a certain "Querulus" ("den Neef, geliefd dit in het oog te houden, den Neef van Nurks!"-p.32), he asks:

"- 'Querulus,...wat dunkt u van de bastaartwoorden?"

- 'Gy meent toch niet,' zeide hy, 'hoe ze gespeld moeten worden? In dat opzicht ben ik nergens banger voor dan voor konzekwensie." (note the double meaning here)

- 'Neen,' zeide ik, 'laat ons de spelling daarlaten. Ook ik schrijf met een goed geweten 'kantoor' en 'beschuit', en kom niet tot de konzekwensie, al zou de heer ALBERDINGH (sic) THYM my daarover een proses doen met een 's'!"

Thijm criticised Beets for this last reference, since he had never proposed the spelling "proces" (though some had), and Beets retracted the sentence (op.cit. II,1304). Exactly what significance is to be read into Querulus's relationship to Nurks (Hildebrand's anti-social nephew in the "Camera Obscura") is not clear.

Jan van Vloten showed himself in a semi reactionary light in his criticism of reform: "Wat mijzelf betreft, het is vooral op de volgende punten dat ik een wijziging van 't woordenboek (=WNT) verlangen zou: 1', erkenning der vier uitheemsch verklaarde letters als Nederlandsche en daaruit voortvloeyend gebruik der 'y', der 'x', 'q' & 'c' in woorden waar de afleiding die vordert (b.v. 'text, quittance, concert')". He sees no reason why 'q' should not be used in Dutch.

The original aspirations of the Kollewijners included several radical alterations for such words, but in their finally adopted "Voorstellen" of 1893 they dropped them as too controversial. Nonetheless in 1931 Van Ginneken still accuses them of proposing the spellings "ekipage, koket, kwiteren, kwazie" etc.
and he stands by De Vries and Te Winkel's rule that such "echt Hollandsche phonetische spelling (is) onbeschaafd"! Undoubtedly some radicals did use such forms but it is not a part of the official proposals of the movement. Dixi in 1934 presents an inconsistent picture: although he resists the rejection of 'x' and 'c' in loan words he pleads for the substitution of 'kx' for 'qu'.

The 1954 Woordenlijst continued the tradition of keeping 'qu' in all obviously foreign words, and offering a varied picture for the "bastaardwoorden" which could be regarded as semi-Dutch. In the latter, where the 'qu' was sounded /kw/ it was sometimes changed, as in "rekest/rekwest" (not "request" - De Vries and Te Winkel allowed "rekest" and "request", preferring the latter), more often an alternative is given for 'k' or 'qu', as in "quitte/kiet" (De Vries and Te Winkel give only "quitte"), and, with different meanings, "etiket/etiquette" (both are "etiquetta" in De Vries and Te Winkel). Many common words in which 'qu' was representing /kw/ now had only 'kw', e.g. "kwaliteit" (De Vries and Te Winkel allowed only "qualiteit"), but some such as "kwalitatief/qualitatief" had alternative forms.

Rombouts opened the attack once more in 1957 with his consistently radical spellings "atakeren, kwart, kwadraat, kijdam" etc. (i.e. not only 'bastaardwoorden' but also fully foreign words such as "quidam"), echoed by Verschueren with his "Konsekwente Progressive Spelling" (KPS). Possibly yielding in the face of such pressures the Rapport of 1967 conceded the point: "De commissie stelt voor 'k' of 'kw' te spellen naar gelang van de uitspraak; dus, 'antikair, kalke, ...antikwariaat'... Uitgesonderd zijn de Latijns woorden en woordkoppelingen 'qua, qui(d)proquo, quodlibet'", an almost complete capitulation. This reform would seem thus to be almost entirely accepted.

Summary:
Dutch words:
- 1653 'qu' unquestioned as a spelling. Leupenius proposes 'kv' but uses 'qu'.
- 1656 first recorded appearances of 'kv'
- 1677 first grammarians to use 'kv'
- c1700 - c1750 'kw' gets even more common, 'qu' lingers a little longer in the South. 1750 'qu' all but extinct (cf Halbertsma), and 'kw' now fully accepted.

Loan words:
- 1843 'qu' unquestioned; sporadic 'kw' spellings since c.1673, and 'k' spellings since Middle Dutch;
1843- various words changed from 'qu' to 'k(w)', mostly one at a time, continuing pressures, starting with Thijn. radical spellings often ridiculed.
Increasing pressures for complete abolition of 'q' (Thijn,Land)

1967 First official proposal to scrap 'qu'.

**Deviations from 'qu' or 'kw'**
(some used, some merely mooted)

- qu Gerard van der Schuuren, Lambrecht, (Montanus), Kramer, Tuinman (cf Low German)
- ku (Dafforne) Winschooten
- kv Winschooten (cf. "dving, tvijffel, svem")
Initial and medial 's' and 'z'

Medial 'sz-

Preconsonantal 'z'

Anomalous use of 'sz-

The suffixes 'sael, -saam'

The use of 'tz', final and medial

Loan words

Final 'sz' and 'z' and 'sde, zde'.

The rules governing the phonological distribution of /s/ and /z/ in Dutch are relatively straightforward: initially /s/ appears only before consonants, /z/ only before vowels and the semi-vowel /u/; medially /z/ appears only after a long vowel or consonant, and /s/ usually only after a short or unstressed vowel. Examples of /s/ after a long vowel, such as "bloesem, hijsen, Pasen" are uncommon. The normal distribution can be illustrated by the examples "staan, slaan, saan, swaen, lessen, lezen, grensen; historiese". This distribution can be seen to be almost exactly parallel to that of the other fricatives /f/ and /v/, except that /z/ only appears before vowels and /u/ whereas /v/ occurs before vowels and /l/ and /r/. Although this simple picture has been more than a little obscured by the intrusion of loan words (e.g. "suiker, kansen"), and words where /s/ before vowels has developed from /ts/ (e.g. the modern equivalents of "tsamen, teentig, tsventig, tsedert", some spelt with 'z' by analogy, of also "tvijftig" now with /f/), the system was apparent enough to influence the use of 's' and 'z' for a very long time.

It can be seen from this distribution pattern that the difference between /s/ and /z/ is not phonemic in Dutch, and this fact alone was undoubtedly responsible for the relatively late appearance of the letter 'z' in Dutch. Certainly spellings with 's' are known from the earliest Middle Dutch texts, but the normal system employed only 's'. This feature of Middle Dutch, where the forms "staan, slaan, saan, swaen, lessen, lezen, grensen" all with 's' are comfortably read correctly by modern and contemporary Dutch readers, extended well into the period of modern Dutch spelling, with repercussions into the middle of the 19th century.

The basic Middle Dutch system was therefore simple in the extreme: 's' was used everywhere ('ss' where necessary in the few words such as "hijsen"), and 'z' was not usually found necessary. The use of 'z', when it did occur, is
surprisingly restricted. Obreen and Van Loey record 'z-' by the 13th century, and Hoebeke also records many instances of initial 'z-', with one fact standing out in both: about half of all the instances of initial 'z-' are to be found in the word "zee" and its compounds. After this the words "zelve, zeer, ziele" and the verb "zijn" are the most frequent (not necessarily in that order). Apart from these few words initial 'z-' is very uncommon, and much more erratic in its application.

By the 15th century the letter 'z' was beginning to be much more common, though the reason for this is obscure. Probably the greatest influence was French usage, and it is certainly noticeable that 'z' first became common in works of Southern provenance. A good example of this is the 1485 Boecius translation, published in Gent, and the 1494 Deventer edition of the Exercitium. The latter has almost exclusively 's' spellings, whereas the former has predominantly 'z-', in the text at least - the prologue uses only 's' except in the verb "zijn". As the 1485 Exercitium from Antwerp also uses the 's' system, not too much of a clear-cut North/South division should be expected, but the trend is there to a limited extent. On the whole however the "all-'s'" system is still the most common, though it is almost invariably adulterated by a few 'z' spellings in certain words (see below). It is not clear how much influence on this spelling came from dialectally different pronunciations of initial /s/ and /z/, cf. modern Amsterdam dialect's use of /s/ before vowels.

Intervocalically the '-s-' spelling continued to maintain a greater frequency compared to '-z-' than initial 's-' did to 'z-'. Spellings with '-z-' are noticeably less common, and it is not infrequent to find 'z-' spellers who never use intervocalic '-z-'. Lambrecht hints at this in 1550 when describing the letter 'z': "zeet ... en cont nergens achter de vocalen in ons Nederlandsch". He may be referring to the different usage of French (cf "voulez"), where 'z' can appear at the end of a word. In the syllable lists he certainly uses 'z' "achter de vocalen", as in "aza, eze, izi, ozo, uzu", and in his Naembouck he consistently uses "deze" etc. with '-z-'. Initially he uses 'z' in "zoukt, ziet" and many more such examples.

The 's-, -s-' system was still the main usage for the second half of the 16th century, though very often with the use of 'z' in a limited number of words,
usually "zee, zeer" and the verb "zijn", - the latter usually to distinguish it from the personal pronoun (see chap.19). Van der Werwe has 's-, -s-' with the exception of the verb "zijn", and Beurier makes an exception for "ziele" in his "Conjugaisons" of 1558; Plantijn has a few entries for 'z' - "zee, zenuwe, ziere, zyde (silk), zijn (vb)", but most of his 'z' entries merely refer the reader to 's'. Yet even this is a sign than 'z-' forms were common, if still in the minority, for he comments that "men Z dickwils gebruyckt in de plaetse van S".

Kilian's usage is even more restricted than Plantijn's, referring the reader from "Zee, zeer, zeewer, zickel, zijde, zijn etc. vide See, seer, seewer, sickel, sijde, sijn". He does not condemn the use of 'z-', but because of the confused state of contemporary usage he finds it advisable to place all the words under 's', "ut inseniendi ratio sit facilior". Even the appendix of foreign names and places has cross-references such as "Zurich, Zutphen &c. .j. Surich, Sutphen &c".

Coornhert's Voorreden of 1563 uses 's-, -s-' with a few idiosyncracies to be mentioned later, but Sasbout's dictionary of 1576 allows about twelve words with 'z' (including "Zee, zeem, zeep, zeër"), the others having cross-references to 's', and being followed by the note "Tout ce que vous ne trouvez icy en la lettre Z, cherchez le en la lettre S".

The first of the grammatical works after Lambrecht to use the 'z' consistently was Sexagius. Initial 'z' is used only before a consonant, and 'z' only before a vowel. The sole exceptions are the anomalous "raisen" (C5) and "swaer" (B3v), of. "zuair, zuac, zuelgen" etc., where it is significant that he uses 's' before 'u' and 'z' before 'u'. This is consistent within the strict rule of 's' before consonants and 'z' before vowels. Between vowels he makes the same distinction: "bassen; bguze, blazzen, verrzen, kezen, lezen, pezen, ligrenz".

Sexagius's comment that "z ... nihil aliud re vera est quam crassum s" is echoed five years later by De Heuiter, who writes that "anders niet en is 'z' dan 's' een lettel dicker van vorder van geluit vallende also hier blijet 'versamen; samen!". He gives three rules for the use of 's' and 'z' in Dutch: firstly wherever the sound of the degenerate (i.e. palatalised) 'c' is heard, secondly in '-se', be it adjectival ending or enclitic (Latijnse, kooptse), and thirdly before a consonant (including 'v' - "stamelen, awigen"). The first and third of
these rules agrees with Sexagius's system, only the use of 'ṣe' differing.

Continuing the line of consistent 'ṣ' spellers the Twe-spraack opposes the contemporary practice of ignoring 'z' and decides that "wy de 'z' veal ende de 's' minder behoeven, daer wy nu int beghendeal de 'z' walnigh ende de 's' steeds in haar plaats ghebruiken" (p. 46). Reacting to this trend, though not altogether following it, the 1534 edition of Reurier's vocabulary spells "zee, zeem, zeepe, zeer, zeeuer, zeneue, ziere, zoom, muyl" with 'z', and comments that "al tghene dat phy hier in de letter Z niet en vindt sooeket inde letter S" (cf. Sasbout).

The earlier edition of 1562/3 contained only "zee, zeer" and compounds, so the expansion is due to the changing habits of usage and other dictionaries, showing that in 1534 'ṣ' was more accepted than in 1563.

The slightly later French-Dutch dictionary of Hellem (1537ff), being a continuation of Sasbout, contains the same comment and usage, right up to the 1634 edition, with an extra note in early editions up to 1602 and omitted from 1630 onwards, in the section on 'F': after referring from 'f' to 'ph' (see chap. 9) it continues - "le mesme entendez aussi de ... l'affinité de ... S & de Z" (see also below). Other dictionaries, such as Hexham, contain similar comments, but as it is such an obvious statement no certain decision on borrowing can always be deduced from its presence.

Contemporary writers' and printers' usage ignored such trends for the most part. Valcoogh (zijn), Coornhert (zee, zijn (vb), zy (they)), Van Beaumont (zijn (vb), zee), Stevin (-), Van der Noot (zadig, ziz), Hoëmer Visscher (zijt, zy (they)), Smyters (Zeeuw), and many others all used the 'ṣ-' system with varying degrees of consistency, and with the more or less regular exception of the 'z-' spellings indicated for each.

In 1612 the newer system received fresh impetus from Van der Schuere. Already in the introduction he declares his intention to show "hое wanschikkelyk dattet is ... S voor inde sillabe inde plaatze van Z te stellen", and consequently on page 33 he formulates his rules: "De 'z' is bequaem, om te gebruyken voor de klynk-Letteren ende 'u',... De 's' komt zoo wel midden ende achter inde Sillabe, als voor; maar de 'z' alleen voor inde Sillabe. De 's' voor inde Sillabe kommende, word gevolgd van de me-klynk-Letteren 'ch, l, m, n, p, t'". This gives the regular spellings "zalige, deze, verzamelen, spellinge". The 'ṣ' "midden
inde Sillabe is presumably before a final consonant (cf. "de-zo"), as in "gequetst" (p.7), "vleyssch" (p.15) etc. Against this view are the traditionalists such as Smyters, who in the preface to his Epitheta of 1620 writes that "wy tusschen ... 's' ende 'z' weynich onderscheyts gemaect hebben, het welcke gescheiden is, omdat zomme Nederlants ocht kleyn onderscheyt maken in de voorschreven letteren, d'emde voor d'andere te ghebruyccken".

Writers in the first few decades of the new century continued to use the older system; included amongst these are the works of Starter (zee), Bredero (zij (they)), Cats (zijn (vb)), Van Borssele (zee, zijde, zijn (vb), zich), Van Santen (1st editions), Camphuysen (zwaert, zijn (vb), zij (they)), Anna Visscher (-), and Boetius à Bollswert (ziel, zijn (vb)), as usual mostly making exceptions for a few words as indicated. Some, such as Huygens, Hooft, the early Vondel, and De Ruyter, are more erratic, with many 'z-' spellings and less consistency.

But the tendency to adopt the newer system was spreading. Smyters, who had used the 's-, -s-' system in his Schryf-konst-boeck of 1613, and despite his comment given above, used the 'z-, -z-' system in his Epitheta, though he often has intervocalic 's' such as "bewijsen, misprijsen". Coster's "Iphigenia" of 1617 also makes the normal distinction between 's' and 'z', but his "Tewevis de boer" of 1627 uses the 's-, -s-' system. Hooft used only 's' in his early writings, adopting some 'z' forms after c.1608 (e.g. "zyn, zyt, zien, zonder, zeght" in Achilles), and after c.1625 he uses 's' and 'z' in the newer manner (datings given by Kooiman in his edition of the Twe-spraack 1913).

Amongst grammatical works a reasonable level of regularity was rarely achieved in the actual usages of the texts, despite whatever rules were given. Van Gherven uses mostly 'z-' but has many 's-' forms, though Daforne and Van Haule, in explicitly supporting the newer 'z-' and '-z-' forms, are more consistent. By the mid 1620's then the situation was roughly that grammars were recommending a consistent separation of the letters 's' and 'z', but most writers and printers were at best erratic. Some used the 's-, -s-' system with or without 'z-' in a few words, and some used the two letters almost without discrimination. The regular 's-, -s-' system is hardly seen in practice.
In 1624 a new system was introduced to those of existing grammars. It is all probability the system was already in use, but this was the first time it had been defended in writing. The new method is that of De Hubert. Because the letter 's' was of Greek origin, in which language (and thereafter in Latin) it represented /ds/ or /ts/, many theorists had avoided it for representing /z/ in Dutch, defending the 's-, -s-' system. Some (e.g. Twe-spraak) had also pointed out that /ts/ was also the sound represented by 'z' in German, and it is beyond question that De Hubert was influenced by the German use of 's' for /z/ before vowels and /s/ before consonants, with 'z' used for /ts/.

For the majority of Dutch spellers foreign usages were not of great relevance, or at best were merely worthy of interest in their similarities to and their divergences from Dutch usage. De Hubert however decided to take over the German use of 'z' for /ts/ and also to use it for /s/ where any mispronunciation was possible, thus reserving 's' for /s/ and /z/: "De letter 'z' hebbe ik gebruikt voor onderdubbele 'ss', gelijk sommige Letter-kunst-schriivers in de Latijnse tale, die daarvoor houden: De Hoog-duiitzen leeren ons, hoe wii die behooren te gebruiken: so spellen sii 'zierlick' met 'z', ende 'sieden' met 's". 'Z' was consequently used in such words as "zilbe, wenzen, mensen" to show prevocalic /z/, as well as in "zierlick, glanz, Zabbath" where it represented /ts/. This resulted in a complete reversal of the 'z-, -z-' system: where others used 's-' De Hubert used 'z-', where others used '-z-' he used '-s-', and where others used 'z-' he used 's-', at least before vowels. Before consonants he preserved the 's' (e.g. "spellen, uytsprake") as also in "tsamen" as a contraction of "te-samen" with /tez-, so that this 's' is not really anomalous.

Only four years later De Hubert was to find an ally in Ampzing: "Wat nu voords de letter 'z' aenlangdi, segge daer van, dat ik ze liever voor een soet-scherpe, dan doof-swaere letter soude kunnen aennemen: ofsoochoon het tegen-gevoelen in onse verdorve uytsprake vrij wat voets schijnt te hebben, ende dapper begint sonder wettelijk oordeel aangenomen ende gevolgd te worden", - a timely reminder that the 'z-, -z-' system was still comparatively new, and was not felt to be intrinsically superior by all. For Ampzing then, like De Hubert, 's' was the correct letter for both /s/ and /z/, both before and between vowels and before consonants, in fact in all positions except in a few loan words such as "zieraad"
where it represented /ts/; and some isolated cases where 'z' was used to identify prevocalic /s/, as in "quanzuys, zedert", and his own name "Ampzine" (see p.19). In "zedert" the 'z' may alternatively represent /ts/, as forms such as "tseedert" are not unknown, e.g., in Hooft's Nederlandsche Historien 92.

Ampzine felt that international conformity in using 'z' for /ts/ (as in Greek, Latin, German, Italian), and historical tradition in using 'z' for /s/ and /z/ were of immense importance: "Dit komt hier ook noch by ten overvloed in bedenkinge, dat wy so bij jater veel 'z' in onse tale sullen moeten ghebruyken, so het tegen-gevoelen vande 'z' steeds grijpen sal, niet alleen tegens onse gewoonte, maar ook tegens het gebruyk van alle andere spraken" (p.18). Earlier he had asked, concerning such historical continuity, whether "de enkale letters in de cene tale niet anders als in ander, ofte ten minsten in alle, maer de oudste ende eygenste uytspraak, behoren te klinken?" (p.15). At first sight the system of De Hubert and Ampzing seems to be the same as the traditional 's-, -s-' system but it is marked off in its use of 'z' in those few words where it does appear, since "zee, zijn" and the other common 'z-' words now conform to the 's-' system, and 'z' is found only in loan words where it represents /ts/ or prevocalic /s/.

This was not the reasoning behind the traditional system.

The system adopted by the Bible translators is still in line with tradition however: 's-, -s-' is used wherever possible, and differentiations in spellings (see chap.19) are employed for "'zyn' esse, 'syn' suus". The words "zee, ziele" (as so often) were granted the use of 'z', and "zitteren" was given the alternative "tsitteren". The latter suggests that they were not in favour of De Hubert and Ampzing's use of 'z' for /ts/, as is borne out by their "zee, ziele" forms. Other 'z' forms apart from those which the translation panel specified in the "Resolvedien" can be found, such as "Zaeyen, zaet", but 's-' (sotte, seggen, sitten) is the normal system followed.

The use of this system in such an authoritative book was of great influence in prolonging the adherence of the general writing public to the traditional 's-, -s-' (plus "zijn, ziele, zee") system. This can be seen in some of the writers mentioned above (such as Cats), who were writing about this time, and such later writers as De Swaen, Revisus, De Decker. Others include Van de Vonne (zijnde), Stalpaert van der Wiele (gezin, zegt, zij (they)), although it is
usually impossible to say whether it is the usage of the Bible or tradition which causes adoption of this system in most cases.

Some exceptions to the 's-' rule were slightly different: in Rodrigues's dictionary of 1639-40 only "zaene, zee" and their compounds have 'z-', not even "zijn". Some banished 'z' altogether, such as Plemp and the anonymous annotator of the copy of Van Heule (1633 edition) in the Koninklijke Bibliotheek (see 1625 Caron ed. p.xxi). Where Van Heule, describing assimilation, states that "Als een 'z' achter E, D, F, G, H, K, P, S, T, X, kost zo vort die als een 's' zachtsens uitgesproken, want in plaats van 'rad zeggen' zeggen wy 'rad seggen'", the annotator (the one using red ink) adds "ik sou soo seggen en schrijven". These red-ink additions never use 'z' (unlike the black ink) and show certain similarities in spelling and syllable division to Plemp's usage (Plemp is known to have owned and annotated a copy of the 1625 edition and of Van der Schuere - see Van Heule ed. Caron p.xxi and Van der Schuere ed. Zwaan p.xvi).

Binnart's dictionary of 1635 (largely influenced by Kilian) allowed the standard "zee, zijn" spellings, but "Zeele, zeem, zeep, zeer, ende andere woorden, die sommige ook met Z. schryven, salmen vinden inde S" (as I am informed by Rev. D J Wartluft of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, which possesses the only copy located).

But by now the system recommended by most grammars since the Twe-spraack, involving the regular distinction of 's' and 'z' and the use of intervocalic '-z-', was becoming ever more common. Montanus used it in 1635 and lists (p.25) "sout" as a "vervoerde Stofmerking" for "zout", "Wanneerder (letteren) zijn die in andere dan haer eerste beteikenis moeten gelezen worden", since here the 's' represents /z/.

Probably of almost as great impact on the use of 's' and 'z' as the approval granted by the Bible translators to the 's-, -s-' system, was the decision by Vondel to regulate his spelling of these consonants. Until about 1639 (according to Koller) he had used 's' and 'z' almost indiscriminately, though with a marked liking for the "s-, -s-, zijn, ziele" system. But after this date he began to make a regular distinction between 's' and 'z', no doubt greatly influencing a large number of writers.

Hexham's dictionary of 1647-48 and Kok 1649 make this same distinction, the
latter probably influenced by the reprinted Twe-spraak of the same year whose usage he emulates in other ways (cf. chap. 3). Others, such as Bontekoe (zee, zuyden, zeyl, zijn (verb)), Jan de Witt (zeyl, zee, ziele, zwydt, zy (they)), retained much of the old system, but these were by now becoming fewer in number.

A new variation of the 'z-, -z-' system came to prominence around the mid 17th century, though it was known long before (see Lambrecht’s comments above). It is used in the grammars of Van Attevelt and Van der Weyden, and involves the normal use of initial 'z-, -z-', but prefers 's' to 'z' between vowels (the 1682 Van Attevelt uses the normal system). As Van der Weyden puts it, intervocalic single 's' is always pronounced /z/ in the Dutch phonological system, and it is “deshalven onnodig dat men deze med 'z' schrijve" (there is nothing new in the concept of phonemic spelling!). It should not be expected, however, that he applied the distinction of the 's' and 'z' in initial position any more consistently than his contemporaries, it was just that he avoided intervocalic 's'.

Due to the general lack of consistency present in the spelling of most books of this and later periods it is often impossible to tell whether the basic 'z-, -z-' system is being incorrectly applied, or an imperfect attempt being made to use the 'z-, -s-' system. Only when a grammarian makes an explicit statement such as that of Van der Weyden and some later writers, or when the usage is highly consistent, can certainty be assumed. It might be thought that this spelling could be influenced by the French system, where intervocalic 's' represents /z/, but there is no direct evidence of this, and it would be expected to find this usage more commonly in the South if it were so, and this is not the case.

The system of De Hubert and Ampzing was still finding supporters in mid century. Amongst these was Leupenius, who has other similarities with De Hubert (see chap. 17). The 'z' he regards as /ts/: "De laatste Letter is 'z', en heeft de kracht van twee meedeklinkeren 'ds', of 'ts': soo wordtse gebruikt in alle taalen... Daen dan deze Letter groot ongelyk, die de selve minder kracht toe schryven dan de 's', of immers sonder onderscheid voor de selve gebruiken". He was well aware of the nature of the distribution of /s/ and /z/ in Dutch, saying
of 's' "datze dan noch zonytys scherper voor koot, dat is in eenige uithoemische
naamen, als Samuel, Simpson: of wanneerse van den bijstaanden Meedeklinker wat
meer kracht ontfangt, als in 'menschen, Schande'". The 'z' he reserves for /ta/
as in "zierraad, verzieran, ontzieran".

Majority opinion now favoured the 'z-, -z-' system, however. For example
Van den Ende rejects the "ouder gewoonte ... 'Salckx'" in favour of "Zulx", and
uses 'z' in the normal way. Some southerners, such as Van Engelen, also followed
this pattern, but many did not: Bolognino uses "sonder, selve, leser, sal, zijn,
oversulcks, dese, sweer, sêt (zee, zeal)" etc., but rather inconsistently declares
that "Qualyc schryftman ooc met een 's' de worden di luyden met een 'z', ende de
gene di luyden met een 's', met een 'z'". The rules he gives bear a striking
resemblance to those given by De Heuiter: "Datmen de 's' meet schryven, darse
luydt gelyc onse 'c' ... In de sillabe 'se' oft 'ser', 'Gricce, segtos'". It must
be borne in mind however, as mitigation of this inconsistency, that the sounds of
"'s' en 'z' sijn in de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw nog niet onderscheiden,
zoals thans het geval is; ze zijn waarschijnlijk nog niet gefixeerd" (Hellinga,
writing in 'Kroniek van Kunst en Kultuur', VIII No.5). This may explain some of
the variation in opinions, though tradition was often a strong influence, as is
suggested by the continued use of 'z' in the same few words (zee, ziel, zuyd,zijn).

Other Southerners who used the traditional system include Binnart, whose
1659 dictionary was less permissive than the first edition: he merely enters
"Zijn ... zijnde" (differentiation forms), without even the cross-reference of the
earlier edition (the later revision in 1719, 1744 has the normal spelling).
Bilius, though not discussing this particular spelling, uses only 's', in "sal,
soc, wesen, sulcx, selve" etc. 'Laconis...' too felt that 's' could, and should,
represent /z/: "S semper leniter ut latinè in 'casa' & passim in medio dictionis"
giving the forms "dese, lasen, segghen" etc.. He does use the verb "zijn"however,
which suggests possible influence from the Bible translators, as is also present
in other aspects of his system.

With the acceptance of the 'z-, -z-' system by the most influential chamber
of Rhetoric "Nil Volentibus Arduum" the trend was set for most future grammars.
The phonetic distinction between 'z' (now accepted as /z/) and 's' (now restricted
to /s/) was felt to be preferable to the older system. Of possible influence here was the increasing number of loan words, introducing /s/ in un-Dutch positions, where, if the same letter were used for /s/ and /z/, possible mispronunciation could occur, and the realisation that a few Dutch words did not conform to the pattern. The most usually quoted word for this was "sullen", used to show that '/s/ was needed here to distinguish the word from "sullen". This was the argument of Pels (in 1677) for one: "Het bekende onderscheid in 's' en 'z', neem ik mede in acht, welker verscheidene klank in het woord 'sullen', als het 'glȳn' betekent, en 'sullen', het hulpwoord, klaarlijk blykt". Followers of this system include Brune, Brandt, Dullaert, Luyken (the latter with frequent intervocalic '-s-', and also '-sw-', see below).

Conservative followers of the older system include Niervaert in 1676 (zijn (vb)), Piélat, Van Helderens's dictionary of 1675 (zijn (verb), zoe, zeer, zoon, ze zoet; sonder, suster, geset), La Grue 1684 (zinker, zap. zolfer, zóp, zim" only, - nb all have prevocalic /s/ and this may be a De Hubert system). But above all is Winschooten, who also mentions the varying dialect pronunciations: "Een opregt Hollander gebruikt cover al een S, schoon de Seeuwen, en voor al de Friesen, doorgaans een Z gewoon zijn te gebruiken". He resents such intrusion on the general spelling practice: "Soo durven sij voor een stokregeel stellen, dat de Z gesteld moet worden, (soo niet voor alle) immers voor het meeste gedeelte van die woorden, die agter de Z een Klinker of Tweeklank kunnen hebben; als 'zijn, zoude': daar en tegen, dat de S geplaatst moet worden voor aan in woorden, waar agter gesteld werden andere Meedeklinkers; als 'sterk, smeer, smot'; maar (ons bedunkens) soo behoorde op sijn Hollands geen woord met een Z geschreven te werden". For him too '/s' represented /tʃ/ "gelijk sulks gebeurd is in 'zoo'ljds' voor 'des' of 'd' sommige tijds', 'zoude' voor 'het soude'; 'zijn' voor 'het sijn". The results of this theory are to be seen in his dictionary of the following year: "Voor al heeft het ons gelust (hoe wel met ongelooflijke arbeid) de spelling van de Neederduitsche Taal, op de hedendaagse en netste wijs te schaaven; hebbende ook veel woorden die in andere Dictionarien op de letter '/s' werden gevonden, gebracht op die van de letter ... '/s'". Not a single word is listed under '/s', even in the onomasticon (Seeland, Switerland, Swol).

Some were not as brave as Winschooten, who is here really going against the
the contemporary tendency. Van Helderan felt that 's' was unnecessary in his short-hand system: "'s' heb ik niet, ik gebruik 'z' in plaats", but in his actual spelling he uses the now more orthodox forms "geleen, deze, zoekt" etc. An updating of the prefatory comment in Mellema's dictionary took place in the revision by T. La Grue in 1682: "Ook isser (1694 has "ister") noch iets daar wel op gelezen moeten worden, te weten, dat vele woorden, so in't begin, als in 't midden geschreven staan met een Z, die van veel anderen geschreven werden met een S, gelijk 'sien' voor 'sien'..." A great many cross-references are introduced including the slightly contradictory "Sien ziet Zien".

One of the decisive factors in the acceptance of the differentiation of 's' and 'z' was its recommendation in the three standard grammars of the 18th century: those of Sewel, Nyloë and Moonen. Sewel, the earliest in 1691, felt that "'s' in plaats van 'z' te gebruiken, komt my zeer ongerymd voor, zynde 't verschil dier letteren niet minder, als dat van B & P, of F & V, gelijk gehoord kan worden in dit zeggen, 'van dit gladde steylte afgaande Zullen wy ligtelyk Sullen': Dies speel ik 'Sabel, servet, siroop, suyker' doch niet 'Semel, segen, sout', 'twelk met de Friesche uytspraak overeenkomt'. Despite the authority Sewel acquired in his later grammar, these comments in his dictionary did not have immediate effect.

Hilarides's Phaedrus translation of 1695 has an individual system, where only 's' in used initially (sijn, seggen, sejt, sow, soo, sonder), but 'z' is used between vowels (deeze, wyze, onze, wezen, vreeze, beezigh, duizend). This system is unusual applied so consistently. His "Niewe Taalgronden" of 1705 follows the normal pattern for 's' and 'z'.

Duikerius's "Schouburgh" has the same system as Sewel, though his "Voorbeeldzels" differs occasionally. Kuyper (zijn), Van Yk (-), Pars (-), Rusting (zijn, zo), Van Geesdale (several 'z-, -z-'), all used the older 's-, -s-' system with the consistent exception of the words indicated. Rusting even excludes 'z' from his poem "Gulden ABC", rejecting first 'x' and 'y' and concluding: "Al was er Zeta by, Wat leyt ons aan die drie? / Wy kunnen evenwel wel schryven sonder die". The 'z-, -z-' system was later adopted by the "Grammaire plus exacte" of 1701, Van Hoogstraten in his gender list, Van Alkemade, and the Van Hoogstraten/Hannot dictionary of 1704, which comments that "Voor wat nieuw ook zal hier aengezien worden, dat woorden by anderen, ook by Kiliaen, met een 'S' beginnende, nu met
een 'Z' worden geschreven; een wyze van spellen by wy ten hoogsten goedt gekeurt, te meer omdat het onderscheit van klank tussen de 'S' en 'Z' tegenwoordig van de meesten aengemerkt en in acht genomen vert. De beste Schryvers van onzen tydt keuren het geluit der 'S' scherp, en dat van de 'Z' zacht". The comment is Van Hoogstraten's (echoed in his list), but the spelling of the dictionary was formulated by Hannot before Van Hoogstraten took over the editorship. It is interesting that both Sewel and Van Hoogstraten think this system, first defended over a century earlier was something new.

That the question was still living and somewhat controversial can be seen from a report given by Sewel of a discussion he recently had (reported in the introduction to the Boekzaal, 1704): "Deeze liefde tót de Letterkunde doet my denken aan een mondeling gesprék, onlangs gehouden met eenige voornaame Liefhebbers onzer Hollandsche taale, waarin wy onder ander ook van de spelling spreekende, op het verschil quamen dat'er is tusschen de 'S' en de 'Z'. Ik gaf toen myn gevoelen daar entrent te verstaen; en dewyl 't eene zaak van een algemeen belang voor 't Staetendom der Letteren is, acht ik het niet ondienstig, op 't papier te stellen 't gene ik daar zeyde, 't welk hierop uytquam: Dat de sissende uytpraak tót de 'S', en de platte tót de 'Z' behoorde". That other languages used 'z' and 's' differently he felt to be irrelevant, a point which he enlarged upon by the insertion of an extra comment in his 1708 (and later) dictionary. It is a pity that he did not also enlarge upon the participants in the conversation and their respective views, though it is attractive to think that "voornaame Liefhebber" may be an allusion to the pseudonym used by Nyloë: only a few months before.

Moonen agrees with Sewel and Nyloë on the use of 'z' in "zee, zoon, zon", "by den gemelden Spiegel en syne Kunstgenooten weder ingevoert, en sedert dien tydt van de treflykste Nedersuitsche schryvers gevolgt" (something of an exaggeration). And this was now the accepted standard view of almost all grammars and most writers.

One of the last defenders of the 's-, -s-' system was Verwer, who was very much under the influence of the Latin spelling system. In fact the only actual comment on usage in the section entitled "Orthographia" in his "Idea" concerns 'z': "verum 'z' nobis planè potest rejici; ut fit Latinis" - the letter could
be completely rejected. 'S' was to be used for both sounds: "Ratio erat, quod, re ultrà loquente, distinctio non est necessaria. nam Hollandiae est pro firma, imò innata regula; ubi sonus sibilans liquescit cum suffecte vocali, tum semper lenem: ut, in 'sak, soker, sout, silver, suiver', iten 'swijgen, swaer', (quasi 'suwijgen, suwaer'. Ita enim & scribant majores). Contra, ubi sonus idem liquescit cum consonante seu antecedente seu sequente, tum semper asperum: ut 'verdigsel, begintsel, maektsel, tsamen, tsedert, menschen'" (p.63). He too recognises the lack of phonemic opposition between the two sounds, and expressly states that his use of 'z' for the differentiation of "syn" and "syn" is not caused by a desire to use 'z' for /z/ (see chap.19). He makes this distinction, he says, on the example of earlier writers, amongst whom he names Hugo de Groot.

A few followed the same tradition as he (there is no evidence of direct influence), including M.S. (1711), and Ludolf Smids in his "Schatkamer" of the same year. The latter, refuting the arguments of Sewel and Pels (the latter reprinted in 1707), writes: "Ondertussen is de 'Z'... niet een Grieksse letter? bestaat haar kracht niet in de letteren 'TS'? Sou ik, in het Latyn niet 'miser' (elendigh) maar 'mizer' moeten schryven? gebruikt de Nederlander dan deze letter anders als de Grieken of Latynen? maar met wat recht? om 'sullen' (glyen) van 'zullen' (helpwoord) te onderscheiden? Doch dit geschil sal ik noch niemand ooit beslissen; en daarom sou ik, zonder een koorts op de hals te halen, durven schryven: 'See Seeland' &c. gelyk ook 'Suiden, Sutfen' &c. overal bykans in dit werkjen is geset". That he is not quite as incensed as his words would suggest is shown by his closing sentence: "Maar laat ons hier van afstappen, niemand moeylyk maaken, en, met noch enige veinige saaken te verhandelen, de Griekse Zeta tot onse woorden overbrengen". He is forced to yield to the weight of common usage. But his comment does show that the issue was far from dead, a feeling that is borne out by the extensive discussion on the use of 's' and 'z' in the introduction to the earlier editions of Halma's dictionary (e.g. 1719).

Smids's submission to the system which only just over a decade earlier Sewel had described as a "nieuwe spelling" and Van Hoogstraten as "wat nieuws", is a sign of the times. From early in the century onwards, greatly influenced by the agreement of Sewel, Nyloë and Moonen, the 'z-, -z-' system was used almost
Tuinman, Ten Kate, Huydecopper and almost all subsequent Northern grammars use, and sometimes defend, the standard system. For example Heugelenburg (whose poetry of 1632 had used the same system as Winschooten) writes that "Gelijk met vele reeds aangetoondte Letteren, zoo is ook omtrent het zetten van een Z, in plaats van de S, neede zeer groote verandering doorgedrongen, want nog voor weinig Jaaren, vried (selvs bij schrandere Verstandigen) overal een S geschreven, zonder onderscheiding, zo wel voor Heel, Halv, als Medeklinkers, en de Z. genoegzaam als balling weg geworpen". The present system he describes as 'z' before vowels, and 's' before consonants and semi-vowels, "dog ook niet altijd" (- to allow for loan words, "sullen", "sons" etc.). Writers too adopted this system; amongst whom can be named Van der Schelling, Rotgans, Poot, Langendijk, Schermer.

In the South opinion differed. E.G.P. and Steven both support the Northern system, the former writing that "De 'Z' heeft sedert korte jaren ten opsigte van haar oude gebiedt seer veroverd; en de 'S' uyt een seer groot deel van hare landeryen gerechtelyk uytgezet", which tendency he supports in theory, though apparently without the backing of the printer (sy, zijn, syvere, seer, zelfde); and Steven, quoting as his authority Heijer, Halma and Marin, though he too uses 's' in "sy, syn (pronoun), zich". Eincken, Verpoorten, Des Roches and the "Snoeijmes" and later Southern works agreed with these, but Pomey's dictionary, up to the 1753 edition, used 's', after which "'t meest der Woorden, die by vele met een 's' geschreven worden, alhier met de 'z' (syn) gespeld, om de zachttheid te vinden in de 'z', en de scherpte in de 's', als 'Zand' van de zee, "Sant" of Heylig". He hints at the continued use of 's' by others, and amongst such were the Ursulines vocabulary of 1738, the "Grammaire pour apprendre..." of 1757, and the conservative "Aerschot" booklet of 1766.

Even in the North the accepted system did not go entirely unopposed. The 'z-', 's-' system mentioned by Van der Weyden, and known since long before, was still in use in 1716 by De Vin, but not until 1769 did it once more receive the backing of a grammar. In that year Zeydelaar wrote that "Ik (ben) van gedagte ... dat de 's' tusschen twee Vocalen, zagt klinkt, én daarom ook gevoeliglijk daartusschen mag geschreven wórden". In his grammar of 1781 he still uses "'s' tusschen twee Vocalen", though he admits that opposition and criticism had caused
him to think deeply about it since his "Spelkonst" first appeared.

One writer who had the same usage as Zeydelaar in this respect, though of earlier date, was Onno van Haren. For example one of the ways in which he "zondig(t)... talkens tegen de conventionele vormen in grammatica (en) spelling" (De Vooys, "Schets", p.60) was just this usage of "daese, bewysen, leesen, reesen, trouweloosse", alongside "sien, zelve, wederzys, suiderzee, zoekt" etc. As this system is quite rigorously applied (allowing for differentiation forms such as "asyn, az") it cannot be called a shortcoming. The last appearance of this system was in 1799 in the grammar of Schwiers, but as he is merely copying Zeydelaar's usage, this does not prove any continued application of the system.

The use of 's' instead of 'z' was still not extinct: apart from consistent users of this now out of date system such as Overschie (1735), the "Inleyding" of 1735 still admits that 'z' "word by onkundige zonder onderscheeyd met de 's' gebruykt" (Van der Palm often has 's' in "selve" and other words alongside the more regular forms), and Wester in 1797 felt that "wat meer oplettendheid" was called for on the part of some users.

But after Zeydelaar (apart from Schwiers) no grammar in the North was to advocate any other than the Sewel/Wyloë/Koonen system. And in the South all since the "Grammaire pour apprendre..." of 1757 had adopted the same usage. Then in the early years of the 19th century a new ultra-puristic spelling school arose, beginning with Van Daele. These regarded the letter 'z' as an abominable import via French from Greek (where it represented /ts/), with no rightful place in any Dutch/Flemish spelling system. In support of this they called on the Middle Dutch spellings, where only 's' was used. The systems of the various defenders of this resurrected spelling differ somewhat in detail, but are united in opposing the use of the letter 'z'.

Van Daele was the most radical, proposing 's' for /z/ and preconsonantal /s/, and 'ss' for intervocalic and prevocalic /s/: "STÉVENS hóft sékerlyk dienst Édaen aen de Tael, maar ik pry's hem daer in niet, dat hy, gelyk véle andere, op lossen grond zegt, dat de boek-steaf 'Z' zacht is, en 'S' hard; het tégendæel gaet vast en sommeklaer" (Tyderdryf No.21, p.10). He considers the possibility of using 'z' for /s/, but "besluit: dat de harde schuylfelinge door 'z' ofte 'ss' moet uytgeprint worden. ... Is 'ghyske' een vlaensch woord, ik sal 'ssyske'
schryven, is 'gieraad' een vlaamsch woord, ik sal 'asserad' schryven: valt dat buytan de gewöntche der oogen, ten minsten het stryd niet tégen geen regels" (loc. cit. 23, 9). Van Daele's defence that 's' was Greek /ts/ and could therefore not be used for /z/ was condemned for inconsistency by De Simpel (p. 26): "Indien dit een voldoend reden is, ... zoo behoort de Grieksche 'y' als 'u' te klinken, dewijl zij bij de Grieken aldus luide". Even the later continuers of Van Daele's system found some aspects too radical, primarily the use of initial 'ss-' for prevocalic /s/, although Van Daele was here drawing the reasonable analogy with the use of double 'ss' in "danssen, perssen" where it served the same purpose. It was felt that this was too great a departure from existing usage, as he anticipated.

De Neckere, the next of these few, in 1815, repeated that "De enkale 's' is dan oorspronkelyk en uytter aerd voor sagt t'aensien, ende en kan niet dan by willekeur hard gemaakt worden. ... Dit alles overmerkt, wy gelooven noodsaekelyk voor het welsyn onser tael van ons te houden aan de oorspronkelyke sagte 's', en voor regel te aenvèrden, wilt men in 't midden van een woord eens 's' hebben, dat men de selve moet verdubbelen", as was also necessary after voiced consonants such as in "Hulssel, Vylssel, Grimssel, Vormssel" (see also below). He preferred to introduce an accent onto the 's' to show initial /s/ rather than use Van Daele's cumbersome 'ss-': "ons dunkt dat het gebruykelyker voor het spellen ... were indien men aan de 'S' een andere vorme konne geven, of liever eenig teeken byzetten (by voorbeeld een cedeken ...) waer by men sulke 'S' van de gemeene ofte sagte 'S' sou mogen onderscheyden" (p. 65ff).

Nothing more is heard of such suggestions until 1844 when Van den Hoven published his Projét. He will have nothing in Dutch of the foreign 's'français, importé par les Hollandais, et tout aussi étranger que l'ý à l'orthographe du moyen age. ... Rien ne serait plus facile pour les Flamands que d’en revenir à l’usage de l’s. Nos anciens bourgeois s’en servent encore; et parmi ceux qui ont fait leur éducation après 1815, il n'en est pas dix qui ne lisent aussi facilement ‘syne suster’ p.ex. que ‘zyne zuster’. Jamais en effet l'emploi de l’s ne pourrait occasionner un double sens ou un sens contraire, car il n’existe pas un seul cas dans l’orthographe actuelle où le ‘z’ serve à differencier un mot. Il indique simplement l’s doux". There is more than a trace of anti-
Holland sentiment here, typical of the times of the Belgian spelling war. His answer, reminiscent of De Neckere's wish for "een andere vorme" for 's', in the problem of distinguishing prevocalic /s/ and /z/ was to use the obsolescent long / for /z/, and the ordinary 's' for /s/ (see chap.12).

A contemporay supporter of such moves was the editor of "De Broederband" J.W. Wolf. In defence of this system, which he applied in the periodical, he writes that "De fransche 'z' hebben wy opgegeven en daarvoor de germanische 's' weder aangenomen... By Cats, by Zevecote, by al onze oude schrijvers is er toch immers geen 'z' te vinden. ... Met het aannemen van de 'z' om de zachte 's' uitgedrukken hebben wy een aantal nederduytsche woorden voor de andere germanische volkeren onverstaanbaar gemaakt". He ignores the differentiaional use of 'z' in "zijn" which is certainly present in Cats, who, incidentally, was cited by Verpoorten as a model for the use of the 's-, -z-' system! Here it is Wolf who is in the right, judging by the early editions of Cats.

Opposition to this system came even from Van den Hoven's fellow pan-germanist Dautzenburg, who only deviated from contemporary spelling in his use of '-lik' for '-lijk' and "du" for "gi"; similarily quoting the usage of Zevecote and Cats in its defence (introduction to "Gedichten" 1850). Wolf was also criticised by many for his somewhat gallophobic and atavistic (in the strict and non-derogatory sense) spelling, including an exchange of pamphlets with Dr. J. Nolet de Brauwre van Steeland, and he seems to have exercised no lasting influence on Southern spelling practices. Apart from the four exceptions just mentioned (Van Daele, De Neckere, Van den Hoven, Wolf), abided by the Northern 's-, -z-' system.

The use of '-sz-'

One of the consequences of certain theories governing the use of 's' and 'z' was the use of intervocalic '-sz-', though it has never been explained or defended by any of its users, who, moreover, have very little in common other than this in their use of the two letters.

The earliest example in a grammar is in Lambrecht, when describing the sound of 'z', who writes "zeet, al huszende ende horselende...". A little later in the "Voorreden" attributed to Goornhert can be found "huysz, kruyszwegen", which is clearly influenced by German usage; this is probably the source of this spelling,
though Lambrecht (unlike the "Voorreden"—see chap. 17) shows no other signs of influence from this quarter. It is probable that, ultimately of German origin, the form was traditional, whilst remaining infrequent. The use of 's' and 'z' in other positions in Lambrecht and the "Voorreden" is quite different, as the latter hardly ever uses 'z'.

The next noted users of '-sz-' have yet another system for 's' and 'z', namely De Hubert and Ampzing. De Hubert writes that he uses 'z' "voor een dubbele ss", by which he means the sound /s/, not the normal 'ss' spelling. His use of 'z' for prevocalic /s/ explains the presence of the 'z' in '-sz-', but not the presence of the 's': one would expect '-sz-'. Nor is it that he has any objection to using 'z' at the end of a syllable since he uses "menz, wenz, ganz" to show the presence of /s/ (see chap. 13). It may be that he disliked the idea of doubling what he regarded as a double letter (/ts/). Whatever his reasons, he uses the form in such words as "tussen, uijtviszinge". Ampzing is equally reticent on his motivation for this form, which along with others he adopts from De Hubert. Again the use of 'z' for prevocalic /s/ explains the presence of the 's' in "kusze, paszen, kennisse, gewisselik".

No doubt this usage continued to be fairly common; it can be found in the works of Jan Zoet ("kuszen, spaansze, Roomse" in "Digtwerkken" p. 297, 306), though after consonants he uses '-ss-' ("danssen, verssen") except in the suffix '-sze' (= '-szel'). Another user was Duikerius in his "Voorbeeldzels", with "lassen, losze, oszen, onsteltnisse" (p. 6, 451, 593, 596). Even in the next century Janssens uses "verwisselt" alas late as 1775, so the forms must have had some currency throughout this period. He does not defend the usage.

The occurrence of "grenszen" in Smits (p. 79, see the quotation given in chap. 17) is not normal for him, and must be a misprint: cf. "lanszen, slenssen" on the same page. The word would, moreover, have /z/ rather than /s/ and has no need of any doubling, so that the entry is doubly puzzling if intentional.

Of all the instances noted, only De Hubert and Ampzing have the rest of their 's/z' system in common. Duikerius has 'tz' in common with Zoet (see below), and Duikerius and Janssens share 'z' in '-zel' (see below). Little explanation can be found for this spelling amongst so varied users except for tradition. Only De Hubert and Ampzing have any justification for the presence of a 'z'. 
The use of 'z' before consonants

In the De Hubert system 'z' was used for prevocalic /s/, but 's' was used before consonants. However, other users decided to make the system more rigorous and to use 's' wherever /s/ was heard. It is not known exactly when this habit arose or died out, and no examples are recorded by Obreen & Van Loey or Hoebeke. This usage is first mentioned by several grammarians just after the end of the 17th century, though the system itself is much older (see below). It must not be thought that the mentioning of this usage by a particular grammar implies a contemporary use, though in the absence of textual examples this should not be ruled out.

The first comment comes from Nylé, though he does not actually claim to have seen the spellings: "De 'z' is by ons zanger van geluit dan de 's' ... schryft een 'sterk, stryk, zuiker, staen' met een 'z', zo is de uitspraak veel te zagt" (p.43 second edition). Hannot's dictionary (1704), referring to those who use "somyle de Z voor de S en de S voor de Z zonder eenig onderscheid" may possibly have seen forms with preconsonantal 'z', or he may simply be referring to the use of 'z' in loan words for /s/.

The first record of the actual existence of these spellings is given by Moonen: "Van de Medeklinkeren ontfangt de Z om haere zoetheit geann achter zich, dan alleen de W, ... Weshalve sy ten hoogsten quaely schryven, die, haer met de scherpe S gelijk stellende, bestaan hebben te spellen 'Zlaen, Znel' en (het geen wy onder de misslagen derouden rekenen) 'zymrna, zmaragdus'". The latter have some etymological foundation for their 'z' but the others, being native Dutch words, do not.

In 1722 Tuinman considered the forms to be of considerable antiquity: "De ouden, byzonder de Vlamingen, gebruikten de 's' en 'z' onverschillig ... en speldden daar om het selve woord dan met de ene, dan met de andere lettere, b.v. 'zee', en 'see', 'ziel' en 'siel'. Ja sy stelden ook wel somtyds een 's' voor een consonant, en schreven 'zme', voor 'snee', 'znoode' voor 'snoode', 'znaeren' voor 'snaeren'. Dus 'smelts, alstu smelts', als gy smelt, 'Zmaken', 'Men zal gemazen ter soberheit'" (No.140). He does not give references to his sources, but such words are to be found in the Middle Dutch dictionary of Verwijs and Verdâl, in the letter 'S' column: 'Zlaen, zlouch, gezlegen, zlach, zlavine,
verzmaet, zmaiden", all in Coucy, "znaren" in the Boecius translation, and others. There may be a connection between these and such Middle Dutch spellings as "secretaris, zezar, zent" (= saint) given by Hoebeke.

In 1769 Van der Palm declares himself opposed to "Zlaen, Zmaedt, Znaer", and in the "Vervolg" to his grammar in 1772 Zeydelaar refers to the normal use of preconsonantal 's', "waarvoor de Vlamingen durvden schrijven 'zlab, znap, zmak, zpat, znao, znaaren, zmaaken'". As he refers to Tuimans's comment he may have got the inspiration from him, though the examples are different.

Of all these comments, only Moonen suggests that he has seen the forms in contemporary writings, though even his statement is ambiguous: he only specifies loan words amongst "de mistlagen der ouden", but uses a past tense ("bestaan hebben") for the other words.

The spellings 'sw-' and 'zw-

When the consistent use of 's' and 'z' was first recommended in a grammar as 's' before consonants and 'z' before vowels, there was sometimes hesitation about which letter should precede the semivowel 'w' (it may also be significant that almost all the examples of preconsonantal 'z' mentioned above are found before liquids and nasals). For some the 'w', possibly due to its frequent written form 'uu' and its name "dubbeld'uwe" (see chap.19), was felt to be classable amongst the vowels and consequently be preceded by 's' (Lambrecht has only 'zw-' spellings in his dictionary); for others 'w' was felt to be a consonant precedable only by 's'. An example of the latter is Sexagius, for, as mentioned above, he makes a consistent distinction between "zwaer" and "zuur, zuc, zuelgen, zuellen, zugren, zuert, zuigt"(cf. zuct, zuur). Here the case is clearly one of having no choice but to use 'z' before a vowel, yet feeling free to use 's' before 'w'. In this he may well have influenced De Heuiter, for the latter gives as his third rule for the use of 's' that it should always be employed before consonants including 'w': "swigen, swaer".

The Twe-spraack, though not discussing the alternatives, uses 'zw-', e.g. in the verb lists (p.52): "zwygh, zwem, zwert". This usage, although constituting an exception to the rule of preconsonantal 's' and prevocalic 'z' has the support of the actual pronunciation and was consequently adopted by most subsequent
Van der Schuere wrote that "De 'z' is bequaem, om te gebruyken voor de klynk-Letteren ende 'w". Thus although he accepts 'w' as a consonant he uses it as a vowel in this respect. Van der Schuere was in turn responsible for Dafforne's acceptance of the 'zw-' rule. All users of the 's-, -s-' system, as also users of De Hubert's system, would automatically not use 'zw-'.

Some written works still used the 'sw-' alongside prevocalic 's', though this usage was already dying out in the early decades of the 17th century. The two editions of Van Santen's plays show the change from 'sw-' to 'zw-' somewhat more consistently than that from 's-' to 'z-' before vowels.

One exception is Van Heule, who prefers the 'sw-' forms, as seen in "sweere" (p.2) and the consistent 'sw-' spellings in the gender list (1625, p.133). The 1633 edition has the same usage, again without comment by way of defence. But two of the grammars heavily indebted to Van Heule do comment: Hillenius (1664) writes that "for S they do write Z; when S preceeds W: or a vowel" (p.5), and Richardson (1677) knows of "the letter Z being commonly put for S, especially when W or a vowel followeth" (p.4). Richardson may have copied Hillenius, or both may have copied Dafforne. Although Dafforne is known to have influenced Hexham, the latter, together with Beyer (two more grammars greatly indebted to Van Heule), did not mention or discuss this usage, and both employ Van Heule's 'sw-', although Hexham's dictionary has the solitary entry "Zweer".

These 'sw-' forms are exceptional in grammars however, and the normal usage is 'zw-'. Usage in printed books is not so consistent, and Luyken for example often uses 'sw-'. As he also often uses prevocalic 's-' this is inconclusive, and the same holds for a great many writers. Southern usage, with its greater use of prevocalic 's-', has a greater use also of 'sw-', and occasional forms slip into otherwise consistent 'z-' books, such as "sweere" in Jansens (1775).

Apart from Van Heule, the use of 's' before 'w' proceeds along the same path as prevocalic 'z', and even Van Heule does not discuss his usage, though it is not indefensible. The main cause of the variation is the conflict between the sound, /z/ before vowels and /w/, (not before /l/), and the straightforward rule giving preconsonantal 's' and prevocalic 'z'.
The use of 's' and 'z' in the suffixes '-zel' and '-zaam'

For the most part the suffixes adopted 's' or 'z' according to the normal prevocalic usage of the writer/grammar in question. This is not always so with the suffix '-sel' however. For over two centuries usage in this suffix wavered between '-sel' and '-zel', often regardless of the usage in other positions. Other things being equal it would not normally be expected that users of the "'s'-everywhere" system would use '-zel', and this is on the whole true, though the followers of De Hubert's system would use 'z' in this position to identify the prevocalic /s/. Conversely users of the "prevocalic 'z'-" system often used '-sel' for the same reason. It is the pronunciation with /s/ (due to the historical form '-sla'), which caused this variation in the rule, since some users based their spelling on the pronunciation ('-sel') others on the overall rule ('-zel'). As tradition played a large role, the use of '-zel' or '-sel' is no guide to the pronunciation used by the user of that spelling.

Lambrecht uses the normal '-sel' forms, despite the prevocalic 's-' rules, but as early as 1563 Coornhert's Voorreden uses "oversetzels" (three times on p.16 of the Ts. edition), despite normally avoiding 'z'. Van der Schuere uses "beginselen, voorsetsel, maeksel" (cf. "beginsel" p.51), Dafforne has "steunsel", and De Hubert has both "decksel" (p.13) and "decksel" (p.19). With Van Reule we get a hint at one of the reasons for the variation in usage: on page 13 he derives the following - "Bereytsel van Bereyden,... Schijnzel... van Schijnen". Here '-sel' is found after an unvoiced, and '-zel' after a voiced consonant. This assimilation spelling contrasts with Van der Schuere's regular '-zel' (assuming "beginsel" to be a misprint).

There are therefore three main streams: those who spell '-sel' on all occasions, those who spell '-zel' on all occasions, and those who use the assimilation spellings. Paucity of examples often makes it difficult to classify a particular writer's usage. The motivation of the first two regularly used forms is that the same form should be preserved for the suffix without regard to incidental assimilation features. The force of this feeling was recognised by Van Attevelt and Van der Weyden, both of whom, while allowing "strax, grotelix" etc., oppose "maxel, hazel, dezal" firstly because of the disappearance of the root 'k', and secondly because the 's-' of the suffix was equally hidden. That
the latter is really of somewhat more weight for them is shown by their allowance
of "pakken" where the 'k' of "pak" is allowed to disappear.

Regular users of prevocalic 'z-' on the whole equally regularly used '-zel'
in the 17th century: Brune (afdrukzel, raadsels, voorwoorpzen), Dullaert
(steuonzet, teelzel), Rintjus (voedzel, questzel), Dubbels (schijnzet), Luyken
(schepzel), and Duikerius (maskzel, schynzel, in his Voorbeeldzensels (sic)), can be
counted amongst these, though from the examples located in Dullaert and Dubbels
they could equally well be assimilation spellers. Regular users of prevocalic
's-', such as Leupenius and Winschooten, and irregular users such as Kuyper, use
'-sel', which can represent /zel/ just as well as /zél/. Those who only use '-zel'
no doubt also varied their pronunciation according to the preceding consonant. At
this stage it is uncommon to find regular users of prevocalic 'z-' using '-sel'.

The same three systems continued in use in the next century. Van Geesdalle,
whose prevocalic usage varies, has "beletzel", De Vin, a little more regular, has
"raadsels" alongside "Raadselen", and Heugelenburg follows the assimilation
spelling with "afdrukzełs" alongside "beginzeł". A similar assimilation spelling
is very frequently found for the enclitic pronoun '-se'. This is often spelt
'-se' after unvoiced, and '-ze' after voiced consonants, as explained by Ampzing
(p.13), and as used for example by Hilarides, with "datse, dienze, daarse,
schoonze".

A minor variant arises in the grammar of Verwer. He prefers the spelling
'-tsel' for "euphonia" (p.23 & 63) in "begintsel, bedingtsel, verdigtsel,
maekezel". He possibly only uses the spelling 'ts' to show that 's' did not
represent prevocalic /z/ (see above), since he did not use the letter 'z' except
in "Zijn verbi". The 't' in Van der Schuer's "begintsel" does not have the
same function, but is probably on a par with such a spelling as "kompt".

After the early years of the 18th century the assimilation spelling faded out
and two main streams emerge: the users of prevocalic 's-' who use '-sel', and the
users of prevocalic 'z-' who use '-zel'. Such 's-' spellers as were still active
(such as Overschie) naturally used '-sel', but their low numbers make it largely
irrelevant to call then an 18th century stream, at least as far as the North is
concerned. Among the first-mentioned class, those who make the suffix conform to
their other prevocalic spellings, are Halma, the Sewel revision of La Grue, the
"Kunst" grammar, Holtrop, Schwiers and Chalmot. Kramer, although using mainly 'sel' (p.14: "Neutra sind Aanloksel, Beginzel, Belatzel, Borduursel") still regards 'sel' as permissible: "Die hochdeutsche Endsilbe '-sal', ist '-zel' oder 'sel', als:... 'Laafsael, Schikzel'". For most of those mentioned the force of the entity of the suffix (as also for '-zaam') was of more weight than incidental phonetic considerations. Given a choice of the two forms to spell the "vaste uitgangen" (Holtrop), they felt it preferable to bring conformity with other prevocalic spellings. This, for some, extended to "blickzem" (e.g. Holtrop and Schwiers), though most felt that 'ks' should be used as a replacement of 'x'.

The only difference of opinion now was whether the primary form of the suffix should indeed conform to other prevocalic spellings, or whether pronunciation (and etymology) should override other considerations. Those just mentioned preferred the former theory, but Huydecoper and Wagenaar, two very influential spellers, and also Zeydelaar, Gallieu and most others, preferred 'sel': "men moet die woorden met 'sel' niet met 'zel' eindigen" (Zeydelaar p.254). This is one of the rare occasions on which Schwiers differs from Zeydelaar, using '-zel'.

Some users are irregular: Janssens has "uitspanzel, deksel", but also "hemelwelfsel", and Hasendonck, writing after Siegenbeek's decision in favour of '-sel', still fails to reconcile his regular use of '-sel' in "uitwerksels, afbeeldzels, schepzel, uittreksels, overblijfzel" with his comment on page 38 that "Nouns ending in 'sel' (are neuter) as: druksel, aanloksel, schepsel". The same usage is contained in both editions. This is probably a quite common Southern variant, since De Simpel also refers to it: "afbeeldzel", bij de Vlarem. nog dikwijls 'afbeeldzel" (p.228).

Siegenbeek (p.145) had decided in favour of 'sel' on the authority of the usage of Hooft, Vondel, Brandt, Vollenhove, De Decker, Wagenaar, Huydecoper, and De Haas (presumably meaning Jan de Haas the poet rather than Frans de Haes the grammarian). How much he took into consideration their general use of prevocalic 's' and 'z' he does not say, though this is clearly of great relevance.

With '-sel' now accepted as the normal usage it remains only to point out the few suggested deviations. The first of these comes from the small group of Flemish radicals in the early 19th century, who wished to banish the letter 'z'. Two of these, in their desire to use 'ss' more or less consistently for /s/,
substituted the doubled consonental form in this suffix. Van Daele, the earlier and more radical of the two, uses 'ss' in all positions for /s/, and De Neckere (less radical; opposing "assieraad") likewise uses it in "Hulssel, Vylssel, Grimssel, Vormassel, Henssel, Vierssel, Browssel" contrasting with "Letsel" where such doubling was unnecessary. This spelling forms an interesting parallel with that mentioned above as used by Verwer, who inserts a 't' with the same function - to show that the 's' used here represented /s/ and not prevocalic /z/. This use of '-ssel' did not gain acceptance and the normal forms adopted conformed to the Siegenbeek '-ssel' recommendation.

The only subsequent challenge to the accepted spelling for these suffixes concerned specifically the spelling of '-zaam'. Because of the assimilation which takes place after certain consonants, Dixi (1934) suggested using '-zaam' except after 'r, n, l, j', where '-zaam' should be preferred. All later suggested simplifications and rationalisations (not always the same thing) carefully avoided any suggestion of such assimilation-based spellings.

The use of 'tz' (excluding '-t' followed by '-ssel')

In earlier centuries it is exceedingly common to find the letter 'z' being used after 't' in all sorts of positions. Some of these words suggest that the usage was borrowed from German, though this is by no means always the case. Examples of this borrowing could include "glantz" (used by Jonstijjs and Van Baerle in "Klioos Kram" I, 186, 291, - cf. the also common spelling "glanz" ibid II, 22 (Sanderus), and "glants" used by Starter). "Gantz" is given by Plantijus as an alternative to "gants" (cf. the Bible translators' rejection of "ganz" Z.3), Verwer has "krantz" (p.16), and Overschie uses "trotz". Most of these are easily identified as of German origin by the final use of 'tz'.

Much more common however is the use within the word, usually paired with 'ts' in final position. This was presumably inspired by a desire to make the words conform with the other gelijkvormigheid spellings such as "huis, huizen". One of the most common words to be found thus used is "plaats, plaatze", used by Van der Schuere (p.22, 29), Brune, Meijer, Luyken ("plaatzen/ kaatzen" p.11), Duikerius (in "Voorbeeldzels), Van Gaveren, De Vin, Heugelenburg, Kramer, Van Belleghem & Waterschoot, and many others. Other common examples include "spitze"
(Huygens), "trotza" (Luyken), "plotzelijk" (E.C.P.), "spitze" (Sinkel), "schatze" (Chalmot) etc., some of which may be influenced by German.

Some of these examples just mentioned may, on the other hand, be included in the smaller group who used 'tz' in all positions, thus also at the end of a word (not only in German loans). Examples of such are "mutz" (Huygens), "trotz, koetz, plaatz" (Zoet, Boon), "Rotz" (Beyer, who spells "Rotz, Rotsen" on page 1031), "plaatz, toetz" (Van der Linden), "Catzz" (Kramer), "mitz" (Boomkamp), "plaetz" (Taalkundige Bijdragen). Such spellings are normal in De Hubert's system (quetzen, duijtz, getoetzt) but these are really equivalent to the 'ts' spellings of others, and those mentioned above as using 'tz' do not use De Hubert's system in their other spellings. This usage is not to be confused with the use of 's' in words like "huiz" discussed below.

Undoubtedly the use of 'tz' ultimately had a German origin, but it soon became a tradition to use 's' after 't' even, as can be seen, in French loans such as "plaatz, rotz". Siegenbeek, at the same time as he rejected 'zel', rejected the use of 'tzen' on phonetic grounds. In this respect he was correct, since there is no reason to use 's' after 't' unless in a rigorous application of gelijkvormigheid, which should in theory take no account of the sound heard.

The choice between 's' and 'z' in loan words actually concerns very few. One small group can be disposed of with relative brevity: Greek loans such as "Zephyr, Zodiaeck" usually retain the 'z' even for writers who do not use 'z' in Dutch (e.g. Van der Werve, De Swaen). Sometimes 's' was used in such words for /ts/ or prevocalic /s/, e.g. Stevin's "Zier" for "Giron, Chiron", and Ampzing's "ziereaed", as discussed in chapter 2. Following the example of Vondel many writers substituted 's' for 'z' in classical names, e.g. "Cezar" (Vondel, Camphuysen, Langendijk, Wagenaar), "Thezeus" (Schermer). "Zezar" is also known in Middle Dutch (see above in the discussion of preconsonantal 'z').

Outside the field of proper names progress was more slow. Although 'izeren' is found at quite an early date (Exercitium has "fantizeren"), other words are less frequently found. Camphuysen has "Medizyn", Poot uses "filozoof", which is actually a fairly common form though rejected by most grammars up to and including
De Vries and Te Winkel (see chap.9), Beyer has "perzoon". For reasons mentioned earlier, intervocalic 's' for /z/ could comfortably remain in the Dutch system, since it would automatically be pronounced /z/. Only after the general adoption of the separation of 'a' and 'z' was there any noticeable tendency to substitute 'z' in loan words, held back by the general reluctance to change loan word spellings at all.

A concession was made by Siegenbeek in allowing "Azië, Mozes, Jeruzalem, Jezus", though he would not permit 'z' to be used in Latin names ("Cesari"), since Latin did not use that letter. Carlebur later criticised this, pointing out that most Greek words (in which 'z' was permitted) came to Dutch via Latin anyway, so that even these words and names should have 's'. De Vries and Te Winkel however retained Siegenbeek's ruling, covering also "philosoof, medicijn" etc. which had to retain their native spellings (cf. chap.2). "Proza, mozaïek, plezier" could retain the 'z' which popular usage had already granted them.

The first explicit voice in favour of the adoption of 'z' was Alberdingk Thijm, who felt that intervocalic '-s-' should be avoided in such words as "krissis, filosoof, Cesar, genezis" (cf."konversie, konversatie"), but with little success. A few of the more common words consolidated their position with 'z', and the 1954 Woordenlijst made a moderate concession: "In aansluiting bij woorden als 'mozaïek, proza, plezier' en reeds ingeburgerde spellingen als 'dubieuze, famoeuze' krijgt 's' in een aantal woorden facultatief 'z' naast zich ('faze, present' en derg., ook 'faze' enz.; zo steeds in de uitgangen '-iseren, -isering' en '-isatie'...)? The form with 's' was 'always preferred however, except for the first mentioned words where the use of 's' was long since obsolete.

Almost immediately radical pressure arose for a greater degree of liberality in the spelling of such words. Rombouts saw the acceptance of "faze, fraze, vizi, krisis, teze, eksplozi, ruzi, vizueel" etc. as essential if any change were to be effected in the 'c' for /s/ spellings: "De schrijfwijze 'presiseren' bijv. deucht niet, want de eerste 's' staat voor 'n 's'-klank. Bij 'musiseren' is et presies omgekeert". The elimination of 'c' could not happen without a prior or simultaneous substitution of 'z' for intervocalic 's'. Verschueren agreed with this, using only the '-isasi, -iseren' alternatives of the Woordenlijst in his dictionary.
The "Rapport" conceded much ground in this respect, allowing "filosofie, presisie, president, sinteze", and '-izeren, -izatie' with intervocalic 'z', though not after consonants (universiteit) where common pronunciation wavered between /s/ and /z/ (cf. the 18-19th century form "konzonant" in Stijl, Bilderdijk etc.). Mulisch (p.49) regarded this as an inconsistency, though the motivation is not without validity.

In the spelling of such words it seems probable that the vast majority of loan words will become adapted to the normal Dutch system, using 's' and 'z' for the same sounds as they represent in native Dutch words.

Final '-z' and '-zde'

This section covers only final '-z' in gelijkvormigheid. The use of '-s' in "trotz, plaats" is discussed above, and the use of '-z' in "menz, ganz, eizt" is discussed in chapter 13.

The reasons for the appearance of final '-z' spellings in "huiz, prijs" etc. are the same as those causing final '-v' in "briev, lov" etc., discussed in chapter 7. Taking the rule of gelijkvormigheid as laid down for final '-d, -g, -b', it seemed only reasonable to some to apply the same rule to final '-z' (and '-v'). There is no objection to the consistency of this rule, without creating an exception to the rule itself. It was seen in chapter 7 that the final '-v' forms, though never standard, are relatively common, but this is certainly not the case with final '-s'. Even amongst '-v' spellers the use of '-z' is seldom put forward, and conversely not all '-z' spellers use '-v'. Some have valid reasons for this (e.g. Zeydelaar) but for most the reasons remain obscure.

The first '-z' spellings appear in Middle Dutch: Hoebeke records "diez, wiez, ghebuerz, lijnwaetz" in the 15th century. These however cannot be counted as gelijkvormigheid spellings, as such a rule has no application in these words; they are probably the result of influence from contemporary French usage (cf. voulez), or the use of 'z' for /s/ (see section on preconsonantal 'z' above).

Much more significant are the '-z' forms in Sexagius. Again, as with his '-v' forms, it is possible that he heard some voicing in the final consonants of "deez, leez, peez, reez, veez, vriez, zez, ligrez, hjurs, keuz, neuz" (cf."aas, duas, bas, kqxs, hjus"), for he elsewhere advocates a very strict separation of 's' and
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z' on phonetic grounds (see above). But it seems that even here he realised the strangeness of such forms, for he comments on the spelling of "'zez'... tamet si non admodum repugnerem si quis scribere malit 'zes'" (D3).

It was then a further fifty years before more '-z' forms are seen, this time mentioned by Van Heule, though he does not seem to think them potentially viable spellings: "Als op het eynde eenes woorts, eene Z zoude staen, zo wort daer eene S voorgestelt, als 'Wijs' voor 'Wijs', 'Boos' voor 'Boos'" (1625, p.30). It is strange that he did not make a similar claim for '-v', merely saying that "de F (verandert) in eene V, als 'Wijf', 'Wijven, LiJf, LiJven'". It is clear however that he feels that consistency should demand a final '-z'. None are used in his book outside this comment. In the second edition the note is absent, but there is a solitary example of "onz" on p.70: "De Ervende Voor-namen ... zijn deze 'Wijn, dijn, zijn, onz, Uw'" - possibly a misprint for "onze of ons'" (with an apostrophe - see chapter 18 and also below). "Onz" also occurs in the anonymous "Voorraeden" attributed to Coornhert (1568, p.14), and is used with a special function by Gargon and Emits (see below).

Another solitary '-z' spelling is on the title page (engraved) of Dafforne's "Leez-leerlings steunsel" (sic) of 1627: the printed title page has "Lees'-". This, and Van Heule's "onz", may be mere misprints, but they may alternatively indicate that '-z' forms were known at least to the type-setters.

As was also the case with the '-v' spellings, where '-vde' was recommended by Montanus at an earlier date than final '-v' spellings are known, so too did he recommend the phonetic '-zde' forms before examples of final gelijkvormigheid '-z' are known. On p.25 he lists as misprints "'s voor 'z' ... als in... 'ic raasde'... 'hersenbrae, delfsbier'... voor... 'raesde... hervzshaen, delvzbier'", and on page 122 he lists the change of "'z' in 's' ... 'Wijs, Wijze, spijs, spijze; was, wazdom...'". This spelling, like his '-vde', has no connection with gelijkvormigheid, but the existence of the forms is significant.

Actual examples of final '-z' are extremely elusive for the next few years. Huygens rhymes "bewijs/ wijz" in his "Oogentroost" (1647), but this is an abbreviation of the noun "wijze", not an adjective, and may be a misprint for "wijz". The situation with abbreviated forms is somewhat different: many writers,
and even grammarians, had no objections to the use of "deez" with or without apostrophe, as the shortened form of "deze" (usually in the masculine). The use of this does not imply the use of thegelijkvormigheid '-z' system. Quite eminent writers, such as Hooft, Vondel, Brandt and Brune, frequently use the form, and it is even recommended by Hillenius in 1664: "Apocope:...'deez Man' for 'deze Man'" (p.99). The later editions vary somewhat - 1677 has "deez" (p.103), and 1673/36 have "beez" (sic). Hillenius's main source, Van Heule, only has "deze", and he could not have borrowed the forms from Van der Schuere since the latter (p.65) does not mention the word, and in any case always uses an apostrophe.

The"Verhandeling"of Nil Volentibus, dating from around 1673, lists cases of '-s' rhyming with '-z' in Vondel, Hooft, Huygens, and Camphuysen, as they did with '-f' and '-v', but again they do not specify the edition used (which was not relevant to their discussion, but would have been useful). The rhymes they note are "huiz/ kruis" in Hooft's "Brief Menelaus aan Helena", "haast/ verbaasd" in his "Verscheide Gedichten" (an anthology with many other writers included), "pas/ laaz" in Huygens's "Korenbloemen"IV, and "omhelzd/ elst" ibid V, "altoos/ daadelooz" in Camphuysen's 33rd psalm, and "ongevals/ halz" in Vondel's "Palamedes" act IV. As with their claimed '-v/-f' rhymes, none of the consulted editions (see chap.7, plus the "Menelaus" of 1615) showed these spellings, so that a precise dating cannot be given. The possible explanation of the difficulty in finding the examples, discussed in chapter 7, is also applicable here.

More definite cases can be found however, in Rintjus's anthology "Klioos Kraam" (1656-57), in the poems of Zoet and Zweerds. The former only has "trotz, kostz, plaetz" in the poems contained in this anthology, but his later "Digtwerkken" (1675) also include "bliez, kooz, rooz, dooz" - in two poems only to be found on page 301-4. In the 1714 edition these words are normalised to "bliez", "kooz", "roos", "doos". Zweerds has "lin" (twice) and "bies" on page 126-3 of Klioos Kraam II, but these are similarly normalised in "Alle/Gedichten van Hieronymus Sweerts"(sic) 1697. No other examples seem to appear in either collected works. However they must have occurred before 1656, as Rintjus consistently retains for each poem the spelling of the original texts, an editorial quality not emulated by all either then or later. The form
"GloorDoz" also occurs in Hooft's "Harderskout" contained in the "Gedichten" of 1636, 1644, and 1658. This particular word may well have been pronounced with a final /z/, as in the original French "rose". "Reez" rhyming with "deez" on page 343 (1658) may be a misprint for "reecz".

Of remotely possible influence in the rise of the 'z' spelling was a contemporary Frisian usage. Because a final voiced consonant was heard in certain positions Gijsbert Japicx (Naauwkeurige Nederlander, 1655) wished to use 'z' in "uwz huwz-muwz: onze huys-muys, niet uws huws met een s, om dat hy het te kort afschijstet, maar met een z, die wat langer zuijzet". He does not extend this usage to Dutch, but were it at all common in Frisian it could have been known to some Dutch readers. Such a possibility remains remote, however, in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Only two years later the first defence of final 'z' did appear, - 30 years before the first defence of 'v'. With the now rapidly settling separation of 's' and 'z', and the acceptance of intervocalic 'z', Bolognino (1657) felt it desirable to make the 's/z' system conform to 'd/t' and 'g/ch': "(worden) di in't meervoudt hebben de 'z', moetmen schryven met de 'z'; aldus, elz, geláz, halz, beuz', gelyc de reden vereyscht". Since in earlier times the 's' was used in "halsen, lesen" etc., there had been no reason to use final 'z', for final 's' spellings themselves conformed to the gelijkvormigheid rules. Van Heule had also realised that a change in the one rule involved a change in the other, but neither had any great effect on the writing public.

In 1664 the usage recommended by Bolognino, and hinted at by Van Heule, is adopted by Hillenius (who borrowed extensively from the latter). Although he does not justify this usage in his discussion on spelling, he gives the verb forms "leen, las gheleezen, vriez, vrooz, gheneez"("kies, blies, verlies") on page 41. In the later editions these all become '-s', but the mere fact that such type-setters' spellings are to be found indicates the presence of a sub-stream of '-z' spellers amongst contemporaries.

A few years later, Nil Volentibus, before giving the examples quoted above, suggest that they too felt there to be some inconsistency in the normal application of the gelijkvormigheid rule: "De verwantschap van geluid tuschen de 'z' en 's'wort op het einde der syllabae of lettergrepen gezien, en is zo
groot, dat het onderscheid der zelve zeer moeilijk in het spreken, uitgedrukt, en gehoord kan worden, zo zeggen wij 'glas, haas, vrees, wees,bies'...enz. voor 'glaz, haaz, vrees, weez, biez'... want wij zeggen 'glazen, haazen, vrezen, wezen, biezen'... en niet 'glassen, haassen' enz. gelijk wij zeggen 'glas, das, lés, mis'
(p.4). The very fact that they mention such forms may reflect a more widespread contemporary usage than the number of examples located and the meagre comments from grammarians might suggest.

But for several decades after this the '-z' forms almost disappear from view. Gargon who in 1686 had so eagerly defended the use of '-v' makes no allowance at all for final '-z' spellings except in one word, which is not inspired by gelijkvormigheid but by homonym avoidance (see chap.18): "Om onderscheyd te maken schryv ik ook 'onz' met een 'z', als het betekent, iets dat ons toekomt, en gestelt werd voor 'onze', als 'onz volk, onz lust' en 'onz' met een 's', als het een veelvuldig getal is, als 'geev ons, sla ons'". This use of "onz" recalls the parallel forms in Van Heule, Leupenius, deits and others, and is connected with gelijkvormigheid insofar as the 'z' is used because of the longer form "onze". This is his only '-z' form however, despite his regular '-v' forms.

A similar anomalous usage is found in Duikerius's "Schouburgh" of 1696. He too defends the use of '-v' but not of '-z'. There is the solitary example of "Peez" on page 6, but no others, and it may be merely a type-setters spelling. The same may also apply to the isolated "Spyz" in the "Opdracht" to Van Rusting's "Volgeestige Werken" of 1699, as he usually avoids any use of 'z' (see above).

One of the more consistent and persistent (and controversial) users of '-v' in the last years of the 17th century was Van der Linden. Yet he too does not seem to have used a consistent '-z' spelling. He has good reasons for this, namely his use of the letter 'z' for the unvoiced /s/ (see chap.13), and within this system he does follow the rules of gelijkvormigheid: "De Woorden, in welke de 's' niet Swaer genoeg is in 't Meertal, Vereizen een 'z': als 'Kanzen, Kranzen, Dazzen, Franzen, Roomzen, Spiezen', en daarom moet men ook in 't Eental der zelve een 'z' gebruiken, en Schrijven 'Kanz, Kranz, Dazn, Franz, Roomz, Spiez'" (Rabbelarij). His inconsistency is thus only apparent, for his "huis, Franz" forms correspond to the plurals "huisen, Franzen" (cf De Hubert and Ampeing).
But some of Van der Linden's small circle of followers, since they tended to use 's' and 'z' in the more normal way, also applied his argument to other words, and such swellings as "Leterbaaz, genees-konst, Wijz-geer, Book-spijz, trouwlooz, Schrijv-wijz, Huiz, behelzde, leezt, omhelzê, verbaazd" can be found in the "Lof-Reden op Piet Rab", and "leez-aard" etc. in the "Zaeuwse Wedergaalm".

These works were closely followed by a similar usage (with respect to 's/z' at least) in a much more eminent work "De Hunten der Graven van Holland" by Van Alkemade, printed by Andries Voorstad. The latter seems to have had an inclination to print books with uncommon spelling systems: he also printed Van Yk's "Scheepsbouwkunst" with a consistent '-v' spelling and Van Overschie's "Covergebleeve Ryn-stukken" in 1722 with that author's individual usage. As the usage in each book differs, they are probably not the printer's spelling, though this cannot be ruled out. As other works of Van Alkemade's have normal spelling (printed by Philippus Losel), it may just have been that Voorstad was more sympathetic to an author's individual whims than other publishers/ printers. He printed two works of Van Alkemade's: the "Kamregt" of 1699 & 1740 (later editions reworked by his son-in-law Van der Schelling) which has such spellings as "Hals, Huizliden, bedeezd, geveinzd" amongst otherwise normal forms; and the above mentioned "Hunten" of 1700, which abounds in less than normal usages, mostly in the variety and number of accents, but also in the consistent use of final '-z', as in "Pauz, Godshuiz, beweaz, Huizlade, geweazt, Waaz, noödlööz, zörglööz, wiiz, vreaz, bewiizt, bewiiz-stukken, onz, priiz, omhelzden" etc., (but no '-v' forms).

Conversely the consistent '-v' spellers Van Yk and Pars have no '-z' forms, though neither use 's' at all, so that there is no inconsistency here. Van Alkemade had no such reason for his inconsistency in using '-z' but not '-v'. Nor did Hilarides, who used only the forms "verbaazd, verbaazde, verwaerloosde, bevreezd, samenoeiflanzde" (i.e. '-z' only before 'd') in his Phaedrus translation of 1695,—a similar system to the phonetic forms suggested by Montanus, rather than the gelijkvormigheid forms which he used mostly for '-v' (cf. chap.7).

After the turn of the century the '-z' spellings seem to have died out, though Poeraet mentions them on a par with final '-v' in 1703. E.G.P. expresses a slight inclination towards the phonetic '-zde' in that he encounters "een kleyne swarighheyt ... alhoewel men ('reyzen, spijsen, raessen') met een Z.
beloorede te spellen, nogtans moet men 'reysde, sijjede, raesde' enz. met een s. uitdrukken: om dat de Z. wel de kracht heeft om een -v te beginnen, doch niet om de zelfde te sluiten". This last rule overcomes the doubts and he abides by the '-sde' system.

Sewel's revision of La Grue in 1719 gives "Deez of Die" (p.266) as the masculine demonstratives ("deez of die" in the feminine), a form still used by many, e.g. Petrus De Huybert's "De Dubbele Schaking" (c.1715): "Deez Juffer, deez trouw" (p.11, 13) - n.b. also before feminine nouns for the sake of the metre. Van Haren often has "deez" in his "Vier uitmuntende Gedigten", though more usually has "deez!". Neither of these use gelijkvormigheid '-z' spellings.

There is some indication however that at the time the '-v' spellings underwent a small revival in the mid 18th century, the '-z' forms began to reappear. They are by no means as widespread as the former. From now on too, they tend to be used by the same people as use '-v', though not invariably, and they have the backing of fewer grammars (e.g. Heugelenburg and De Vin do not mention them). Van Belle hints at this revival by the note in his second edition, borrowed from Ten Kate (see chap.7), but Van Rhyn is much more explicit as to contemporary usage. On page 17 he writes that "Somnige (op gelyke wyze als hier vooren in de verhandeling van de F en V gezien is,) schryven de volgende met een Z op 't eind. Als: 'Huiz, Muiz, Fluid, of 'Huyz, Huiz, Pluyz'. Om dat zy door de Z (gelyk de voorgaande met de V,) meervoudig worden. (Dit) geschied om... aan de algemeene Regel te voldoen; te weeten, van in 't Eenvoud op 't eind der Woorden duodaanig een Letter te stellen, waar door dezelve meervoudig worden" - i.e. the normal rule of gelijkvormigheid, applied here consistently.

However, Egbert Buys seems to have been ignorant of any such contemporary usage in his revision of Sewel's dictionary in 1766. After Sewel's original comment on the use of final '-v' he adds that "De redenen die voor het Gebruyk van de V in plaats van F bygebracht worden, zyn zeer ligt te wederleggen; de voornaamste is, dat men in 't Meervoud schryft 'Brieven, Hoven, Stooven': Maar als die Reden doorgaat, waarom moet men dan ook niet schryven 'Baaz, Blaaz, Huiz, Glaz, Muiz'? Immers is het Meervoud ook 'Baazen, Blaazen, Huizen, Glazen, Muizen', en echter spelt niemand op die wyze". He uses the non-existence of '-z' forms as an argument against the use of '-v'. Either the '-z' forms referred to
by Van Rhyn in 1753 had completely died out by 1766, or the forms were so rare as to be unknown to Buys. It is certain that 'z' forms are indeed extremely rare at this time, despite Van Rhyn’s statement, and no examples have been found in the texts examined since the reprint of Van Alkemade’s work in 1740. In his pamphlet opposing ‘v’ Pietersen makes no mention of any contemporary use of ‘z’.

The ‘z’ forms missed the stimulus won for ‘v’ in 1769 when Zeydelaar had defended the latter in his “Spelkonst”. Zeydelaar’s use of ‘s’ and ‘z’ was such that he always used intervocalic ‘-s-’ for /z/ (see above). What then at first sight seems merely a minor variation in the use of the two letters now proves to have major consequences for this related system. For naturally, since he used ‘s’ in “huisen”, he would use ‘s’ in “huis” as a gelijkvormigheid form. That he writes on this letter is of importance however, as he seems to have encountered ‘z’ forms: “Wat spelling toch is ‘t die sommige gebruiken, wanneer zij schrijven, prijz, huiz’ &c?” Even more significant is his comment on the consistency of his contemporaries: “Het verwonderd me zeer dat de drijvers van dit gevoelen (i.e. “huiz, prijz”) niet ook ingevolge hiervan, voor het gebruik der ‘v’ aan ‘t einde der woorden zig verklaaren”. There were therefore some who used ‘z’ but not ‘v’ (Buys knew ‘v’ but not ‘z’!). Such a usage has indeed been noted at an earlier date (Van Alkemade), yet Zeydelaar seems to be referring to his own time. His own use of ‘v’ and ‘s’ is, as explained, quite consistent within his system.

One grammarian who definitely knew both systems was Stijl, and he accurately reflects the infrequency of ‘z’ compared to ‘v’: “De spelling van de ‘v’ achter aan in ‘wijv, wolv, stov’, ens is tot nog toe weinig in gebruik, en nog weiniger van de ‘z’ in ‘huiz, muiz, prijz’ ens.” Kluit too knew both forms: he advocates the use of ‘f/v’ and ‘s/z’ according to “het achtbare gebruik... ondanks de pogingen door sommige Taalkundigen aangewand, om en Regelmaat en Gebruik omverre te werpen, door in beide gevallen te schrijven ‘leez, huiz, wijv, hov’.” Unfortunately he does not name his sources, and this is the more regrettable in the case of ‘z’ since, as can be seen from the development so far, no grammar since Bolognino had explicitly suggested the use of ‘z’, except Van Rhyn who, though not adopting it, did not condemn it either. Such spellings do not deserve the scorn poured onto them by Kluit, since they are in reality more regular than
those of the contemporary system (though Kluit's ideal system differed – chap. 5).

In the 1780’s two works are found closely connected with the ‘-z’ spellings, one defending them and one using them. The first is the anonymous “Inleyding” of 1785: “verscheyde Schryvers verbieden, de Lettergrepen met de Z te sluyten, als: ’beez, booz, raasde, reyze’, en zeggen dat een moet schryven: ’bees, boos, raasde, reyze’; dog het kan ligtelyk gebeuren, dat de Z, die sedert enige jaren by ons (i.e. in the South) merkelyke bezittingen van de S heeft ingenomen, haer ook uyt die plaetsen zal verdryven” (p. 23). Unlike the ‘-v’ forms (see chap. 7) the writer does not seem to know of actual ‘-z’ spellings, but predicts a future role for them. In this case he was to be less accurate however, with only a handfull of exceptions.

The first of these exceptions comes only a year later (1786) in Staring’s “Mijn eerste proeven”, where ‘-z’ and ‘-zde’ are used with complete regularity:

“Wat hieuw zijn blinkendwaerd al schilden
Tot enkel grui
 Hoe menig heeft zijn speer doorrengen
Tot roes van ‘t kruis
...
Hij blaast - een dienaar komt...” (Adolph en Zama),

and similarly in “Ada en Rijnoud”, with “huiz, bloz, gepsinz, achtlos, hals, kluiz”. “Kruis, glans” have ‘-s’ since they do not have ‘-z’ in the plural. Again the later editions have a normalised spelling (“regularised” would be an inappropriate term here).

No more is heard of these spellings for quite some time: Schwiers, in accordance with his model Zeijdelaar, rejects the use of intervocalic ‘-z-’ and consequently also of final ‘-z’, though “dat huiz” appears on page 43. Solhuis in 1803 realised the inconsistency of using ‘-f’ and ‘-s’, feeling that ‘v’ and ‘s’ were too soft for use in final position  “wat ook de regelmaat der tale vordere”. Siegenbeek had similar views (p. 146), and like most failed to explain why ‘v’ and ‘z’ were too soft to appear at the end of a word, but ‘d’ and ‘b’ were not.

Amongst those Flemings of the early 19th century who expressed sympathy with ‘-v’ (Van Daele, De Neckere, Hasendonck), none used ‘-z’ because of their
divergent use of 's' and 'z'. They found themselves in the same position as those of the 17th century, in that they did not use 'z' for /z/ at all (see above), and consequently not in "huizen". Like Zeydelaar therefore, they had no need for any "huiz" spellings. Van Daele criticised the inconsistency of any who used 'z' for /z/ but did not use final '-z'. Speaking to his imaginary friend Jacob - the second half of the dialogue in his "Tydverdrijf" - he asks "Maer, Jacob, syt gy niet eenen 'z'-schryver? schryft gy niet 'lözen, bezéten, vaerzen' ens.? en gy schryft nogtans: 'leést, best, vaést, raést, verbaesd' ens.: wéld dit soo syno ... gy moet schryven 'verbaezd, haesti, knarzti' ens.: wy sullen allengskens Polakkers worden" (pp.56). The last comment alludes to the very strangeness of such, for him, hypothetical forms, which add weight to his opposition to the use of 'z' in the now accepted manner.

Van Daele's implication that such forms were non-existent remains valid until the mid 1820's, when two consistent '-z' spellers appear. The earlier(?) is the grammarian De Ré referred to frequently by De Simpel (see chap.7), who used such forms as "ik lóz, gij lózt, hij lózt, gewúzt" (cf. Van Daele's use of the single vowel in "lévt"). De Simpel had no sympathy for those who deviated from the norm, however well founded and regular their system: "Eene kiesche nauwgezetheid op regelmaat en afleiding, heeft menig taalopbouwer eigendunkelijke stelsels doen voordragen".

The latter comment can certainly be applied to the system developed by Smits in 1824, which De Simpel may thus have known. Just as he defended the use of '-v' by analogy with the use of '-b, -d, -g', so too did he argue for '-z': "Met de 's' sluit men: 'altoos, ons' (nos) 'hij is, was, geweest'. Maar de regelmaat veróejscht te schrijven met 'z': 'ons huiz, weez, weest': alsoar de 's' in de naaste afléjding: 'onze hujzen, wezen, wesende, gewezen' zich geregelte vertóént zó als in 'vróez, vróézt, vróezen'"(p.82). Note that Smits goes less far than De Ré in not extending the 'z' of "wezen" to "geweest" (De Ré's "gewúzt"). This aspect of Smits's usage, like all his other deviations from the norm(e.g. 'u'j; 'éj' by analogy with 'iij' - actually an old spelling used inter alia by Hilarides), was totally ignored or at best ridiculed (cf Bonhoff's comments given in chap.7).

It is noticeable that up to c.1750 the use of '-z' and '-v' did not go hand in hand. The first hint at the regular use of both is given by Van Rhyn, but
only after 1735, with the "Inleyding" and Staring, and thereafter with De Ré and Smits, are both systems found side by side in the same writer’s work. After De Vries and Te Winkel’s system was introduced it is also found that the fate of ‘-z’ and ‘-v’ pursue the same path. Te Winkel used the same argument of "onechte letters" against ‘-z’ as he did against ‘-v’. Van Ginneken also applied the same rule to both, and Romeyn also found just the same difficulties with ‘-zde’ as he did with ‘-vde’. Pauwels and Paardekoper both treat ‘v’ and ‘z’ as parallel cases, noting "leen, bonz" respectively. This later development is described in chapter 7.

Summaries

grammars using or defending ‘s-, -s-’:
  Voorreden, Plemp, Bolognino, Minschoten, Van Daele, De Neckere, Van den Hoven, Wolf.
other users of ‘s-, -s-’:
  Middle Dutch, Stevin, Anna Roemer Visscher, Van Yk, Pars.
grammars using or defending ‘s-, -s-’ with some ‘z’ spellings:
  Exercitium, Van der Werve, Mauritius, Plantijn, Kilian, Susbütt, Mellena, Skyters, Bible translators, Hinnant, Rodriques, Dikus, Lacoms..., Mierwaert,
  Pielat, Van Helderen (die.), La Grue, Kuyper, Verwer, M.S., Smits,
  Pomey (pre 1753), "Grammaire pour apprendre".
others using ‘s-, -s-’ with some ‘z’ spellings:
  Boecius, Valloogagh, Coornhert, Van der Noot, Roemer Visscher, Starter, Cats,
  Bredero, Van Borsselen, Camphuysen, De Swaen, Revius, De Decker, Staelpaert
  van de Wiele, Van Rusting, Van Overschie, "Aerschot".
users of mixed systems, unsystematic:
  Huygens, Hooft, earlier Vondel, De Ruyter, Luyken, Van Geesdalle, Van der Palm.
grammars using or defending ‘z-, -z-’:
  Sexagius, De Heuter, Van Heule, Montanus, Hxham, Kok, Van den Exde, Van Engel, Peas,
  Nils Volentibus, Savel, Nyloë, Moonen, Van Hoogstraten, Halma, and all
  later grammars not mentioned elsewhere.
other users of ‘z-, -z-’:
  Coster, later Vondel, Brune, Brandit, Dullart, Duikerius, Van Alken, Revius,
  Rotgans, Van der Schelling, Fout, Langendijk, Schermier,...
users or defenders of ‘z-, -s-’:
  Van Attevelt (1650), Van der Meyden, De Vin, Van Haren, Zeydelaar, Schwiers.
users of ‘sz-’ alongside prevocalic ‘z’:
  Sexagius, De Heuter, Van Heule, Hexham, Beyer (Jansens).
users of ‘s’ for /z/ and preconsonantal /s/, and ‘z’ for prevocalic /s/ and /ts/:
  De Hubert, Ampzing, Leupenius, La Grue (not all to the same extent)
noted users of ‘sz-’:
  Lambrecht, "Voorreden", De Hubert, Ampzing, Zoet, Duikerius, Jansens (Smits).
users of preconsonantal ‘z’:
  "Borchgravinne van Couchy", "Boecius" translation, Middle Dutch (all Southern)
users of '-sel' alongside prevocalic '-s-':
Dafforne, Van Attevels, Van der Heyden, De Vin, Kraeser, Wagenaar, Zeydelaar, Ballieu, Wagenbeek, De Vries/Te Minkel and all subsequent official spellings.

users of '-zel':
("Voorreden"), Van der Schueren, Brune, Dullaert, Rintjens, Dobbela, Layken, Duikerius, Van Geussalle, De Vin, Halma, Kraeser, Holtrop, Schwiers, Chalmot, Hagemann ("-zel" = /zɛl/ in De Hubert, Ambzing).

users of '-sel' and '-zel' according to the preceding consonant:
Van "zels", "seegelenburg", "vansens" (?), and possibly some of those listed in other groups, where insufficient examples available.

users of '-sel':
Van Daele, De Neckere

users of '-zel':
Verwer

users of 'saam' or 'saam' according to the preceding consonant:
Dixi

users of '-tza' in final position:
Plantijn, De Hubert, Huygens, Jonetia, Van Baerle, Zoet, Verwer, Boon, Van der Linden, Kraeser, Boomkamp, Overschelde, Taalkundige Bijdragen.

users of '-tza, -tze':
Beyer

users of '-ts, -ts':

loan words: '-z-' in names:
Vondel, Camphuysen, Langendijk, Scharmer, Poot; some allowed by Siegenbeek and later official spellings.

loan words: '-z-' in common nouns:
Exercitium, Camphuysen (for 'c'), Poot; '-izeren' fairly common.

loan words: radicals:
Thijm, Rombouts, Verschuuren, V.W.S., "Rapport".

defenders of '-z':
(Sexagius) Bolognino, Van Rhyn, "Inlayding", De Rê, Smits, (Pauwels).

more or less consistent users of '-z':
(Sexagius) Camphuysen, Vondel, Hooft, Huygens); followers of Van der Linden, Van Rhyn, "Inlayding", Staring, De Rê, Smits, (Pauwels).

users of '-za' and '-s':
Hillenius, (Hooft, Vondel, Camphuysen, Huygens), Zoet, Zweerts, followers of Van der Linden (not himself), Van Alkemade, Staring.

users of '-zde' alongside '-s':
Montanus, Hilarides, Rombouts.

chronology of '-z': first appeared c.1650; first defended 1657; never common, though found especially around 1655, 1695-1700, 1735, 1820-25.

short comparison of those who used '-v' and those who used '-z':
a) users (more or less consistent) of '-z' and '-v':
(Sexagius)(Camphuysen, Vondel, Hooft, Huygens); followers of Van der Linden, Van Rhyn, "Inlayding", Staring, De Rê, Smits, (Pauwels).

b) users (ditto) of '-s' and '-v' caused by intervocalic '-s-':
Van Yk, Pars, Van der Linden, Van Rusting, Zeydelaar, Schwiers, Van Daele.

c) users of '-s' and '-v' despite intervocalic '-s-': all listed in chapter 7 apart from those contained in a) and b) above (Vargen, Duikerius etc.)
d) users of '-s' and '-s': Bolognino, Hillenius, Zoet, Zweerts, Van Alkemade.
e) users of the phonetic '-z/-s, -zde/-vde' system: Montanus, Rombouts.
f) user of the mixed system '-z/-v, -zde/-vde': Hilarides (cf comments in chap.7)

Of these a), b) and e) are caused by consistent regular application of "rules" c), d) and f) defy explanation in terms of self-consistency.
Chapter 12. "Long s" and "round r"

Note: Illustration is difficult here, due to the absence of both letters in modern types: the "round r" has been here depicted by 'g' and "long s" by '/'

Although seemingly a question of typography or calligraphy rather than spelling, the use of "long s" and "round r" is certainly a matter of orthography in its strictest sense. There are several different manners of writing various letters in the traditional scripts of the Middle Ages, including such things as the digraphs and ligatures 'æ, œ, ò, ð'. But the only letter variants to be taken over consistently into the printed forms were the "round r" (g) and the "long s" (\). The round 'g', used only in Gothic types, dies out with the replacement of the latter by the italic and roman types. Consequently very few grammars even discuss it. Lambrecht just lists the two forms: "r of g, er, thende van der tonghe al bevende...", without discussing their respective uses. Spiegel, in the Twe-spraack, casts out the variant, but not with any linguistic motivation: "ick (soude) de 'j' een meklinker zynde óóck 'je' nóemen, onde het a, b, (die voors. letter 'j' daer in voeghende ende de one 'r', die ons doch niet nut is, na latende) soude hy het vorighe ghetal van XX/II letters blyven: de welcke men na der Hebreen ende Grieken wyze in drie maal neghen letters zou moghen verdelen" (p.47). The Greeks and Hebrews had this system in order to furnish themselves with numbers - nine units, nine tens, nine hundreds - but the fact that the Dutch did not need to do this apparently did not matter, and Spiegel still feels the attraction of the magic number 27 (3x3x3). He does no actually say which 'r' he wishes to reject, and the phrase itself is printed "de one 'r'", not "...'s'".

The most common contemporary use of these variants employed the 'g' after a round letter (o, b, u, etc.) - it was therefore used purely for ease in writing and there was no real need for its continued presence in mechanical types. That the application of the 'g' became confused is shown by Van der Schuere in 1612: "Zoo vol het tweederley maekzel vande 'r' belangd: Eenige willen, dat voor ende achter inde Sillabe, ende ook achter 'e' men een rechte 'r' maken zal, anders altijd een ronde '\'. Ander willen, dat de ronde 'g' komen zal over al daerse een ronde letter volgd, welcke zijn 'b, d, g, h, k, o, p, v, w', ende elders altijd een rechte 'r'. Dan alzoone over al eenderley kracht ende beteekeninge hóft.
Heft hier in yergelijk zijn vryheyd". He has no desire to reject the use of either form, and includes both in his alphabet, which thus has 23 letters. (Examples of both types of 'r, ụ' and 's, /' can be seen on the title page of his work, reproduced in the Zwaan edition of 1957.)

Dafforne, in 1627, possibly influenced by the Twe-spraack, or alternatively reflecting current opinion, rejects 'ụ', and in 1628 the Bible translators also felt no merit in the variation: "non observandum discrimen inter 'r' et 'ụ'". Van der Weyden exhibits another usage in recommending 'r' in final position and 'ụ' initially, parallel to the use of the long 'i' (see below) - the opposite to most grammars (Sewel for example recommends 'r-', -ụ').

The next reference to 'ụ' is many years later, when Bolhuis published Styl's grammar in 1776. Styl quotes the use of 'ụ' after round letters, but Bolhuis comments that the difference "wordt niet bestendig waargenomen, vooral niet in schrijfletters". This is the final comment on 'ụ' apart from the Trap der Jezus of Baptisten Cromer, in all editions up to 1897: Repeating almost verbatim the earlier editions (1769 onwards) the latter, in the framework of the traditional dialogue form, has the pupil ask: "waartoe dienen de tweërlei r, ụ"?, to which he receives the answer "De 'r' dient om een woord of lettergreep te beginnen, en de andere 'r' om dezelve te sluiten [cf. Van der Weyde...],... dit echter wordt naar bij weinigen in acht genomen". To this is added the footnot: "In de gewone Italiaansche drukletters zijn niet eens tweërlei r's voorhanden". In 1897 the discussion seems a little anachronistic, as for example are also his comments on 'm' and 'n' that "als men boeken met eene Hollandsche letter gedrukt leest, zal men dikwijls boven een' zelfklinker 'a, e, i, o', enz. een dwars streepje geplaatst vinden,... dat streepje nu beteekent dat een 'm' of 'n' is weggelaten". It is highly unlikely that the average schoolchild for who the book was intended would come across many examples of this in 1897, though the comment is highly relevant in the first editions. The use of the "streepje" (§, ɕ, etc.) was moreover not restricted to Gothic letter types, but can also be found in the normal italic faces.
The long '/' had a much longer life, as its duality with the curly 's' was transferred into the roman type face, as well as being retained in the black-letter faces. The custom was, basically, that the 's' was to be used at the end of a word, and the long '/' within or at the beginning of a word, as formulated for example by Lambrecht: "'/' of 's' finaal...". The Twe-spraack went so far as to give them distinct names (as others, such as Cramer, did for 'r, p', cf. chapter 19): since '/' cannot come at the end of a word, its name could not be "es", but must be "esse" (or rather "e//e"). Van der Schuere agrees with this system: "De 's' heeft tweederley maekzel, ende 'tgebruyk daer van, is, dat t'eynden in 'twoord (dewyle men daer geen lange '/' gewone en is) men een ronde 's' steld, anders altijd een lange" (p.10). In accordance with this rule most printers at this time used double '/' in the middle of a word, e.g. "mi//en, dan//en".

In 1653 one of the stranger suggestions concerning the '/' came from Leupenius. He feels it desirable, for one word only, to break the rule prohibiting final '/': "In het meervoud van 'ik' en 'ayn', hebben wy 'ons', daar tusschen men nochtans eenig onderscheid soude kunnen maaken, schryvende het zelfstandig 'ons', en het hyvoeuglyk 'on/', om het gevolg", i.e. "ons" (=us) is undecinable, but "on/'" (=our), because of the inflected form "on/e", may have final '-/'. This is purely for differentiation (cf. chap.18), otherwise consistency would have demanded "hui/'" because of "hui/en" etc. (Leupenius does not use 'z' for /z/).

Moonen in 1706 continues the standard practice (p.33) as does Sewel: "men acht het cierlyker ... te schryven 'pla//en' dan 'plas/en/'", otherwise 's' is final and '/' used elsewhere (Spraakkunst p.2). Before long there seems to have been a change of opinion regarding the internal use. Sewel seems to have known of it already in 1708. Meijer's Woordenschat (1745 edition) has the word "gras/atie" where earlier editions (e.g. 1688) had "gra//atie". The use of 's/' does not appear to have been very common before that date however, and '-/-/-' continued to be widely used. Van Belle (1743) still has "mi//en", and in 1755 "St//en".

The first grammar to give internal usage differently is De Haes, in that "men de eerste ('s') gebruikt om een lettergreep te sluiten, en de tweede, om eene lettergreep te beginnen, gelyk in 'pas//en, was//en, mes//en, /luiten, /poor', enz.". The significant change is from beginning and end of a word to beginning and end of a syllable. This necessarily involves the use of internal 's/'.
Van der Palm has the same usage in 1769, and the "Kunst" grammar of 1770 specifies De Haes as giving the best model for usage. Zeydelaar (1769 & 1772) still uses 'l/'/-', as does the "Inlayding" of 1735, but in written works such as Van Alphen's poetry of 1773 can be found "Les/en". Stijl echoes De Haes: "De lange 'l/' ontent, de korte 's' sluit een lettergreep, of woord, als '/is/en'" (="sissen"), and as with the round 'g' Bolhuis's footnote explains that the difference "wordt niet bestendig waargenomen, vooral niet in schrijfletteren. Men is echter niet gewoont met '/i' een woord te sluiten, als 'hui/'", maar wel een lettergreep, als '/i//en'=("sissen"). Usage thus still oscillated between the two alternative systems.

Chalmot's biographical dictionary of 1798 uses "pers/e, klas/e", which is the most common usage of the late 18th century. Contemporary English usage, for comparison, also rejected '/i' in final position, but used '/-s' in such words as "gro/-s, goodne/-s". Other variants may have been used by less-well lettered writers, as suggested by Cramer (again in all editions up to and including 1897, from which the following text is taken): "V(raag): Waartoe heeft men een korte 's' en een lange '/i'? A(ntwoord): Ten zelfden einde als van de 'r' en 'g' gezegd is: de lange '/i' (eigenlijk '/e' genoemd) dient om een woord of lettergreep te beginnen, en de korte 's' ('es' geheeten) om dezelve te sluiten, als 'was/en', of 'was/chen, plas, plas/en' enz. Waarom men moet letten, dusdanige woorden niet te schrijven met 's', of '/i', of '/e', als 'wassen' of 'wassenen', 'pla/', plassen' enz., noch ook 'wa/-en' of 'wa//chen, pla//en' enz.; ook niet 'wa/chen, pla/len' enz.".

It is noticeable that several grammars consider '/i' the basic form and 's' as the variant. This is understandable considering their relative frequencies: initial and internal '/i' together will be more frequent than final 's'. There may on occasions have been a little influence from Greek, which shows the same variation between two forms of sigma. No grammar refers to this parallel however. Lambrecht is one who regarded 's' as the variant, as his entry quoted above shows - '/i' is the first to be mentioned. Even as late as 1774 in Kramer's grammar (Von Moerbeek edition) the same preference is given, when the alphabet is listed as "... o p q r / (s) t u v...", - 's' only merits a place in brackets.

The 19th century was to see the death of the long '/i', but not immediately.
Because the use of this variant depended almost exclusively on the views of the printer, and not on those of the writer, very few grammars even commented on its use after the turn of the century, not considering it a matter of spelling. Siegenbeek did not discuss it, but his "Woordenboek" of 1805 uses the long '/', whereas the second edition of 1829 replaces it by 's'. A late and much revised edition of Steuwel's "Guide" appearing in 1814 used '/s' throughout, with a few rare slips such as "grast/en, os/en, men/chen" on p.208-9. Smits (1824) uses '/s' and does not discuss '/ at all. Bilderdijk's "Sprakleer" (1826) uses '/', and De Simpel's "Taalkundige Tweespraak" (1827) uses 's'. The 3rd edition of the Hut's grammar (1829) still uses '/', but soon after this date their other works adopted 's'.

The main change over seems to have occurred between 1820 and 1830, with quite a substantial transition period, probably because of the printers' natural reluctance to discard a large amount of expensive and still usable type for no urgent reason. The "Boekzaal" finally completed its change from '/ to 's' in January 1835, when a completely new type face was adopted (same printer). By around 1840 long '/ was all but dead, but seems to have lingered in some regions.

It was in 1844 that the most strange suggestion for the use of '/ appeared, in the "Projet" by the French-speaking Flemish Hubert van den Hoven (or "Delecourt"), and hints that '/ was long since dead in Holland. He wished to cast out the foreign letter 'z' "importé par les Hollandais", and if any should then feel a need to distinguish the hard and soft sounds of 's' (i.e. /s/ and /z/), "on pourrait facilement exprimer l's doux par la longue '/ en usage autrefois (/yne /uster, /yne ind/en) et réserver l's bouclée pour le son dur (sodert, somtys, sidderen etc.). En Hollande l'adoption de 1'/ serait plus difficile, mais la connaissance de la langue allemande, qui se répand de jour en jour davantage dans ce pays, faciliterait beaucoup cette réforme". Unlike Leupenius who merely wished to differentiate homonyms when substituting '/' for 's', Van den Hoven wished to give separate sounds to the two forms.

It is interesting to note that this proposal would have coincided very largely with the older usage, since /z/, which never appears at the end of a Dutch word, would be represented by 's', which also never appeared in final position in traditional usage. Conversely the /s/ is less frequent at the
beginning of Dutch words, so that('/') would be more frequently seen there,
again corresponding to the established usage (deliberately?).

The use of('/') may have been dead in the North, as Van den Hoven suggests,
but it also appears to have been dead in the South, to judge by the nostalgic
yearning of David. In "Belgisch Museum" (1849) he points out that Maerlant and
others had carefully discriminated between('/') and 's* "naer gelang zy het woord
of de lettergreep begon of sloot. In het eerste geval gebruykten zy altyd de
lange '/'; in het tweede steeds de gekrulde 's'. Dit onderscheyd is zeer dienstig
in samengestelde woorden, om alle dubbelzinnigheid voor te komen. In de volgende,
bij voorbeeld, is de beteekenis gansch verschillig, volgens dat de 's' het eerste
woord sluyt of het tweede begint: 'ryk-staf (ryks-taf), koning-staf (konings-taf),
dorp-slooper (dorps-looper)'enz. De lange '/' is by de Hollanders zoo wel als
by de Duytschers nog in gebruyk, en by ons te herstellen". It is strange that
he regards '/' as current in the North and dead in the South - cf. V.d.Hoven.

David's comments on word-division are strongly reminiscent of Moonen's
arguments against 'kw' in "gek-wel (wel-gek)/gequel" (see chap.10), and are
later parodied by Van Lennep: "Ten opzichte der 's mogen wij niet verzijgen, dat
daar-voor vroeger twee verschillende letterteekens werden gebezigd: het eene, de
'/', ofschoon 'STAART-es' heeten, werd aan 't begin van een lettergreep
geplazt, het andere, de 's', sloot het hek. In 't begin dezer eeuw raakten
staarten uit de mode en zoo ook de 'staart-es', wat ten gevolge heeft gehad, dat
men nu dikwijls niet weet, of de 's' aan 't begin of aan 't einde van een
lettergreep staat, en zich diensvolgens in de uitspraak van 't woord deelrijk
vergissen kan. Wie kan nu b.v. weten of hij 'St. Michiels-Ges-tel' moet
zeggen, dan wel 'St. Michiels-Ges-tel'?" (Verm.Spraakkunst).

When discussing the spelling systems of Siegenbeek, Bilderdijk, Weiland and
others in 1856, Carlebur mentions that they all used the long('/', but that most
contemporary writers now used 's', and further that the '/' is functionally
useless, confusing, and "ontciert het schrift". Land elaborated further: "Het
toppunt van lettervergoding is bereikt door de aanhangers der mystieke lange 's.
Moet die letter op een 'f' gelijken wanneer zij de lettergreep niet sluit,
waarom dan niet ook bij de andere letters zulke een onderscheid ingevoerd? Omdat
de gril van een kalligraaph het zoo meebragt" (p.37).

Usage in handwriting, as opposed to printed books discussed above, is much
more difficult to establish. This is especially true for the state of flux present in the later stages of their demise. But it is probably fair to deduce that 'l' and 's' faded out much earlier in informal written texts, as is suggested by Bolhuis's comments given above, to the extent that the distinction between the variants "wordt niet bestendig waargenomen, vooral niet in de schrijffletteren". Here the sheer conservative traditionalism of most grammar-writers is at play. Furthermore Cramer's comments show that when the alternatives were used, it was not always in the manner preferred by the theorists!

Summary:

long 'l': up to c.1750 used consistently in the right places; certainly the usage in printed books shows a high degree of standardization.

c.1750 - c.1815 's' used often instead of 'l', often seemingly indiscriminately except at the end of a word, where 'l' was never used.

c.1815 'l' begins to be replaced entirely by 's' in printed works.

c.1835 'l' now all but extinct; nostalgia in the South.

c.1850 'l' very rarely used, except by some ultra-conservatives (see comments of Land).

round 'r': died out with the use of Gothic and other black-letter types. Within these types usage varied greatly, with a great deal of inconsistency.

Systems: long 'l':

a) 'l' at the beginning of a word
   's' at the end of a word
   'l/' internally

b) 'l' at the beginning of a syllable
   's' at the end of a syllable
   's/' internally

Round 'r':

a) 'r' after all round letters
b) 'r' at the beginning of a word, 'r' at the end
   'r' at the beginning
   'r' at the beginning and end of a word, and after 's', elsewhere 'r'.
The sound combination /sch/ occurred in Dutch in all positions, initial, medial, and final. That at least was the situation in early Middle Dutch, though the medial and final sounds slowly devolved into the simple /s/. The spelling reflected these changes, though conservatism in usage was rampant in all periods.

Earlier Middle Dutch texts very frequently have the spelling 'sc' for this. The Middle Dutch dictionary of Verwijs and Verdam lists alternative spellings with 'sc-' for almost all words beginning with 'sch-', and describes 'sc-' as "de gewone, doch volstrekt niet uitsluitend gebruikelijke schrijfwijze van den klank 'sch', welke zich uit 'sk' (sc) heeft ontwikkeld. Doch in het hnl. was 'sk' niet meer de gewone uitspraak", except in Frisian and some Saxon tinted dialects. Similarly Van Loey records that "In de anlaut vindt men 'sc' (en reeds vroeg 'sch!')" — roughly from the 13th century onwards (hnl. Sprk.). It is attractive to consider this 'sc-' spelling as a remnant of the time when it had accurately represented the /sk/ pronunciation, but there is no proof that 'sc-' was anything apart from the normal way of spelling /sch/, and 'c' sometimes occurs for /ch/ (see chap. 3), possibly by analogy with this usage. The insertion of the 'h' was presumably to prevent mispronunciation as /s/, as found in loan words such as "science".

Such spellings still occur in later texts, being fairly common in the Boecius translation, e.g. "gescreven, bescauen, graceappen", alongside "beschermen, beschaent". The Exercitium has "scriver, scade", "screid" is used by De Castelein, and Anna Bijns has such spellings as "erstseal". By the end of the Middle Dutch period however the spelling had become firmly settled as 'sch' in initial and medial position, except before 'r', where 'scr-' is not infrequent, e.g. on page 43 of the Twe-spraak - "scryven" (see also Meurier below).

De Heuiter still knew these spellings in 1581, for he pleads that in "Woorden
beginnende met 'sc', voubt altoos 'b'. bij" (p.86). Van Heule uses a few 'sc'
spellings in his etymology lists (1633 p.159) in order to illustrate the
similarities with Latin words. For a much later attempt at resurrecting 'sc'
see Smits and Schumann below.

One side effect of the use of 'sc' is criticised by Erasmus in 1528. So
used were readers to pronouncing Dutch 'sc' as /sch/ that they did the same for
Latin: "Nos hic & alio recessum modo, spiritum addentes, 'c' quoties antecedit
's', & sequitur 'm' vel 'u', 'schando' sonantes ero 'scando', & 'schutum' pro
'scutum'". In 1764 De Haes records this as the normal pronunciation: "de Latynsche
'sc' worden by ons ... uytgesproken gelyk 'sch', als of 'er stond 'schipio,
schire, schedula!'", as too did Van Geesdalle a little earlier: "De 'sch' der
Vlaesche word op de selve wijse uytgesproken als de 'sc' der Latynsche" in
dese woorden: Scribere, scelus, sciphus &c" (p.47). See also the comments of
Winschooten and the "Inleyding" below. In the same context can be noted the
(spelling-?)pronunciation of "beschuit" from French "biscuit".

This is a minor, but interesting variant, enjoying the greatest of its
limited popularity around the end of the 17th century, and again about a century
later. The actual date of origin is not known, and although final '-sg(e)'
spellings are known at an early date (see below), the first reference to initial
'sg-' comes in 1683, when it is already sufficiently well known for Winschooten
to criticise it: "De bekende spelling SCH in de aanvang van een woord ... is
onberispelijk" (except in foreign names such as 'Scipio, Scylla')... en het
baat haar geensins die wonder reede en wonder voorbeeld van isaan der wereld
de SCH in dit deel veranderen in SG gelijk in 'sgryven, sgenken'; want dit
strijd reegelregt teegen de gewoon'lijke uitspraak en spellingen deeser woorden".

He seems to think it a fairly recent phenomenon. It is rather strange however
that he should criticise this spelling, since it is only a symptom of a theory
which he himself firmly supported - that 'ch' should be avoided in Dutch words
(see chap.3). It is just that it has been taken one step further than he would
envisage.

Although Winschooten does not say where he has seen these forms, it was to
he no great length of time before they were actively supported by a grammar.

This was in 1696 by Duikerius, who, however, realises that since it was a fairly radical spelling, which might confuse his youthful audience, it should be avoided in the actual text: "Ten eynde de selve niet door ingeboele moejelykhert van onze wijse van spellen afgeschrikt worden. Want 'Sgaa, sgaum, sgand' voor 'Schaad, scheaund, schand'... geeft, ik beken het, zoo merkelycke veranderinge, voor de ongeoffende... Derhelve..., en niet om dat wy oordelen het zoö best is, blyven we in doeze, door dit geboele werkje van zoemige onze grond-regels verschillen" (Introduction).

In these rules which he mentions (p.32), he reports that this spelling, already in existence, is very new, and also theoretically superior: "Wijders werd in once Taal de C. gebracht in... 'Schaad, Schaad'... Die hier de C. in plaats van 'ch' spellen voldoen wel sygynlijkst, de kracht, die zulk slag van woorden in het uytgesproken hebben (cf. Winschooten's comment!); maar al zoö dit in once Taal en Spelwijze al te merkelycke verandering breng, is zulks best naagester, want 'Sgaa, Sgand, Sgeel' voor 'Schaad, Schand, School', 'Sgool, Sgol, Sgout' voor 'School, Schol, Schout', Zow veale die anders al wel leesen kunnen, op nieuw na een Schoolmeester moeten doen osalen".

One schoolmaster who would have made an admirable choice in the latter event was Klaas Najar,- "Sgooler. en Voorsanger tot Kwadijk: Leer in syn Konat en Konatagool, de regte gronden, en Fondamenten der Nederduytse Speelkonst: ook Leesen, Sgyven, Gyeren, Italianens en Sjeepe-Boek-houden" (Amsterdamse Courant 21 August 1700). In his published work on mathematics he used the same spelling (though only after page 211), including "sguyne, ingesgyven, versgyl, gesgil, versgoningen, sgikken, bllysagap" (pp.22-40), and even referring to the "Rekenwr. Jakob vander Sgure!".

In his defence of Najar's right to his own spelling, against the attacks of Doedijns in the "Naegsche Mercurius", N.S. (not K.Smallegange as sometimes maintained - see Dibbets p.207, note 90), though using 'sch-' himself, says that Najar spells "sgaap, sgout,... op een regte en behoorlyke wijze" (p.65). He also refers to the radical avoidance of 'ch' by Duikerius "al eh heeft by niet gespelt 'sgaa, sgand, sgaatem!" in practice (p.15).
A further reference is made two years later, in a fairly impartial tone, by E.C.P.: "Men zou misschien deze letter (c) gantschelijk kunnen derven, ten ware men se van den hadde om 'ch' ofs de friksche 'Chi' uyt te drukken; als (by voorbeeld) in 'schryven'. Sommige nogtams weyne dit met de G. goet te maken, en 'sgryven' in plaaes van 'schryven' te spellen. Doch ik geloof dat deze nieuwigheit weyningen ingang by de liijnheboren vinden zal" (p. 11). In this he was quite correct, for the usage seems never to have been widespread, and Hager is the only actual user located. It may well have been more widespread, since the number of references to be found concerning it are unlikely to have been all caused by a solitary grammar (Duikerius) and a solitary user (Najer).

Tuinman in 1722 certainly knew the spelling, when musing on the pronunciation of 'c': "Hoe komt 'c' tussen 's' en 'h' aan 't geluid van 'g'? Zekerlyk 'sgoon' drukt dat beter uit, hoewel het gebruik dat nu weinig begunstigt, en ook de oude daar toe weinig aanleiding gaven". Ten Kate is more critical, however, when speaking of "de Sg in steé van SCH" (1.122): "De tweéleedige gedaante heeft sommigen van niewer tijd misléid gehad, om de GH te willen verbannen, veralts in den klank, voor wélken CH dient, gééne dúbbelhééd, veel min C nogte H gehóórt word; waarom ze óók Sg voor SCH (als 'sgóón' voor 'SCHóóN') zochten in te voeren". Both he and Tuinman are of the opinion that this usage is now obsolete. To judge by these comments, the phenomenon would seem to have begun in about 1680, and died out before 1720.

However, in the later years of the same century further comments are to be found. Van der Palm is the first to renew the discussion in 1769, when he mentions "'schoon, schryven' enz. waer voor men geen 'sgoon, sgrýven' enz. spellen kan" (p. 10). Although it cannot be ruled out that he has merely seen these forms in the older works such as Tuinman and Ten Kate, it is possible that a mild resurrection had occurred, this time in the South. "Janssens is zoo grooten wyand van de 'CH', dat hy, om de zelve geheelyk uyt onze Tael te bannen, voorstelt: de 'G' hume plaatse te laten vervallen, en, voor 'schande, schryven', 'sgande, sgrýven' te stellen; dog ik denke, dat syne voorstelling van navolginge zal vervreemd blyven. Wy konnen deze in 't begin der Lettergeprent niet missen, en hy geven hun geluyd in 'schanden, schenden' gelyk hier te lande by de Latynen in
This comment comes from the "Inleyding" of 1785, but is rather misleading, as the following quotation of what Janssens actually says would make clear: "'s moet men doen met de letters 'c' en 'h', die zoo dikwils noodig schynen te zijn in de woorden 'Schoón, Schanie, Schryven' enz.? Ant. Ik bevindt dat die woorden die selve kraft hebben met de 'g': want heeft de 'a' zoo een scherp of schetterende veluid voor de letters 'l, m, n, p, t' volgens de leêringe van P.R. gedrukt by Bicken binnen Antwerpen,... het selve geluid heeft zy ook voor de 'g', gelyk men kan zien in de woorden 's morgens, snöden, spruiten, opgorten, spoön, agraöden, atryven, agande' enz.". What he means is that in the sound normally spelt 'sch' the 's' is unvoiced, just as before the other letters he mentions, and that even if 'g' were placed after it, it would make no difference. That he knew of such spellings is not a valid deduction from his statement, though it cannot be ruled out. Nowhere does he use such a spelling in his grammar. A later comment on final 'se' (see De Neckere below) may indicate that 'sp-' forms were indeed known in the South at this time.

Oddly enough this same spelling was to reappear some 200 years later, though not in favourable circumstances: In his speculations on what radical spelling reformers would devise next, Mulisch suggests "sgaven" as a potential "vervoeging" for "schaven" (cf. "laggen" chap.4). There is actually little which can be held against such a spelling, apart from unfamiliarity.

Shk-

This possibly unique spelling was proposed by Van Dale in 1805, on the simple grounds that since 'c' and 'k' are "eene en de selve boek-staf" they are mutually interchangeable, even to the extent of "scheiden/skhelden" (No.1, 15).

Sk-

This is equally uniquely put forward by Van Heule (1633, p.12) in line with his general simplification of 'ch' to 'h' (see chap.3). Although this is inspired by a similar move from De Houtier the latter retained 'sch'. Van Heule only actually uses this spelling in "Schepter" in the etymology list on p.159 (cf. "Schepter" p.156).
Final and medial 'sch', 's' and variants

Unlike the very uniform development described above, the spelling in other positions, whether in living suffixes such as '-isch', or other positions such as "mensch, tusschen", has been a thorny problem right up to the present day, when the last relics of the '-sch' spelling are being tidied away. At the end of a word where /scurr/ sound was already assimilated to /s/ as early as in Middle Dutch (Schönfeld §.72). Internally (e.g. in "tusschen, menschen") it lasted much longer, especially in the southern dialects; in Holland province (North and South) an /-sk/ pronunciation lingered on, and still lives in some dialects above the IJ. To complicate the matter further, many words which should have had the '-sch' spelling lost it by analogy, e.g. "broos(ch), vlees(ch), mass(ch)" by analogy with such as "loos, pees, kaas" (loc.cit.).

It would be understandable to expect that spelling would reflect this state of pronunciation, and that after the Middle Ages the spelling '-s' would be normal, but in fact on the whole it did not. The standard spelling was the historical but progressively less often fully pronounced '-sch', until 1934 when Marchant put the first official nail in its coffin. It is usually impossible to tell whether a writer who spells '-sch' pronounced it fully, and unfortunately not many grammarians elaborate on this either.

That in Middle Dutch the pronunciation was commonly /s/ is clearly shown, firstly by several instances of phonetic spellings, especially for the words "vis, vers" etc., and secondly by hypercorrect spellings - words spelt with 'sch' but undoubtedly spoken with /s/. Examples of the latter are found in the West Flanders "Corkonden" - "lansch vert" (= "lands waard"), from Roermond "overmijtsch" (= "mits"), and such words as "wasschen" used for "to grow", and "vreeschelle" (see Schönfeld p.95). Salverda de Grave records (p.255) an incorrect 'sch' in such loan words as "baschena" (basis), "bussche" ("bus"), "diversch" (cf. Valcoogh below), "peertsch" ("pears"), on which he notes that "Dit zijn verkeerde schrijfwijzen, die tonen dat in het Nederlandisch 'sch' reeds in de oudste periode ongeveer als 's' werd uitgesproken". Unfortunately he does not elaborate on the word "ongeveer".

On the other hand some written forms quite clearly show that the fricative was pronounced fully: e.g. in the Zutphen "Corkonden" - "tuschen, eysgen,
visghojet (see above) - strongly indicating a full pronunciation at least in Zutphen, or at the very least for the scribe who wrote the text (see Ooreen & Van Loey). Van Loey (ZWBr), given the variation between '-s, -sch, -sgh', postulates two pronunciations held by different scribes. Similarly, towards the end of the Middle Dutch period one can find in the poems of and attributed to Anna Bijns such forms as "laschen, ayyleschen" for the more usual "eylacen", where a pronunciation with the fricative is unlikely. Likewise in the form "diversche" in Valcoogh and Van der Gucht, alluded to above; this was later accepted by analogy with other adjectives, and Jansses uses it in 1775. W.d.T. gives it as an obsolete variant. Plantijn uses the hypercorrect form "Francoiseshe" in the sentence quoted earlier (chap.2).

With the spread of education, and wider reading habits, bringing a certain amount of stabilization in the spelling of the 16th and 17th centuries, usage settled down to '-sch', with only rare exceptions. The Boeckius translation and the Exercitium consistently spell '-sch', with only rare '-a' forms ("eysen" in the latter). Van de Werve lists "afwasschen, afwassinge", but normally uses 'sch'. Sexagius spells consistently with '-sch' those words which etymologically derive from '-sk', all others with '-a', from which Dibbets (p.163) deduces that he probably pronounced the former with the fricative.

De Heuiter does not make the same distinction, but he knows of the existence of the two pronunciations, he personally preferring /s/ for aesthetic reasons:

"V tale int spreken en schriven sal zeer verzaeten, indien u gelief metter tijt afbreken, en verlaten d'oude gewente van veel consonanten int middel en cinde der woorde bij een te breingen ... 'Nederlands/ Nederlandsch, mens/ mensch, wens/ wensch ... in welke woorden groote bartheit maken drij consonanten aet mouiten en slainx geblaze melkander zonder noot uit den mont stotende", - he not only disapproves of the spelling '-sch', he also disapproves of the pronunciation /sch/! In inflected forms he is not opposed to the sounding of the fricative:

"sprekende van veel, kiest dat u gelief, 'menschen, Nederlandschen', of 'mensen, Nederlantsen', etc". He later also comments that "natuur leert dat men aldaas behoort te spellen: 'men-schen, wen-schen, pen-schen', bemerckende dat 'o' en 'h' hier half overvloedig zijn". In "tuschen" and at the beginning of a word he regards 'sch' as the only possible spelling; at the end he uses '-a' - for
example when discussing the use of 's' he says that it must be used in the
suffix 'se', as in "Latijns, Grieks,...". In general terms however, he would
be satisfied if those who spoke /s/ spelt 's', and those who spoke /sch/ spelt
'sch', provided each was used consistently.

The Twe-spraak recommends 'sch' in "schep, schip" etc., but does not
discuss its use in other positions. Usage within the text is erratic: "Duyts,
Duitse" (p.64) "Hoogduitschen" (p.63), etc.. One grammarian who definitely
hears the fricative at the end of a word is Gabriel Seurier in 1558; in his
treatise "Della pronuncialione tedesca" - "Molti vocaboli Tedeschi (=Dutch)
finiscono per 'h', come 'vleesch, visch'... quali si pronunciano a la firentina
cio un poco di la gola", i.e. a fricative guttural (initially he uses 'sc-
however, as in "scaet, escel").

The use of 'sch' in Van de Noot's lines "...en daer verdriet/ In mijn
Veerschen sal lesen" (Ode aan Olympia) is probably hypercorrect, but Van der
Schaere seems to hear a regular fricative:"als voor de 'h' een 's' komt, dan
moet de 'c' ook daer tusschen beyde gevoegd worden in 'schaendig, scherphschimpig,
versch, gesp, geest"; he does not say whether he refers to the spelling alone
or also to the pronunciation, and he may be reacting to 'sh' which could be
generated by De Heuiter's rules (see above, and chap.3).

Sporadic 's' spellings occur in most writers' printed works, but most often
they are type-setters' spellings, e.g. Roemer Visscher's and Starter's "Franse",
Bredero's "duyts, vlees, vis", Goster's "valse", Bontekoe's "vis" (alongside
"visschen"), and "Engles, Duyts" in the "Grooten Vocabulaer". But also "in de
17de eeuw (vindt) men bij Bredero, Starter e.e. vormen als 'lask-ijzer, mensk,
Paaske-pronk" (Schönfeld loc.cit.), where a pronunciation other than the simple
/s/ is indicated, presumably an attempt to suggest a particular dialect form.
Huygens rhymes "Viss" with "is", and "vissen" with "mischen" (e.g. in the
epigram "Kleine Viss"), suggesting that he pronounced all with /s/. Vondel too
uses mixed rhymes, e.g. "Wat Rijn, wat stroom, wat meer, wat grondeloos plassen
/Vermogen lijf en ziel van deze vleek te wassen?"(Heegden).

In Van Heule's first edition there is a hint at the /s/ pronunciation: "als
men zegt 'Vaders goet', dat is by nae zoveel als 'Vadersch' ofte 'Vaderlic goet',
also ook 'Waerelts verderf', dat is by nae zo veel als 'Waerelsch verderf'"(sic).
What he means precisely by "by nae" is not clear, but he evidently hears a very
great similarity between "Vaders" and "Vadersch". In his second edition (1633)
he records both pronunciations specifically, in the section "Rijmver-lof": "on
de uytspake der woorden te verzoeten zo worden dik-mael enige letteren
naer-gelaten als 'Mense', voor 'Mensache', 'Zeeuse', 'Hollanse' voor 'Zeeusche,
Hollansche" (p.146). In this respect once more he echoes De Hauiter more in
his second edition than in the first. That he is talking about pronunciation
and not merely spelling here is shown not only by the reference to "uytsprake"
but also to the deliberate separation of this case from those in the next
paragraph where "in vele woorden kan de vermindering, der letteren ooc plaetse
hebben, zonder verandering der uitsprake", covering such examples as "no(o)ren".

One oddity in Van Haule's system is that he rejects "een Duytse" for "a
German" in favour of "een Duyts", but allows "eene Duytse"... als wy van eene
vrouwe spreken" (1633, p.105). How much he is speaking here of the presence or
absence of 'ch' and how much of the 's' is not made clear. The resolutions of
the Bible translators reject this contemporary 's' spelling: "Vleesch, Visch,
Mensch' scribendum, non 'vlees,...vis, mens'".

Aespwing (1628) uses 'z' for /s/, but unlike De Hubert (see below) he keeps
the 'sch' spelling and pronunciation: "de 'h' (slaet) met de 'c' te saemen een
gelyk ... als onse 'g'. In de zilben met 'sc' beginnende, wilse ooc de
meklinkers scheiden; ofte ook eene zilbe syndigen, 'mensch, vleesch, visch'".

Like his predecessors Plemp records both pronunciations: "gansch" is, he claims,
composed "uit 'gan, egan' (daer den Griek ξυρυ voor seid, den scherpen accent
quaelik op den 'a' stellende) en 's' of 'sch'". But he seems to think of the
fricative pronunciation as the more basic form, since he declares "vriendschap,
maalchschap" to be composed of "vriendsch, maechsch' en 'ap'; niet 'vriend,
maech' en'schap' soo Kiliaen droomt". Had he not known the /-sch/ pronunciation
for the adjective ending '-sch' he could not have postulated such a derivation.

Despite his usual thorough phonetic methods, Montanus (1635) does not discuss
this phenomenon as such. His usage is consistently with '-s', and on page 119
he gives "mensch" as an example of parempotis (Naeschil-cleefdubbeling) - of
the double suffix in "mingel" from "min"("less"); and on page 137 as examples of
paragoge he cites "dubbel/ dubbel, enkel/ enkel, mensch/ mens". He does not
say whether they are pronounced differently, though the context suggests that they are, and since he advises against the use of the first of each pair as less correct, this implies that he knows and dislikes the /sch/ pronunciation.

It is instructive once more to seek hypercorrect spellings in the writings of non-grammarians, and one who frequently displays them is De Ruyter. Alongside many simple inconsistencies like "tussen/tusschen, amensen, Carybysche" etc. occur such spellings as "kousche, prymsche, kansche", and even "schell, Schyylge". These latter especially suggest that for him 'sch' in many positions had no other function than to indicate /s/ where 's' came before a vowel.

Unlike many of his predecessors Leupenius mentions only the fricative pronunciation: "De 'c' heeft by ong een ander gebruik, dan om de 'h' een sterker uitblaasinge te geeven, dan van de 'g' of 'h' bekomen kann, als in 'lichasm, menschen, schaapen', dat men quaalyk saude schryven 'lihhaam, mensgen, spaapen'". It is probable that Van den Ende, whose dictionary appeared a year later, also used the fricative pronunciation, since he studiously avoids any unnecessary letters, yet always writes "mensch, visch" etc. Bolognino on the other hand, who knew and often criticised the latter, uses '-s', though with many inconsistencies in the text itself (printers' spellings?), e.g. "Antwerpsche, Nederduytse". His choice is for 's' however, as seen in a comment remarkably like De Heuiter's given above, that 's' should be used "in de sillabe 'se' oft 'ser', 'Grisse, segtse". The brief preface of Billus a few years later expresses a similar dislike of superfluous letters, simplifying such forms as "daeghelyckxsche" to "dagelycse".

A writer who was to contribute much to the small flurry of phonetic dropping of the '-ch' later in the century was the historian Adriaen Pars. He always spells 's' rather than '-sch' in his personalised system, as is seen in the title of his literary history "Index Batavicus, of Naemrol van de Batavise en Hollandse Schrijvers" in 1701. This was also used in his earlier works, e.g. "Katwyks Oudheden" (though '-ze' is also used - see below) of 1683, and "Louwerkreans aan de Heer Willem Swinnaas,... over zijn Engelge, Nederlandge, en Munsterge kraakkeelen" of 1665. Pars had many similarities in his system with Winschooten (see below), but as they had radically different views on other
points (see especially chap.7), it is unlikely that there was any question of influence. Pars was one of the first to use the 's' spellings consistently in literary works.

From about this time however the '-s' system does appear to become more widespread (though rarely fully consistently), for example in the works of Broedeleuken (see below), Luyken, De Decker (valach, valsheyd), Brandt (bij vist), Hilardes (Duyts, Hollantee - in Phaedrus translations). Sometimes the 's' form is to save space on the printed line, as not infrequently for example in Dukkerius' 'Voorbeeldzels'. De Vooys (Gesch.) comments that "in volksgezien prosa van 't 17de en 18de eeuw zijn zulke spellingen lang niet ongewoon" - by "volksgezien prosa" he possibly also includes non-literary texts such as the "Oprecht Haerlemse Courant" (see below) and the works of such as Pars, and also the various attempts to represent dialect pronunciations in several works. The 's' spelling is far from being restricted to dialect tinting in prose however.

Speaking for the society "Nil Volentibus" in 1677 Pels declares that "kleeden, visschen", wordt wel en voegchelyk berymd met 'leden, missen!', but does not propose any change in spelling to reflect this. Nil's own "Verhandeling" gives "los, mosch" as a permissible rhyme-pair.

The first grammarian to reject '-sch' explicitly and unequivocally was Winschooten in 1683. In his "Letterkonst" (p.2) he says that the spelling should now be accepted as 's' "in het midden en einde der woorden ... want wie twijfeld daer aan dat men vele woorden nu flauwer uitspreakt, als wel voor heen; en dat men, lettende op de uitspraak, eer sal hooren: 'Vleeselijck' als 'Vleeschelijk'; 'Vissen' als 'Visschen'; 'Vlees' als 'Vleesch'; 'Vis' als 'Visch'. Wij besluiten dan daer de 瑄 in het spreekken weinig of niet gehoord word, en bij veele buiten gebruik is (NB), dat men daar veiliglijk de瑄 missen mag ... en soo ons geoorloofd was ons gevoelen vrij uit te spreeken: soo souden wij durven voorzeggen, dat de瑄 in 'menschen, wenschen', en diergelijke woorden, met der tijd meede sal veranderd werden in SS, schrijvende en spreekende 'mensen, wenssen!'. He thus indicates the variations of the contemporary pronunciation in different positions in the word, and predicts (accurately) the future trend, even if somewhat prematurely, at least as far as the spelling was concerned. Similarly in his dictionary the following year,
the entries read "Nederduits, Latijns, mens, menselijk, vis, vissen, visser" etc. and the even more radical "Historien". The '-isch' suffix spelling was to last much longer than the other final '-sch' spellings though they are known at an early date - Pars spells "Batavise" and the Haarlemse Courant has "Britannisse" (see below).

Also in 1634 La Grue's grammar, like Van Heule, records both spellings, with 's!' as the variant. Under the heading "Syncopa" he gives "een Hollandsche vrou" as a syncopated form for "een Hollandsche vrouw". But whereas Van Heule also mentions two pronunciations, this is not implicit in La Grue's statement, since he includes it along with "hoor: horen, spreeken: spróken" where no difference of sound is involved. Sewel uses the standard '-sch' spelling, without commenting on these contemporary trends, though in the 1712 edition of his grammar is inserted that "het woord bosch spreekt men gemeenlyk uyt bos"(p.33).

Despite all these attempts at a realistic representation of the /s/ pronunciation, Moonen, like Sewel, is conservative: "In het opmaeken der dubbele letter ('ch')... dient ook de K, die door de C ... een sterker uitblaezing ontfangt, dan za van de G bekoomen mag. En dus spel't men door haer 'mensch, wensch, aerdisch, wereltsch, Duitsch, schyn, lichaes, juichen!'" (p.7). He clearly hears the same sound in "schyn" as in "mensch". Yet in his "Vragen aan den Here J.v.Vondel" he had raised the question whether or not "was" should have '-ch' on the end. As the context does not make it clear whether he means "was"(wash), "was"(grow) or "was"(wash), it is not known whether the indication in the manuscript that "wasch" was preferred is grammatically correct. It does suggest however that Moonen's claim to hear /ch/ in "mensch" etc. may be more puristic than realistic, since he is clearly in doubt here and pronunciation seems to offer him no guide. The majority of grammars in the following years simply recommend '-sch' without giving any hint at the pronunciation it was to represent. This is true for example of Verwer, Hilarides, Van Geesdalle, E.C.P., Nyloë, Bicken, Des Roches, and De Haes.

The '-s' spelling continued to enjoy a moderate degree of popularity however, despite the opposition of the major grammars. This system is used with fair consistency by Leydekker (including "Britannisse, Philosophise"), Marin's dictionary of 1701, Van Geesdalle (very irregular), and Pars (very consistent).
K.7. uses 's' without 'ch' in "bussen" only, and Snids uses the '-s,-sse' system (see below).

Kesel in his edition (an almost complete reworking according to his own principles) of Ph. La Grue's grammar in 1719 makes note of the fact that the C "en plusieure mots ... se met avec 'h', & alors il se prononce comme 'gh', comme 'lichtaa ... nach ... mensch, aardsch ... wortelich ... schaal'", but mentions neither the spelling nor the pronunciation with 's'. (This comment is, as usual, echoed word for word by Guno in 1741.) Even the later editions of this grammar retain the same comment, when many contemporaries were refusing to accept the /sch/ pronunciation.

The flux not only in the pronunciation but also in the spelling is amply shown by a statement in Tuinman's "Fakkel" of 1722 (§.139): "De ouden gebruiken wel 'sch', daar wy 'as' of 'z' stellen. b.v. 'verschenen, versenen, plaetschen, plaatzen'. Doch hier in was ook wel het tegendeel. Zy zeiden 'kintselyck', voor 'kindschelyk', 'evangelize', voor 'evangelische', 'lasarye sweerer'. He seems not to be casting any criticism on either pronunciation or spelling variants, but just records them objectively. All four contemporary variants (see below) are present in these examples - the single and double 's', the 'z', and the regular 'sch'; it would seem that he assumes that a spelling with 'sch' always represents a fricative pronunciation, i.e. in "plaetschen". It is also apparent however that he himself pronounces the fricative in "kindschelyk, evangelische" since he expresses surprise at the 's' spelling in these words. Note however that "plaatzen" does not constitute an example of 's' for 'sch' but rather that "plaetschen" exhibits a hypercorrect 'ch'.

Ten Kate seems undecided: in his experimental new alphabetic script he depicts the word "kindsch" as KİŋD§X ('=' nasal, '=' fricative, ' ' unvoiced) with Š = /s/ and K = /ch/, so that "kindsch" is represented as being pronounced quite definitely with a final fricative (cf DÊA for "schat"; vol.I, 130). Nonetheless in vol.II (p.74) he describes the "adjectivale Uitgangen I3K of ISCHE ... na 't genak van de uitspraak, in spreek- en leestaal slechts 'se' of 's' ... als 'Grootsch' of 'Groots', ... 'Mensch' of 'Mensch' of 'Mens'". He has no desire to reflect this pronunciation in the spelling ("schrijf-taels"), though he does not condemn it in the spoken language. Usage in the book is erratic however,
including "tussen, gemeenlandse, Nederduitsche, Hoogduitsen, Italiaanse, Fransse"; 'sch' is the most common form.

In 1730 Huydecoper bemoans the frequent confusion of "wassen" and "wassen", whereas "de Ouden" never did that, and he decides "dat zij in de uitspraak dese twee woorden, eend onderlinge geval hebben, 't welk wij thands missen" — an uncontestable statement from an authoritative source that the 'ch' was unpronounced (p.450). He does not think however that this "bedorven uitspraak" necessitated any new spelling (cf. I,747: "het gebruik (t.w. in 't spreken is by my in kolline achtig"), and in Book II p.546 he heavily criticises those printers who drop the 'ch' merely to save space in the line — "Mensdom" voor 'menschdom', gelijk ik my vcerpter, dat VONDEL geschreven heeft; doch de Lettersetters hebben hier twee letters 'ch' uitgelaaten, omdat dit vaars, buiten dezen twee, reads zo veel letters heeft, dat 'er op dien regel niet een meer geplaatst kon worden. Hierom hebben my liever twee letters willen uitwerpen, dan het vaars breken, en den staat op een' nieuwen regel zetten: het welk in dat werk noit geschied is. Dat is, ik beken 't, een sieraad van den druk: doch ik vind die Drukkers en Lettersetters onverdraagelijk, die het sieraad der taale bederven, om dat van den druk te behouden". This practice no doubt often occurred, especially at those times when printers could decree their own spellings; a similar state of affairs obtained with 'gh' (q.v.).

Huydecoper seems to have felt fairly strongly about this, since similar comments are scattered through the book: "na voor naer" (VII,333), "bos voor bosch"(IX,921), "vroumens voor vrouwensch" (XIII,712), "queeken voor queeken" (XIII,1144), "weet voor westen" (XIV,4), "vlees voor vleesch ... op rekening des Drukkers, en niet op die des Dichters" (XIV,315). These are some of the very few instances of Huydecoper's comments being concerned with spelling rather than with language or poetics (see also chap.5). He is not criticising the spellings "mens, bos, vlees" primarily for inaccurate representation of the pronunciation, just for either their non-acceptability as standard spellings, or their lack of authenticity as Vondel-spellings.

A very similar comment, with the same implications, is contained in his defence of Corneille (p.75-76), where he finds himself misquoted by a critic: "Schryft by weder in het aannahen van myne woorden, 'de Fransman vertellen',
daar hy nood-zaakelyk, gelyk ik gedaan heb, haat musten schryven, 'den Franschman',
hy (schrylt) ook doorgaands 'Nederduits' en Frans' sonder ('ch'),
daar zelfs de geringste taalkundigen weeten, dat men schryven moet 'Aardsch, Duitsch,
Wereldsch, Engelsch' enz.".

That "onbeduidend curiosum" (according to De Vooy's "Geschiedenis...") Van
Belle's rhymed "Korte Wegwyzer" of 1743 shows a lot less prejudice than many of
his more exalted fellow language teachers, and thereby becomes the first
grammarian since Winschoten 65 years earlier to propose scrapping the '-sch'
spelling. (De Vooy's main cause for deeming it unworthy seems to be its being
in rhyme; but it is a work held in some esteem by contemporaries, and Chalnoet
describes him as "een groot kender en voorstander der nederduitsche taal- en
digtkunde". Van Belle also had illustrious models to call upon, including the
third century treatise "de litteris, syllabis pedibus et metris" by Terentianus
Maurus - see Kooiman p.102.) Van Belle observes that 'ch' should be used
"In 't voors van 't woord, als blykt in Christus, 33Maalen;...
... maar nooit nas de S in Wensch;
Mensch, Valsch of Fransch: het is genoeg Vals, Mens.
Schaap, Schap, Schip, Schop zyn ligtlyk uit te spreek'en;
Maar hémelSCH Goed blyft in de keele steeken:
Duitsch, Hollandsch Geld, Noorsch Goud, Helsch Spel, Aardsch Guitt
Spreekt nimmermeer een Neederlander uit" (p.12).
And similarly in his "Korte Schets" (1755): "Geenszins voegt (de CHEE) in ...
'eis, mens, aards' enz." (p.7). But tradition was still too well-set for the
public to adopt this spelling on a large scale. Like Pels before him Van Belle
comments that "Kindsch" could rhyme with "Prins" (La Grue had also quoted this).
For many grammarians however this suffix had already become what it was to be
for Siegenbeek and Te Winkel, namely a mere adjectival indicator; De Haes for
example writes in 1764 that instead of 'x' "verklezen wy de ka; doch wy voegen
achter dezelve de 'ch' in het woord 'Fiksch'".
Contemporary '-s' spellings can be found in Van Steyn's periodical, and in
Marin's dictionaries. The latter includes such double entries as "menschen of
mensen; tusschen of tussen" as well as entries with just 's' such as "vis,vissen".
He also uses the '-s' in such as "historis of historisch", Halma has only 'sch'.
Paralleling this 's' spelling are a few comments that 'sch' must be used in these words despite the pronunciation with /s/. This is true for example of Schutz, Winkelmaas, and later Stegenbeek, whilst Sinkel was almost sarcastic about Moonen's arguments for 'sch', which had called upon the pronunciation.

In much the same way that Winschooten, 36 years before, had presented a dual picture, with 'sch' pronounced /s/ in some positions and /sch/ in others, so too does Zeydelaar in 1769. But whereas Winschooten's variants are different words - e.g. he hears /s/ in "vissen" but /sch/ in "menschen" - Zeydelaar hears the difference according to the position in the word: "'Sch' klinkt op het einde der woorden als ene enkele 's', voorbeelden 'mensch, wensch'... spreekt uit 'mens, wens' &c. 'bosch-schaadje schrijft ik met tweeaal 'sch'', whereas in the plural "verkrijgt 'sch' uederon haare natuurlijke bloasing". This implies a slightly different situation from that described by Winschooten. Unlike the latter, who had wished to anticipate future pronunciation changes in his spelling, Zeydelaar wished to preserve the 'sch' in all positions, because of its full realisation in the inflected forms. Zeydelaar actually contradicts himself here, since earlier in his book, when discussing 'ch', he writes that "'ch' klinkt op 't einde der woorden veeltijds als 's'", as could be heard by comparing "lesch/les, wasch/was". Van der Palm on the other hand considered that the dropping of '-ch' in any position, "schoon zulks van vele onkundigen geschiedt... zoude tegen den aert der Woorden en de rechte uitspraak stryden" (I.23).

In his edition of Kramer's grammaar in 1774 Von Moerbeek still describes a contemporary split between spelling and pronunciation ) "...wird sehr oft ein Buchstab oder Sylbe am Ende eines Worts weggenommen oder ausgelassen, ohne Apostropho, als: 'Hollands, Frans, Spaans' &c., 'Mens ... Vlees, Vis' &c ... an statt 'Hollandsch, Fransch, Spaansch' &c., 'Mensch ... Vleesch, Visch' &c. ... diese Figur ... findet wohl Statt in reden, doch sie wird im schreiben bey wenigen guten holländischen Schreibern gefunden" (p.121). It is interesting that he regards the loss of /ch/ in speech as equatable to the loss of a syllable (his other examples include "seg(ge), vou(de), Sus(ter)"). But despite his qualification about "guten holländischen Schreibern", his vocabulary lists several alternatives such as "dis, disch; visch, vis; tusschen, tussen; assche, asse, as". On page 235 he is much more tolerant of the 's' spelling - "Die
hochdeutsche Endylbe "=sch" oder "=sch" ist im holländischen "-sch", und
bisweilen "=-s", als ... 'Aerdach, aards,... Frans, Italiëans, Hollands, Spaans'
dc.". The "Nuttig en Noedig Speldboeke" of 1775 (3rd edition) uses only "-s".

Usage in the South was just as variable as in the North. Janssens has a
very erratic record with "Vlaams, vlaamse, Hollands" alongside the more common
"Fransche, menschen" etc. A quite radical plea comes in 1785 from the anonymous
"Inleyding...". Despite its regular use of "-sch" in inflected forms such as
"Vlaamse, tusschen", the writer feels that "ons dient de CE te vlugten, soo
veel als bestandig is, waarom reeds verschesyde Hollanderen en andere schryven:
'Roomse opperhoofd, Romyyns Ryk, Henols gezang, hels gebroed', schoon zy deze
Letters plaatsen in 'Roomse Opperpriester, Romysche Kroon, Henolischen zang,
helchen geest' etc. He does not say where he has found these particular
examples (they coincide with Zeydelaar's system) - had he seen them in some
religious work as suggested by the examples, or was he just using religious
examples in his grammar as was a common feature of such education at that time,
especially in the South. He does however record it as a Northern phenomenon,
and C.W.Holtrop similarly records it as happening "beneorden den Rhijn", and not
to be emulated.

Yet despite all these arguments, only two years after the "Inleyding" Stijl
has nothing new to say when he writes that "Bosch, bos, bus" zijn onderscheiden,
'Een bosch' wordt met bomen beplaat; 'bos' is een bundel, 'bus' een arnbus" -
he is evidently referring only to the written forms - if the fricative were
pronounced there would be no chance of confusing "bosch" with "bos" (cf Sewel).
An apparently hypercorrect, and most unusual spelling is found in Van der
Voorst's essay in 1780, using "thansch"; this seems to be very rare, and no
d examples are forthcoming in W.N.T..

Some grammars were still claiming that only /ch/ was heard at the end,
notably the "Trap der Jeugd" of the Nut in 1793 (2nd edition): "van meelijye
of bijzondere uitspraak: aasch, schrikt, diisch". Whether this implies that they
pronounced /sch/ depends whether "-sch" is "meelijyke" because of the awkward
/sch/ pronunciation, or "bijzonder" because the "-ch" was not pronounced;
"schrikt" is clearly in the former category. In the Nut's later works (e.g. the
Rudimenta of 1805) a more orthodox (Siegenbeek) viewpoint is put forward: "men
Six years before Siegenbeek Chalmot's "Biographisch (sic) Woordenboek" (1793) had been the vehicle of many individual spellings, including the consistent replacement of final and medial 'sch' by 's', as in "Hollands, Nederlandse, gants, Leidse" and even "Europise" (p.xv). Siegenbeek in his turn acknowledges the pronunciation as /s/ but, like Huydecoper, he cannot bring himself to approve of it, and certainly will not countenance the '-s' spelling. In his "Verhandeling over de invloed der welluidendheid op de spelling" (1804) he writes that an 'e' is needed so much between final 'sch' and the suffix '-lijk' "dat men zonder dese lve ter nauwernood deze woorden zuiver, d.i. met bescheidelijke uitdrukking van de samengestelde klank van 'sch' kan uitdrukken"; as in "Gantschelijk, menschelijk". And on page 223 he states that "vergeefs" is "eigenlijk een tweede naamval,... doch als bijvoeglijk naamwoord (vordert het) den samengestelde klank van 'sch', als 'vergeefsch moeite'". Despite the established '-s' spelling throughout the 13th and much of the 17th century Siegenbeek cannot accept it as a cultured form: "Men vindt vooral bij vroegere schrijvers, in de verbuiging wel eens, oversaamhostig de dagelijksche uitspraak 'aardse, grootse'; doch deze schikking naar de spreektaal werd in den schrijfstijl, sedert lang, met regt verworpen". Like earlier grammarians he does not seem to condemn the /s/ pronunciation as such, only the '-s' spelling.

With the acceptance of the Siegenbeek spelling the death-knell was sounded for the quite common '-s' spelling, which now had the official seal of disapproval on it. Bilderdijk warns against a possible spelling-pronunciation - "men moet ... 'wenschen' (niet) uitbrengen 'wen-schen' met den klink die 'sch' in 'schaap' of 'schip' heeft" (Spkl.50) - but he too considers the 'ch' a useful addition to the 's' to show "wanneer zij (de) middelbare scherpte te boven zou gaan". By this latter he probably means that the 'ch' in "mensch" is a useful indicator that the plural is /mensen/ and not /mensen/, with the 's' not changing to 'z' (see chap.11). In his "Voorlezing" (p.192) he expresses a preference for '-s', but accepts the '-sch' spelling because it is...
standard usage, though recognizing that the \-'ch\' is now no longer needed to strengthen the 's' in this way, since the roles of 's' and 'z' are now well-defined and distinct.

Smits did not agree with such a view: "Ofschoon 'sch' of 'sc' in de goede uitspraak van de enkele 's' onderscheid wordt, vindt men ze somtijds verkeerdelijk gebezigd" (p.53), and he explains their use. He agrees with Siegenbeek's statement that the full pronunciation as /sch/ is better. The spelling 'sc' which he mentions is in line with his theory that the 'h' is as unnecessary in 'ch' as in 'gh', and as the latter is now simplified to 'g' so should the former be simplified to 'c' (see chap.3). He is also one of the few grammarians to give a separate name to the combination 'sch' (see chap.19).

A modest plea for the \-'s' spelling is contained in Bomhoff's essay of 1347. The \-'sch' was used by Siegenbeek originally to show that the final 's' was kept hard in inflection cf. "mens(ch)/mensen, - huis/huizen" (excluding loan words such as "kans", not spelt "kansch"), but this use, claims Bomhoff, is now forgotten, resulting in spelling-pronunciations, "zoodat men op vele scholen de woorden 'mensheid, de barbaarsheid' enz. hoort uitspreken als zeide iemand 'men schijt, de barbaar schijt'", for which reason he would prefer the \-'s' spelling; Siegenbeek's "gevleeschd" he calls a "wanspelling". Although he did not consider himself a radical in the spelling reform field, he is aware of the imperfections in Siegenbeek's system, as well as conceding that a perfect system is an impossible attainment. Siegenbeek had actually published in 1336 an open letter warning against such spelling-pronunciations, including /banch/ for 'bang', and /mensch/ for 'mens(ch)', which seems to contradict his statement of 1304 that /sch/ was the purer pronunciation. This warning did not have totally immediate effect, since Bomhoff is writing eleven years later!

Nor did the warnings against spelling-pronunciations reach all grammarians, especially those outside Holland. Ahn's "Holländische Sprachlehre" of 1329 was aware of the situation: "Am Ende eines Wortes oder in der Mitte lautet 'sch' fast wie ein 's': 'visch ... wenschen' spr. 'vis, wensen'", though he expressed no desire to see an \-'s' spelling. Nor is it clear what he meant by "fast wie ein 's'", though it is possible that he was merely being cautious, not wishing to sound too progressive. The English translation of his grammar by Laun in 1362
disregarded Ahn's original statement and put the traditional view: "'g' has a more
guttural sound than the hard English 'g', whilst the 'ch' is sounded still more
guttural and somewhat sharper:... 'visch, schip...". This view was shared by
another contemporary grammar of Dutch for English speakers, Van der Fyl's
"Practical Grammar" in 1319: "'Sch': the sound of this combination of letters
cannot be described in English:... 'Schoon, Malsch, Grootsch, En-gelsch'". The
"revised" edition (even the misprints are the same!) of 1373 and 1333 says the
same. In 1354 Gooshoff repeated his earlier plea: "Het is grootelijks te
bejaamoren dat bij het regelen der spelling deze 'ch' niet als overtallig
verbannen word, dan zou ons oor niet zoo dikwils met zulke barbaarsche klanken
worden gekwetst" (p.36), which implies, unless he is merely carrying forward
his earlier plea, a continued tendency to spelling-pronunciations in the manner
described by the grammars above.

In 1353 another foreign grammar, that of Gambs, compromised with a theory
reminiscent of those of the previous century: "'sch' = 's-ch', wobei 's' immer
allein für sich lautet, b.v. 'fransch = frans-ch, schotel = s-chotel"(i.e. it
was not the same sound as the German 'sch' = /s/)....Anm. Wird das Wort mit
'sch' Auslauf durch einen Vokal verlängert, so hört man nur 's', b.v. 'fransch
= franse" (p.6). This is directly opposite to the claims of Zeydelaar and the
"Inleyding" that '-ch' was silent in final position but reappeared in inflexion!
As far as Gambs is concerned, in accordance with Siegenbeek, the /s/
pronunciation is "nur für die tägliche Umgangssprache".

De Vries and Te Winkel, as would be expected from their historically
motivated system, kept the 's-ch' system, but conceded that "wasschen, flesschen,
visschen' enz., eigenlijk hetzelfde is als 'wassen...". Te Winkel's "Leerboek"
states the case more fully: §.236: de 'ch' is stom achter de echte 's', in het
midden en aan het einde der woorden: b.v. 'menschen, tusschen, visch, valsch,
worden uitgesproken als 'mensen, tussen, vis, vals'. §.237: Het uitspreken der
'ch' is in dit geval een verkeerd en leelijk aanwensel, dat geheel strijdig is
met de beschaaerde uitspraak". An "echte 's'" is one which does not change to
'z' in inflexion - the 's' in "huis" is really an unvoiced 'z', so that the
first paragraph in effect gives the same rule as Bilderdijk, that the 'ch'
shows that the final does not become 'z' in inflexion. This has nothing to do
with an etymologically based system, except that the obsolete pronunciation with /-ch/ was the cause of the final '-s' not changing to '/s/' in inflection. This was therefore reversed, and instead of '-ch' causing the non-change of '-s', the non-change of '-s' now caused the '-ch'! A number of exceptions also complicated the picture: "bits, spits, kras, roos" as adjectives should have had '-sch', and "vleesch" (cf. "vleesen, vlezig") should have had '-s'.

Just how much the '-ch' was regarded as an atrodded appendage can be seen in the plural formation. Here the '-ch' was totally ignored when the '-sch' came after a short vowel, and the '-s' was doubled as appropriate according to the normal rule, the 'ch' being then reinserted to the middle of the word, giving such as "visch, visschen". As a double '-s' is never pronounced /z/ the argument of Bilderdijk and others could not be applied here and the 'ch' is superfluous, except on etymological grounds. The official Te Winkel view was naturally adopted by all school grammars, such as those of David, Renier, Beers, and by other works such as Oosterzee.

Critics were not silent however. Taco Roorda had rejected the De Vries / Te Winkel spelling on the grounds that "de 'ch' wordt in de hedendaagsche uitspraak weer weggelaten" in such words as "jaarlijksch". F.C. de Greuve could not accept this criticism as validly affecting the spelling: "Dit moge hier en daar zoo zijn, maar een fijn oor zal het onderscheid merken b.v. tusschen 'lans' en 'gansch', 'bossen' en 'bosschen'. Dat echter de 'ch' weinig gehoord wordt b.v. in 'mensch, mensen' en als einduitgang van een woord niet moet worden uitgesproken, als stond er '/s/', of niet zo scherp als in het begin van een woord, b.v. 'schoon, schip', dit behoort tot de uitspraakleer" - i.e. whether /ch/ was heard after the /s/ was totally irrelevant to the spelling! His statement is also at variance with Te Winkel's comment that it was a "stomme 'ch'" (see above). His claim to hear a difference between "bossen" and "bosschen" rests largely on autosuggestion.

The first extension of the attack on the '-sch' spelling from grammars to the literary world came in 1862: "de etymologische spelling van de 'sch', die sedert Pontus de Huijter weinig opzettelijke bestrijding gevonden had, werd in 1862 aangevallen door Multatuli". This rather sweeping claim by De Vooys in his "Geschiedenis..." ignores the certainly "opzettelijke bestrijding" by
Winschooten and Van Belle, but is otherwise true. In the later editions of "Max Havelaar" Multatuli had, amongst other changes, simplified all 'sch' spellings in medial and final position to 's' (e.g., "mens, mensen"). As he also wrote in his "Deëën": "Roep eens: ‘geloof me o mens...CH! zo’n mens zal wat geloven, ja, maar hy zal niet u geloven. Hy zal geloven dat ge een vervelend mensCH zyt"

(No. 45). He was to find a strong echo in the proposals of the Kollewijn simplification movement: "De stomme 'ch' (vervalt) in Nederlandse woorden ...
'vis, dorseen, morse, Hollandse, Fransel'. Amongst members of this "Vereniging" views differed on the degree of radicality desired: a full conversion to '-s' was pleaded for by Jan te Winkel, Huisman, and Uraaf, though the latter opposed 'ies', Sloet wanted to abolish 'sch' except for the differentiation of adverbs and adjectives, and Schumann wanted to simplify the spelling to 'sc'. Amongst literary figures the Kollewijn spelling was supported by Van Ostaijen (a quite radical supporter, using inter alia such forms as "desember, ekilibrist, sent" as well as '-s' forms). Even Gossijn, who strongly opposed many of Kollewijn's theories (De Gids, 1895), approved of the abolition of final '-sch', though he was uncertain about '-ies' (see also below).

This was one of the very few Kollewijn reforms which found any semblance of approval from Van Dieren, who felt the adjective/adverb distinction pointless: "Hier voel ik wel iets voor; Multatuli is er trouwens reeds mee begonnen den staart van 'mensch' en 'visch' af te hakken; het enige bezwaar is, dunkt me, dat in sommige streken van ons land en ook in Vlaanderen deze lettercombinatie nog duidelijk uitgesproken wordt; heël veel gemak zal mijns inziens het weglaten voor ons niet meebrengen. ... Wat er ook besloten worde, in ieder geval zal het verschil dienen te verdwijnen, dat geheel onnodig tusschen de op een sis-klank eindigende bijvoegelijke naamwoorden en bijwoorden kunstmatig is tot stand gebracht; als zulk een verschil noodig was, dan had immers iets dergelijks bedacht moeten worden voor bijvoegelijke naamwoorden en bijwoorden, die niet op een sis-klank eindigen. ... Het verschil (tussen ... 'dagelijksch' en 'dagelijks') moet opgeheven worden. ... De uitgang 'isch' dient veranderd te worden in 'ies', verbogen vorm 'ise'" (pp. 21, 243, 247).

The differentiation of adjectives by means 'isch' with adverbs having '-s' had been very strongly defended by Siegenbeek, and by De Vries and Te Winkel
(see above). The opponents of this usage pointed out (often fruitlessly), like Van Dieren, the limited nature of its applicability— if it can only be applied to adjectives ending in 's' it cannot be claimed to be vital; even for these words it was not applied consistently—"spits, kras" did not have 'sch' even as adjectives, and "frisch, holsch, homesch" kept the 'ch' even when used as adverbs.

Notable amongst the opponents of the Kollewijn reform were the writer and critic Scharten and the linguist Van Ginneken. Scharten regarded the abolition of 'sch', especially within the word, as undesirable—firstly because the fricative was pronounced in many dialects (West and East Flanders, West Friesland, with /sk/ in some areas, e.g. the coast of Holland), and secondly because "het verschil tussen 's' en 'sch' hielp ons in het gevoel-krijgen voor bijvoeglijk naamwoord en bijwoord; er was daar een dwaas en kras rijtje uitzonderingen bij ... in welke taal zijn er zoo geen?". He gives the impression (akin to the feeling of the notorious Monsieur Jourdain in Molière's "Le bourgeois gentilhomme", on realising that all his life he had unwittingly been speaking prose) that without the difference between 's' and 'sch' he would never have realised that adjectives and adverbs were different word-classes! Not content with keeping it in such cases he also wished to introduce it where it was not already present,—if the spelling 'ie' were introduced for the suffix '-isch' "kon ook daar in het bijwoord de 'ch' zeer goed vervallen, zodat men 'praktisch' consequent tegenover 'prakties' krijgen zou". There are few precedents for the introduction of such a linguistic class-marker into the normal spelling system, but it is notable that he did actually welcome the use of '-ies' in adverbs such as "prakties, histories", which was much more radical than the later simplifications of Marchant and the Woordenlijst allowed (q.v.).

The motives of Van Ginneken and his supporters were not quite as understandable. Firstly they disliked the anomaly of "Duits" alongside "Pruisisch" (why not "Pruisies"?); secondly, the fricative was pronounced in Flemish dialects, and finally "woorden op 'sch' doen anders aan, dan die op 's':... met 'mens' zal een associatie met 'pens' nu veel gemakkelijker worden ...

Voor forsche woorden hebben we graag een forsch woordbeeld. Bij woorden
als 'men, fles, vla, boss, bos', enz., zullen we die voortaan moeten missen"
(Van Vierlo, Onze Taaltuin III, 51).

Possibly even stronger for Van Ginneken was his main driving motive - European unity: "De '-ies' schrijving van het juist in een ontelbare menigte van internationale woorden voorkomende algemeen Europeesche achtervoegsel '-isch', beteekent eenvoudig een Chineesche-muur-isolement. Alle talen van Europa, zonder één uitzondering kennen dit suffix, dat daar overal met een 'c' of 'k' of 'ak', 'ak', 'ac' en nergens met een louter 's' wordt geschreven, of (gelijk in het woord 'fransch') dan ook niet meer als dit suffix wordt gevoeld. Zie, dat is het weer zoo echt Holland op zijn smalst en op zijn malst".

The most thorough critic of Van Ginneken was Gerlach Royen, who delivered an incisive attack on this argument: "Dat de Staatskommissie van 1916 met Van Ginneken erbij, eveneens Holland op zijn smalst vertoonde, zal denkelik een donkere bladzijde blijven in de geschiedenis van onze spelling. ... Zeker, '-ico' of '-isko' is werkelik een idogermaans achtervoegsel; maar dit suffiks heeft natuurlik in elke taal zijn eigen verloop gehad, en het behoort allerminst tot de wezenheid van een suffiks, dat het na vier of vijf millenniaan nog de voor ieder kennelike sporen moet dragen van zijn herkomst.

"Toen men in het Goties 'mannisks' schreef, was dat omdat het oergermaanse 'manniskaz' zich zo gewijzigd had. In het Duits schrijft men 'datselbe' voord 'Mensch', en niet meer 'mennisco', zoals het nog in het Oudhoogduits luidde. In het algemene Nederlands ging de verandering nog een stap verder, en werd het 'mens'.

"Nu zal toch niemand verlangen, dat alle germaanse talen dit woord nog op z'n Oergerraaans zouden spellen, zelfs niet vanwege de taalpolitiek. Want dan zou een andere politikus een nog hogere troef kunnen uitspelen en de indogermaanse vorm op '-iskos' verlangen. ...Als de Italianen 'francesse' spellen, en de Spanjaarden 'francés' en de Provençalen 'frances'... waarom zouden wij dan geen 'frans' mogen hebben. Zeker de Zweden en Denen schrijven 'fransk', en de Polen 'francuski', en de Bulgaren 'franski'; terwijl de Russen 'francouskij' spellen, de Tsjechen 'francouskij', de Albanezen 'frantsustschje', de Engelsen 'french'" (Romantiek, p.127ff). There is really little appearance of "Europeesche saamhorigheid", or at least so little that even some of Van Ginneken's close
associates could not agree with this theory. Overdiep felt "anders dan hij ...
... over de rolging van 's' en 'sch', maar hun syntactische functie van
bijvoegelijke dan wel bijvoegelijke dekaming. Zijn opvatting in dit opzicht
lijkt mij voldoen in strijd met o.a., de door hem verdedigde 'phoneenspelling'"
(Onze Taaltn I, 59). It is also difficult to see how an 's' spelling could
harm the (Jubious) "unanimity" of "c's" of 'k', of 'sk, sh, sc'!

The minor and unorthodox reform proposals of Dixi in 1934 also affected
this spelling. Not only did he adopt 's', but also proposed that "De uitgang
'lisch' in de officiële spelling wordt in ons stelsel 'is' ... Men schrijve dus
'ípis, grafîs, logîs, praktîs', ënz." (In inflexion the accent was dropped -
"úpis", - p. 11).

But when the Marchant spelling was introduced it went halfway along the
road of Kollewijn: "'Sch' wordt alleen daar geschreven, waar de 'ch' gesproken
wordt: 'schip, vis, mens'. Echter behoudt de uitgang '-isch' de thans gangbare
spelling: 'Belgisch, komisch'". No justification was proffered for this
exception, and even in the "Populaire toelichting bij de nieuwe spelling" Heeroma
could not resist mentioning this inconsistency: "'Logisch' heeft een onlogische
'isch'. Dat komt, omdat de uitgang 'isch' van Duitse herkomst is en de
ministers willen graag, dat je deze indringer direct kunt signaleren, waar hij
ook gaat of staat. De minister van Justitie heeft er weliswaar van afgezien
om 'sinjer 'isch' als ongewenst vreemdeling over de grens te zetten, hetzij
omdat de diplomatieke verhoudingen met een bevriende staat het niet toelaten,
hetzij omdat de minister van Justitie het zelfs niet kon, ook al was hij
minister van Justitie, maar toch moet 'isch' hier voorlopig nog het pakje van
zijn vreemdelingschap blijven dragen. Misschien, dat hij later eens voor
naturalisering in aanmerking komt, als hij zich netjes gedraagt en nog
Nederlandse wordt..." (p. 27-28).

The Woordenlijst of 1954 follows this usage but does not discuss it in the
section on Dutch spelling. In Rombouts's reform plan "de uitgang 'isch' vorst ...
... niet langer 'n uitzondering wat de 'ch' betreft, maar wort, zoals bij
Kollewijn, 'ies'". And Verschueren's "Konsenswente Progressive Spelling"(K.P.S.)
likewise suggested that "De uitgang 'isch' wordt 'ies (-ise)'", as also did
the V.W.S. with their "Doelmatiger Spelling" (D.3.), in wanting to "afschaffen
overbodige letters", proposing that "'ch' in 'isch' wordt '-ies, -isℰ'".

The first official step in this direction came in the "Rapport" of 1967:
"De commissie stelt voor deze uitgang volgens de regel van de spelling voor het
fonce /ie/ als '-ies' te spellen; dus 'belgies(e), prakties(e)'". This was
welcomed by the progressives - "Al diegenen die in hun lessen met de spelling
van het Nederlands te maken hebben, (zullen) alleen maar dankbaar zijn. De
gedachten gaan hierbij bijzonder uit naar de spelling '-ies' in plaats van
'-isch'" (J. Schoon in Levende Talen, April 1967).

But then with the appearance of the later "Eindvoorstellen" (1969), C.
Bruyskamp raised objections. "De schrijfwijze '-isch' is een in ons
spellingsysteem geheel op zichzelf staand grafem dat juist daarom geen enkel
kwaad kan doen; de combinatie '-ies' daarentegen komt in allerlei posities voor,
be克莱mteende en onbeklemteonde, en het gebruik in een nieuwe positie kan alleen
tot verwarring leiden. Bepaaldelijk geldt dit voor de vele gevallen waarin een
't' voorafgaat, als in 'drastisch, mystisch, poetisch'. Immers dararnaast staan
zeer vele meervouden van woorden op '-tie', die dan '-ties' krijgen, en daarmee
zouden zamenvallen met de uitgang '-ties', die nu '-tisch' geschreven wordt.
Tegenover de woordparen 'statisch/staties' (als in 'kruiswegstaties', en het
zelf. 'staties' = 'stations'), 'erotisch/emoties, ethisch/concreties', zou men in
de 'progressive' spelling krijgen 'staties/staties, eroties/emoties, eties/
concreties': ... Een soortgelijk geval is 'logisch/logies' (- Fr. 'logis')"
(Levende Talen March 1969).

To this could be answered that 'qu', 'ph', 'ae' etc. are/were also an "op
zelfstaand morfeem, dat juist daarom geen enkel kwaad kan doen" (this is
in fact Koonen's argument for keeping 'qu'), but more to the point would be the
fact that the resultant homography of "staties" is due to the inaccurate
(i.e. not accurately representative) spelling of the '-tie' suffix, and is not
the fault of the '-ies' for '-isch' reform. The present situation has two
inaccurate spellings - 'isch' (for /ies/) and '-tie' (for /tsie/ or /sie/),
whereas in a radical spelling reform these would become respectively 'ies' and
'(t)sie'. Kruyskamp's objection is thoroughly valid however in pointing out
that in order to be able to fully implement the conversion of '-isch' to 'ies'
a simultaneous or prior conversion of '-tie' to '(t)sie', as proposed by some
Kollwijkers, Rosboula, V.W.S., Verscheuren, and to a certain extent in the 1967 Rapport (see chap.14), must be implemented.

Other variant usages

-s, - esse: This spelling is of the same origin as the double 'ss' before a vowel, as described in chap.17 (e.g. "herssens"), namely to ensure an unvoiced pronunciation of the 's'. The spelling "Franse" for example could easily suggest /z/ at a time when the relative values of 's' and 'z' were far from finally fixed. Similarly if 'df' were dropped from the ending 'isch' a doubling was often felt necessary in inflexion - 'isse', though 'isse' is also known from an early date (see above). No grammar has actively supported this spelling, and it seems to be restricted to the later 17th century and the early 18th century. The first noted instance is in the "Oprechte Haerlemse Saterdaegse Courant". In the passages from 1666 quoted by Haje ("De O.H.C en Michiel de Ruyter") the following forms can be found: "Engelsse, Engelsse, Britannisse, ververssen", alongside a number of '-s(e)' spellings; 'ach' is only found in "tusschen" where it is used consistently.

The first grammar to use these forms was Winschooten, though he only mentions them as a possible future trend (see above). He uses "mensselijk, wenissen, vereissen" etc., but always has a single 's' in adjectives - "Hollands, Hollandise" etc.. A similar usage is to be found in the poems of Broekhuizen, for example in the line "De forsse Leeuw der dieren Vorst, ontwaekt het bosch met moedigh brullen" (Kragenzang, 1712 edition). As he uses "bosch" alongside "forsse" and also "bossen", he would seem to contradict the statements of his contemporaries that the fricative was heard within the word but not at the end.

Amongst the more consistent users was Ludolf Saids, who in his "Schatkamer der Nederlandse Oudheden" of 1711 regularly uses such forms as "Griekse, Hollandise, Nederlandse", but keeps the suffix 'isch' in such as "historisch". He is thus less radical than the Haerlemse Courant. An isolated "fransse" can also be found in the introduction of Kramer's dictionary in 1719.

One of the last mentions of this spelling comes from Tuinman, who, as noted above, included "'ss'...verssenen!" amongst contemporary variations. The doubling of the 'ss' in "versse" is much more common than in such as "Hollandsse"
and other adjectives, and is really more akin to the "kanssen" type of spelling where 'ms' does not replace 'sch' but a single 's'. Luyken for example uses it yet never has '-ss-' in the adjective ending. The true '-sse' adjectival ending still survives in use by De Deckere in 1315 (fransch, fransse).

It is noticeable that of these users all except Broekhuizen and Kramer (in whom it is moreover exceptional) consistently use the letter 's' for /z/ as well as for /s/, and would thus need to use the double 'ss' here. It is distinctly possible that a number of the other 's'-for-/z/ spellers at least occasionally used these '-sse' forms, though certainly not all did so. Pars and Leydekker for example always used the simple '-s, -se, -ise' forms.

-s, -ssse: Essentially a minor variation of the latter spelling this is to be found used by Zoot in his "Digtwerkken", with "spaansse" on page 297 alongside "Nederlandse, Engelse, Roomse", though the latter is amended to "Roomeze" in the 1714 edition. It is a hybrid of the '-sse' system and the '-sz'-for-'ss-' system (see chap.11), cf "tuszen".

-se, -sghe, -sg: This spelling, akin to the initial spelling "spoon" etc. discussed earlier, is not used by the same people. From the early 13th century onwards such forms as "tusghen, bosghe, mersghe, driesghe, maeqhen, eyqen" as well as "boschqhe, drieschqhe, merschqhe" are known, albeit rarely (recorded by Hoebeke, and Van Loey's ZWBr.). Final '-sgh' is also known in the 14th and 15th century, though this is even scarcer, and Hoebeke records only 'riedmersgh'. He has no examples of initial 'sg(h)-' from the same source.

Nothing more is heard of these early spellings until the mid 17th century when Leupenius moots them only to reject them: "'menschen, schaapen' dat men quaklyk soude schryyen... 'mensgen, sgaapen'" (see above). As his mention of "schaapen" predates the earliest known example of initial 'sg-' it is possible that he had not seen either form in practice. He may merely be copying the comment of Van der Schouwe to the effect that "tusschen 'g' ende 'ch' dit onderscheyd is, dat de 'g' nimmermeer in een Sillabe de 's' en volgd, gelijk 'ch' menigmaal doet". Alternatively it is possible that both writers had indeed encountered such forms.

Neither Winschooten nor Duikerius mention these forms, all their examples
being for initial 'sg-'; Bultakarius and Nager both use the simple '-se' suffix.

It is not clear whether the misprint in the title of Hexham's "A copious English and Netherduytch Dictionarie" of 1660 is nothing more, or whether the typesetter did indeed know of such forms. The other editions are normal.

One of the only two references to actual existing spellings of this sort comes from Tuinman, when discussing Middle Dutch usages: "De ouren schreven 'diefven, briefven,...sechghen...meinsghen'... 't geen den grond schynt te loggen tot 'mangen...'", though such "wanschepzels (zijn) nu te recht buiten boord geworpen". It is strange that he regards this as a "wanschepzel" however, as his comment that "'goon' drukt (het geluid) beter uit" than "schoon" (see above) is only six paragraphs earlier. The inference is however that he did know of such spellings, though not necessarily contemporary.

This is even more explicit with De Neckere, almost a century later, who gives several spelling variants "sonder dat het oor daer entrent eenig gevoelyk verschil kan, of soude kommen waernéen, als syn B.v. ... 'duytsche, diutsche, duytage'"(p.4). Although no such contemporary spelling has been located outside this comment it may well have existed as a Southern usage, where it could bear some relationship to the 'sg-' spelling mooted by Janssens (see above).

-s', -se: Cosijn, in De Gids (1895 III,73) puts forward this strange spelling as a compromise mooted by a contemporary: "Dr J.M. Hoogvliet ... stelde voor dat samengestelde letterteeken (ch)... door een apostrof te vervangen bij wijze van grafmonument: 'mens', mens'en, dors'en, heers'en' enz.". No other reference to such a suggestion has been located, nor has the ultimate source.

-z, -ze: This is closely related to the use of 's' for /s/ (see chap.11), and must not be confused with the use of final '-z' in "huiz, huizen". In fact these two spellings could never be used together, since the "huiz" type is only used by those who spelt "huizen", which would not be a feasible spelling for those who used 's' for /s/.

It should thus be no surprise that the first to use the spelling "menz, wenz" was the first to argue for the use of 's' for /s/ and 's' for /z/; namely De Hubert. Having done this he took the logical step, given that final 'sch' represented /a/, of using 'z' there too: "'ganz' met een' 's'", on datman seii
'Den gansen dag' as compared to the noun 'mans' met een 's', om dat men in 't voorvuld saith 'de gansen'. It is in effect a quite regular gelijkvormigheid spelling in both cases, producing the forms 'wenz, menz, hebrewsz, Nederduitsz, Fransz' and even 'tussen' (cf chap.11).

Not all users of the 'z'-for-/s/ system did the same however, and both Aszing and Leupenius preferred '-sch'. The next recommended use of final '-z' in this way became a major part of a furious polemic at the turn of the century. When Cornelis Van der Linden, preacher "aan de Leidzendam" published his work "De Wijsen van Oosten binnen Jerusalem" early in 1696, Rabus, then editor of "De Boekzaal van Europe" gave it a passing mention, as was his custom with new books which he did not think merited a full review; and he added that "Het gene deze schrijver in zijn voorrede van de Nederduitsche taal spreekt gaat by my niet door". Exactly what he said is not known as the work in question cannot be traced.

Van der Linden was somewhat annoyed by Rabus's comments (and also insulted at not getting a full review for his books "die 't beter waardig zijn dan een Verhaal van Kromwols bedrijf en regering" which had occupied 11 articles in the Boekzaal from January 1695 to July 1696!), and attacked him in the introduction to his next (and equally untraceable) work "Troostreden" in 1697. Rabus was in turn inflamed by this and wrote a full but wildly scathing review of both books in the Boekzaal of July 1697, attacking principally their style, language and spelling rather than the content. As a result of this Van der Linden published in 1698 (about March) his "Rabbelary van de rabbelende Rabus" attacking the latter, which was immediately countered by Rabus's pamphlet "De schaantalooze Leidischendamsche Broer Knelis" (an allusion to a blood-and-thunder Flemish monk/preacher of that name). This he seems to have circulated free with the March and again with the May parts of the Boekzaal (see op.cit. March and May 1698, p.369, 553).

What had most annoyed Rabus was in part Van der Linden's predilection for divisions and sub-divisions of every paragraph: "(hij) maakt den lezer baloorig met niet meer dan 20 zijden vol van de gemelde l.2.3. en a.b.c op a.b.c. zoo deel-zugtig is de Schrijver"; in part also his over-use of the
expletives "Ja, Immers" etc., and in part his over-use of capital letters, in
"zelfs de woorden 'In, Uit, Op, Van, Al, Een, Haar, Hoe, Voor, Na, Nu, Dan, Med' 
(voor met) en duizend andere" (of the passages quoted from Van der Linden in
earlier chapters, e.g., chap. 6). But largely it was Van der Linden's
"allerminzelijke Nederduitsche spelling" which annoyed Rabus, and of this
principally his use of single vowels in open syllables, and of the 'z' "tegen 't 
algemeen gebruik, voor 'ss' of 'sch', en aan 't eind der woorden gezet; dus
schrijft hy 'Nen, Nenzen, Toetz, Toetzen, Elz, Eizen, Ganz (voor 'gansch' of 
'geheel') Joods, Prinz, Hebreez, Griekz, Plaatz' en 'Oudwrijze'" - note that all
are instead of '-sch' except in 'Prinz, Plaatz, Toetz'. Especially the form
"ganz" seems to have aroused Rabus's ire: "laet hy zig scholen gansche gesmaakt
te hebben tot Ganze, als of hy, die meer verstand van henen, eyeren, en ganzen,
als van taal heeft, een gansche vergadering (Troostreden p.13) wilde noemen een
ganse vergadering. ... Ja! (ik zoude dat 'ja' van hem wel leeren) de gansche 
Hemel (p.70) een ganze Hemel; der mate dat hy hem selven in eenigen deele als
een andere malle Frans schiebt te willen aantasten' - i.e. preaching to animals 
('malle Frans' = St. Francis of Assissi). Rabus's final advice to the preacher is
"Schoenmaeker blijft by uw leest", which is somewhat unfair since Van der Linden's 
spelling constitutes a system in many ways more consistent than Rabus's.

As a preacher Van der Linden may well have read De Hubert's psalm translation 
and its preface, and there found inspiration for his spellings of the type
"menz", but their spelling systems differ radically in other ways, and influence
on any large scale is unlikely. There is also a considerable time gap of 70 
years between their works, though as Van Hoogstraten refers to De Hubert's work 
in 1701 it is quite possible that Van der Linden should also know it.

Van der Linden's followers deviated slightly from their model's tenets, for
in the "Lof-Reden op Piet Rab" the forms "Engelse" (and "huiz") are used instead.
Van der Linden had defended his own spelling in the above-mentioned "Rabbelary", 
saying that "De Woorden, in welke de 's' niet Swaer genoeg is in 't Meertal, 
Vereizen een 'z', als: 'Kansen, Kranzen, Danzen, Franzen, Roosen, Spiezen'; en 
Daarom moet men ook in 't Meertal der selve een 'z' gebruiken, en Schrijven 'Kanz, 
Krans, Danz, Franz, Rooss, Spisz'" (p.43).

That the whole affair was largely a matter of conflicting personalities, and
reciprocal antagonism and prejudice is suggested by the fact that Rabus reviewed Van Alkenaede's "Kampregt" and his other works without mentioning any of the odd spellings to be found in them. Van Alkenaede's spelling of '-sch' did not deviate from the norm in most books, though 's' is found in "Nederlandse Displegtheden, Kampregt, Rotterdamse Heldendaden", and the occasional '-ze' form can be found in the "Hutten" (e.g. "Hollandize" p.63), though the latter is exceptional.

The third and final certain user of this system was Overschie, between 1715 and 1735. In his "Oiwd Biws" in the latter year he consistently uses such forms as "aardz, Latynz, glanz, vleez, helzen, ganzen". The earlier dating is due to his use of the same system in his earlier work "An 't Hooft der Land-Foëten onser lyd, Raybert Korn." Foot" written in "1715 à 6" (sic!). This places the conception of Overschie's spelling system very near to the time of Van der Linden's writing (though the latter died in 1712), and may indicate some continuity of usage throughout the early years of the century. After Overschie's work such spellings have not been encountered again.

-ze: This spelling is caused by analogy with the system for "huis, huizer", though it raises a question as to the actual pronunciation heard in "Engels, Engelze" etc.. The use of this '-ze' is already seen in the mid 17th century, but may bear little relationship to the orthographically similar but differently generated '-ze' form of De Hubert et al.

The first mention in a grammar comes in Hillenius 1664 edition (only):
"(variations occur) by leaving out, or taking away a letter, or syllable from the midst of a word, - as 'silbe' for 'sillabe';...'Zeeuse, Hollandze, Engelze, Duitse, Uitheemse' for 'Zeeusche' &c.". Though based on the comment in Van Heule 1633 mentioned earlier, the spelling is different. The editions of Hillenius in 1677, 1678 and 1686 have the normal "Zeeuse " etc.. The forms are actually known from earlier years, mostly but not exclusively in non-literary texts.

A very good example of this is the "Hollanditze Mercurius". This magazine presents a varied picture of contemporary spelling, and amply reflects the lack of uniformity; but any attempt to correlate its spellings with other contemporary tendencies is risky, since the phases which it goes through are
best described as whimsical. "Hollandes" for example is spelt (to the despair of library cataloguers) as "Hollandes, Hollandits, Hollandtse, Hollandts, Hollanditz, Hollants, Hollantsze", without any pattern. Typical is the year for 1661 where the title page has "Hollantsches Mercurius"; the first page title reads "Het twaelfde deel van den Hollantsche Mercurius" and the page headings read as follows: "Hollants" pp.2-5, 11-14, 17-19, 21, 23-24 etc.; "Hollantsze" pp.6-10, 15-16, 20, 22, 25, etc.; 'ze' is the commonest form until 1677 when with Abraham Casteleyn taking over the printing from Pieter Casteleyn, the spelling became a uniform "Hollandes". Very conspicuous by its absence is any spelling with '-sche' on the page headings of either printer, though it does occur, very rarely, on the volume title-pages, as noted above for 1661. In this context at least the comment of De Vooys (see above) would appear to be something of an understatement.

One contemporary literary text showing these forms is Dullaert's "J.D. Karel Stuart" of 1657, which contains the spellings "Roomze, onderaartse, binnenlandze, aardze" (recorded by Weijnen p.15, though since he does not record the uninflected forms, it must be presumed that they were '-s', since '-z' would have merited comment). No trace of such spellings appears in other editions of Dullaert's work, and the 1719 edition has no unusual usages at all (it is possible that Van Hoogstraten had edited them out).

Sporadic instances of '-ze' can be found, rarely used consistently. "Engelse, Nederlandse" can be found in Zoet 1675 (p.299 ff.), "Engelse" in Van Helder, "Katwykze" in Pars 1683, "duitze" in DemElger's "Zinnebeelden", "Egmondse" in Eikelenberg 1739. Heugelenburg uses "Hollandse, Nederlandse" alongside "Nederlandse" but all other words have '-sch' ("menschen" etc.). It may be recalled from chapter 11 that Heugelenburg also spells "plaats, plaatzen", an exactly analogous phenomenon (q.v.). The spellings "engelize, lasaryze" are also recorded as contemporary by Tjinman in 1722 (see above), but the usage did not last much longer after the time of his writing, and no further examples have been located.
Summary

Chronology: -sch, -sche

Middle Dutch: 'sch', occasionally 's'
1500 - 1650: 'sch', occasionally 's'
1650 -: 's' more common in popular prose
1650 - 1854: 's' gets more support in grammatical works, such as Winschooten, Smids, Van Belle, Bomhoff.
1854 - 1862: Siegenbeeck establishes 'sch' as normal; popular 's' less common, but more attacks on 'sch'.
1862 - 1925: Multatuli, followed by Kollewijn, fighting for the 's' spelling.
1935 - 1956: Marchant abolishes 'sch' except in 'isch'. Woordenlijst has same usage.
1956 - 1967: Rombouts, W.S. etc. fight for 'ies'; Rapport introduces this.

Grammars recommending or using 's' (sometimes with 'sche' in inflexion):


Post-Marchant defenders of 'ies':

Dixi, Heeroma, Rombouts, V.W.S., Bindvoorstellen

Recommenders/users of 's, -sche':

Haerlemse Courant, Winschooten, Smids, Kremer, De Neckere

Recommenders/users of 's, -sche':

Zoet

Recommenders/users of 's, -sche':

Hillenius (1664), Dullaert, Zoet, Beugelenburg, Hollandae Mercurius, (Pars), Den Elger, Elkelenburg (the latter erratic)

Recommenders/users of 's, -sche':

De Hubert, Van der Linden, Overschie

Users of 's,-, -sche':

Middle Dutch, Dukkerius, Najer (Janssens, De Neckere)

Critics - Van der Schuere, Leupenius, Winschooten, E.C.P.; Tuinman, Ten Kate, Van der Palm, "Inleyding", Mulisch

Recommender of 's', -s'e':

J.M.Hoogvliet

Writers using 's,-, -s' (occasional users in brackets):

(Middle Dutch), (Huygens), (Bredero), (Van Engelen) (De Ruyter), (Ponteske), (De Docher), (Luyken) Van Alkemade, Pars, Chalmot, Multatuli.
The spelling 'ti', in the suffixes '-tie, -tion', where it is not pronounced /ti/, occurs only in loan words. As until comparatively recently the usual method was to leave loans as near as possible in their original native spelling, the majority of earlier grammarians do not discuss this particular spelling. But since these words include many which have been in use ever since the Middle Ages it would unreasonable not to expect a certain amount of variation in spelling.

In Middle Dutch the normal form was '-ti-' with a high degree of consistency but with a substantial minority of '-ci-' spellings applied with the same consistency by different writers. It would appear that the two spellings have their origin in Latin and French respectively, i.e. "conscientia, gratia" are influenced by Latin "conscientia, gratia", and "consciencia, gracie" by French "conscience, grace"; either spelling is justifiable in Dutch.

Hoebeke records "consciencia" in the 14th century, "audița" in the 15th, "consciencia, gracie" in 1291, and many other examples (e.g. "condicie"). Salverda de Grave, in his discussion of loan words from French, does not discuss this spelling, but words noted in his examples of other spellings include "alliantia, abondantia, kwitantie; accitance, allianse; kondoleancie, defaillancie, assurance; destourbanche", giving quite a variety of forms (some of them from later dates). W.N.T. gives "nacie" as the most common spelling for that particular word in Middle Dutch, and in 1435 the Ghent translation of Boethius has exclusively the '-ci-' system, apart from in one position; thus we find always such forms as "execucie, sciencie, iusticie, ignoracien, Boecius", and the exception constitutes words containing the combination '-cti-' which is always spelt thus. The reason for this may lie in the printing of ligatures in the type involved - 'c' and 'i' are usually joined in a ligature in the suffix, though not in other positions ("sciencie, paciencia", usage in "Boecius" varies). In '-cti-' the 'c' and the 'i' ligature takes preference over the ligature of 'c' (or 't') and 'i', since a threefold ligature is not possible. The spelling '-cci-' does not seem to have been considered (they are not unknown - Bredero uses "coreccy", and see Gelliers and Cramer below), even though this would have had the support of 'cc' spellings in such words as "accident". The '-ci-' spelling is restricted to French loan words in this book, '-ti-' being retained in Latin words (e.g. 'consolatione').
Other printers were not so rigorous — the William Caxton edition of Boethius in 1431 reads "Boecius de consolazione Philosophie". No difference in pronunciation is likely to be concealed by these two spellings.

"Although it is probable, as stated above, that the '-ci-' spelling is due to French influence, it is not noticeably more common in southern works than in works from the North. The Antwerp jurist and purist Jan van der Werve uses '-ti-' but Cornelis Cruel, also from Antwerp, regularly uses '-cie' in the early years of the same century. Coomhert's "Voorreden" of 1568 uses '-ci-' in most words "conversatie excellencie", but wavers in the word "natie" spelt with '-ti-' for example on page 13 & 14, and with '-ci-' on page 13. Plantijn and Killen both use '-ti-'.

Minor variants from this period include "correxie" recorded by Verwijs & Verdam, and "correcxcie" used by Everaert.

From the beginning of the 17th century comments begin to appear on the pronunciation of these words, there being two accepted pronunciation still today - /si/ and /tsi/. Not all of the comments are unambiguous however, as will appear. Van der Schuere gives the pronunciation as /c/: "Wanneer 'ti' een sillabe maakt, ende de volgende sillabe in 't zelve woord met een klynk-letter begin, ('t welk alleen in uythemsche woorden geschied) zoo heft de 't' daer een kracht ende klang in 't uytgespreken als oft een 'c' waer". It is possible that by /c/ he means to indicate the pronunciation /ts/ often represented by 'c' (see chap.2). Dafforne in 1627 prefers to say that 't' has "de kracht van 's', blykende in 'Portie, Spatie'" (p.122), objecting to Van der Schuere's use of /c/ since it could equally well suggest /k/ to an inexperienced reader. For the reasons stated in chapter 2 it is also possible that Van der Schuere used /c/ rather than /s/ because 's' sometimes represented /z/, and the sentence he uses would be read giving 'c' its alphabetical name of 'cee' (pronounced /se:/), indicating the sound he wishes to hear. Neither Van der Schuere nor Dafforne wish to change the spelling. A later writer who also gives the pronunciation as /c/ is Duikerius. Bredero (or his printer) has a varied usage, with "nacy, reputacy, rekreatie, scienty".

The first grammar to moot a possible change in the spelling is Van Heule in 1633, referring to "...'Conscientie', daer wy volgens onze tale, zouden konnen schrijven ... 'Konciencie'" (p.144). This comment is preserved in Beyer, using
"Konciefij" (p.105), but is omitted in Hexham who notes instead "that 't' coming before 'i' is pronounced as 'c'; Example 'conditie', condition, pronounce it 'condicie'; 'sortie', portion, as 'porcie" (first page of the grammar). Note that he does not consider this a possible spelling (unlike Van Heule). Just as unambiguous about the pronunciation as Dafforne is Montanus: "De Stofmerking der uitheemse woorden geschiet schier altijt nae den Oorspronc; als ... 'natie'... voor 'naasie'... en in 'gratie' (bedeut) de 't' een 's" (p25). This is a clear statement that etymology should overrule pronunciation.

But whereas the choice between '-ci-' and '-ti-' was relatively straightforward for men of letters it was not so easy for less well educated writers, and phonetic spellings with 's' often occur, for example, in De Ruyter - "nasye, predycasye, declymasye, pasenysye". He also occasionally uses the equally phonetic 'ts' forms such as "vysytatyey", though spellings such as "Hoeuneryakys; haeckxayen" for "Mauritius, action" are less easily defensible. Of other variants the 'g' spelling discussed in chapter 2, with its possible representation of /ts/, is found in such words as "stagy", used by Anslo (Klioos Kraam II, 16). Van Helderen's claim that "'tie' luit als 'sie'... schrijft 'grasi" (Kort-schrift-boek, p.14) is probably not the plea for spelling change which it seems as he is discussing the use of the special characters in his short-hand alphabet, not in the everyday system.

The '-ci-' spelling is now quite uncommon, and is defended by none of the contemporary grammars, with the natural exception of words which had 'c' in Latin such as "provincie" (this is the system followed by, amongst others, Vondel and Meijer). It does however appear to have been in continued use throughout the 17th century, since it is given(or used) by some grammars in the early years of the following century. De Vin (1716) uses "porcie, instrukcie, and Kramer's grammar of the same year actually gives this spelling as the norm: "Die Endsylbe 'enzi' ist (in Hollandischen) 'ance' oder 'antie', als 'Abondance, (Abondantie), ... Die Endsylbe 'enzi' ist 'encie' oder 'entie', als: 'Audiencie, Audientie' &c, ... Die Endsylbe 'ion' ist auf Niederdeutsch (!) 'cie' oder '-tie', oder 'issie', als: 'Abbreviacie, Abbreviatie; Actie; Affectie; Alteracie, Alteratie; Assignacie, Assignatie; Citacie, Citatie'". He gives no examples of the '-issie'
alternative, and it is interesting to note that he gives no alternative forms for the words containing '-cti-', recalling the similar exception made by the Ghent Boecius (see above). It may be assumed with a certain degree of certainty, given the usage of De Vin, that this was indeed still a contemporary spelling, though this does not necessarily hold for the later editions of the grammar (e.g. 1744) which still contain this comment! His dictionary similarly contains such forms as "negociacie, naciën".

Sewel's revision of La Grue in 1719 records three different spellings, though they are not the same as Kramer's three alternatives: "le 'ti' (se prononce) comme en François & en Latin: 'oratie'... lisez 'oracie'; 'predikatie'... prononcez 'predicacie'. Il y en a qui écrivent ces mots & semblables par 'ti', d'autres 'ci', & quelques-uns 'tsie', comme 'predikatie, predikacie, predikaatsie'". Note that to all three he ascribes the same pronunciation, and is concerned only with the variation in spelling. The form "predikaatsen" is used by Nyloe, e.g. in his book of sermons, where it constitutes the plural of "predikaats" (sic) to be found on the table of contents; "staatsi" can similarly be found on page 39. This dropping of the final '-e' is uncommon. Langendijk's use of "predikaatsje" to rhyme with "glaasje" (in "Remedie tegen de dronkenschap") is probably a diminutive rather than a further alternative for '-tie'. The joint influence of eminent figures such as Moonen, Huydecoper and Wagenaar, using '-tie' made other variants noticeably less widely used. Moonen recognised the pronunciation "als of 'er ... 'tsie' geschreven is" (p.12), but did not wish to alter the accepted spelling.

As has been noted with several spellings in other chapters, many grammars did not think it necessary to discuss the spelling of foreign words, in this case a foreign suffix, yet it still comes as a little surprising to hear Van Belle's reasons stated so blatantly — "TI Behoort niet tot het Nederduits, en behoeft derhalven in eene Nederduitse Spraakkunst niet verklaard te worden; ten waarde men voorhad eenen volkomen Lyst van de uitspraak aller vreemde Letteren te maaken". As so many very common words were involved it is strange that he should consider their spelling outside his terms of reference. It is possible that a puristic tendency underlies this, as is shown even more strongly in the
later words of Zeydolaar — “De ’tie’... (klinkt) in die woorden als ’cie’; dus sprekt men uit ’oorasie’. Edén alle deze ón dergelijke woorden behoorden uit onze Taal’, gelijk de Jesuiten uit Spanjen, verbannen te worden! Most people were not as radically puristic as these however, and the use of both the words and the spellings continued unabated.

Gelliers, recalling the statements of Van der Schuere and Duikerius, tells his readers that “’tie’ komt van ’t Latyn, Leest als ’cie’ = ’Correctie. Exousatie Gratie Penitentie’ Leest ’Correctie Exousatie Gratie Penitentie’”. But Bastiaan Cramer reads two pronunciations into the spelling variation: “De ’t’ wordt in bestaandwoorden als ’c’ of ’s’ uitgesproken (does he mean /ts/ or /s/?, or two ways of spelling /a/?, bij voorbeeld: ’oratie, gratie, satisfactie, correctie, predikatie’, enz., welke woorden men iets scherper uitspreekt (/ts/?)) dan ’oracie, gracie, satisfacce (= ’satisfaccie’), correctie, predikacie’, enz. Doch te schrijven ’provintie’, voor ’provincie’, is niet goed, als komende datwoord van ’provincia’”. He too kept ’-ti-’ as the preferred spelling. Remarkable is the insinuation at two spellings for two different pronunciations — “oratie” (“iets scherper”) and “oracie” (quoted from the 1394 edition, 1777 is similar).

Van Rhyn gives the pronunciation as only with /s/ in 1753 (p.19) but Ballieu (1772) gives it as “een sterke ’s’”, probably meaning /ts/ (cf. chap.11). The Dutch-French dictionary of Winkelman in 1733 enters alternative spellings for many words, e.g. “quitance of quittanie”, yet lists only one form for “natie, provintie” — the latter being the more exceptional as it disregards the often stated derivation rule mentioned by Cramer. The only other user of ’-tie’ in this word to have been noted in the texts consulted was Smyters in 1613 who uses both ’-tie’ and ’-cie’.

Bolhuis (1773) not only recognizes only one spelling he also recognizes only one pronunciation, attributing the ’-tie’ spelling to foreign influence along with all spellings using ’c, q, x, y, ph, th’ — “De uitgang ’tie’ (klinkt) als ’tsie’: ’satisfactie, oratie, notitie, administratie, navigatie’”. This comment is in full agreement with the second edition of the Hut’s “Trap der Jeugd” published in the same year — “Als de woorden met ’tie’ eindigen, spreekt men die eind uit als ’tsie’... schoon deze ’e’ er niet staat”. The later similar work by Varick
Wester also keeps the now almost standard spelling 'tie' although, like Bolhuis and the Nut, recognizing the pronunciation as "naatjiaal, administraatsje" etc. It is noticeable that the number of comments on this spelling begins to rise about the second half of the 13th century. This probably reflects not only a puristic move against the variety of spellings and pronunciations in such words, but also a growing awareness of the place of these and other loan words in normal Dutch. Unlike Van Walle, these later grammarians clearly did consider the discussion of the spelling of loan words relevant to a discussion of Dutch spelling.

Siegenbeek gave the official blessing to the 'tie' spelling, though for rather conservative reasons - "... daar zij anders een wanantallige aanzien verkrijgen". This remained the standard spelling until the end of that century, when the first opposition began to appear. Some Southern grammars do not give the pronunciation as the Northern /ta/, but as /s/, e.g. Renier states that "'t' luidt als 's' in 'natie, statie'", though he has no objection to the fact that the spelling is therefore non-phonetic. L te Winkel also gives the pronunciation as /s/, but Bomhoff reaffirms that 'tie' is normally pronounced in standard (Northern) Dutch with /ta/; the latter too has no desire to adapt this spelling to the pronunciation.

The first attack on this spelling came from some of the more radical members of the Kollewijn reform movement, wishing to see the introduction of the more phonetic forms 'sie' or 'tie'; it did not however constitute a part of their official "Voorstellen". Nevertheless the fact that some of the members had supported this move made it a target for criticism from Van Ginneken as late as in 1931. Scharten was also opposed to such a change, feeling that "Een groot aantal monstra ontstaat vooral door het 'tie' dat als 'sie', 'tie', of 'psie' moet worden uitgesproken. Primarily however, he is opposed to the inconsistencies not to the spelling of the suffix itself, as seen in such semi-Dutch "monstra" as "konkurentie, redakte, auktie, koncientie, koncert" - "het zijn of 'redakte' of 'redactie'". He accuses the proposers of such hybrid spellings of a "verbijsterende willekeur, die de zonderlingste regelingen van De Vries en te Winkel evenaart". He does not seem to have been in principle against this
particular reform. Wille however, another critic of the more radical Kollewijners was opposed to these forms (see chap.3). Since the official proposals of the Kollewijn movement did not touch this spelling it is not strange that the spelling of Marchant in 1935 left the '-tie' intact. Similarly the Woordenlijst of 1954 rules that "'tie' in woorden als 'advertentie, attentie', blijft" - it had not been within their terms of reference to consider this change, and it was not one of the most keenly sought reforms.

One of the stranger suggestions for the spelling of this suffix came in 1934 from the anonymous "Dixi": "Voorts vervangt de 'c' in ons stelsel de 't' der bestaande spellingen waar deze in woorden van vreemde oorsprong ook als 'c' wordt uitgesproken: 'administraci, advertenci, agitaci, ambieci,... stacion'. Bij al deze en dirgelijke woorden staan we voor de keus tussen 'c' of 'ts', die beiden in de beschaisde uitspraak worden gehoord. Bij enkele, zoals 'ambieci, iniciatief, naci, staci', zal men allicht aan de 'ts' de voorkeur geven; de spelling is dan 'ambietsi, inicietsiatief, naatsi, staatsi" (p.17 - cf. Nyloe's forms). Exactly what sound he claimed for 'c' is difficult to establish - here it seems to be /s/, yet elsewhere he argues for the restoration of 'c' where radicals suggested 's', "overeenkomstig de uitspraak", suggesting that 's' was unrepresentative (cf. chap.2). Even less orthodox is his suggestion for '-ctie' which, in line with his ruling that "m'n schrijve ëck voord zo kort mogeleg" becomes 'x', as in "anxi, reaxi, sanxi, sexi" (cf. chap.16).

After the decision against change taken by the Woordenlijst of 1954, Rombouts was one of the first to renew the demand for this reform, though he is aware of some of the difficulties involved: "Wellicht is op geen enkel punt de eenhijt zo moeilijk te berijken als op dit. De moeilijkheid schuilt hier echter minder in de spelling dan in de uitspraak... In et algemeen schijnt er 'n tegenstelling te bestaan tussen noord en zuid: in et noorden bij voorkeur de 'ts'-vorm, in et zuiden... de 's'-uitspraak... Hoe et zij, de vigerende spelling: 'gratie, attentie, vakantie' is voor bijde partijen onvoldoende: voor et noorden zou et moeten zijn: 'graatsi, attentsi, vakantsi', voor et zuiden: 'grasi, attentsi, vakansi'... De 's'-spelling (verdient) de voorkeur... omdat ze, wel voor et grootste deel van de Dietse bevolking, voldoet aan de spellinggrondwet: 'schrijf wat er klinkt'... Wi per se 'polietsie' wil zeggen, kan dat even goed doen bij
de spelling met 's' als bij 'di met 't'"- i.e. with the 's' spelling the pronunciation of over half the speakers is accurately represented, and the others are no worse off than with the '-tie' spelling (p.109).

Verschueren agrees with this proposal in his reformed spelling, the rules of which are given in his 1961 dictionary: "27. 'ti, tie' gespro. 'sii' of 'tsi' = 'sii': 'administrasi, assi'". The WJS and Wellekens also wanted change, the latter mooting "reaksi". But the government "Rapport" tried to compromise with the proposal of two spellings: "De commissie stelt voor 's' te spellen na 'k' en 'p', maar overigens geen wijziging aan te brengen; dus 'konstruksie, absorpsie', maar 'abstinentie, politie, station", - i.e. where only /s/ is possible spell 's', where either pronunciation is possible retain 't', which, as pointed out by Rombouts, fits neither pronunciation. The intention was probably to offend neither body of speakers by suggesting that the others' pronunciation was more acceptable than their own. The later "Eindvoorstellen" made no amendment to the "Rapport" on this, and the "Aksiegroep Spellingvereenvoudiging 1972" accepted this compromise system.

A reform of this spelling could be of great effect in no longer hindering the simplification of the anomalous spelling '-isch' to '-ies', since with the present spellings a simplification of '-isch' alone would result in such homographic pairs as "staties" (stations) and "staties" (static) - see chap.13.

**Summary**

Usages and users mentioned above:

- **-tie** Middle Dutch, Van der Werve, Plantijn, Kilian, Van der Schuere etc.
- **-by** Bredero
- **-nie** some Kollewijners, Scharten, Rapport
- **-eye** De Ruyter
- **-zie** Kramer
- **-taie** La Grue/Sewel, Kollewijn
- **(-tajje** Langendijk)
- **-teye** De Ruyter
- **--tie** Nylot, Dixi
- **-ei** (Van Helderen), Rombouts, Verscheuren, WJS, Wellekens
- **-ae**
- **-ce** these Middle Dutch spellings probably represent a French pronunciation
- **-che**
- **-tie** Middle Dutch, Boecius, Grul, Smyters, Van Heule, Vin, Kramer, La Grue/Sewel, Cramer, Winkelman
- **-ey** Middle Dutch, Bredero, Beyer
- **-y** Anslo
- **-ci** Dixi
Chapter 15: 'w'

-\(w\), \(-u\), \(-m\) in final position
-\(uw\), \(-we\), \(-ewe\) in medial position
-\(eew\) in systems where '-uw' is used after other vowels

\(w\), \(u\), \(w\) in final and medial position

The principal spelling concerned here is the addition or non-addition of 'w' at the end of such words as "vrouw, nieuw, eeuw", and its analogous insertion in such words as "behouwden". In the uninflected form the 'u' and the 'w' are not both necessary, but the presence of the glide 'w' in inflected forms - e.g. "vrouw, vrouwen" - analogous to the 'j' in "maaijen", influenced most writers, at least in modern times, in retaining the 'w' in the uninflected form. A large number of users felt this to be unnecessary however, dropping the 'w' in final position. Some conversely felt that it was the 'u' which was superfluous and used just 'w' in all forms, and yet others used '-u' in the uninflected forms but did not add 'w' in inflexion. This latter minority usage is analogous to the now fully accepted spelling "maaien", cf. "vrouwen".

Possible spellings are therefore: "vrouw, vrou, vrow", and the inflected forms "vrouwen, vrowen, vrowen". All of these occur, and the most common combinations to be found are "vrouw - vrouwen", "vrou - vrouwen", less commonly "vrow - vrowen", and much less frequently "vrouw - vrouwen". Each of these combinations can be justified, and has been at various times by some grammars.

Middle Dutch has as its predominant spelling "nieu - nieuwe, vrou - vrouwe" etc., though final '-uw' is not unknown. Variant spellings such as "niewe, niewe" recorded by Van Loey (Sprkk. p.61) probably reflect variant pronunciations. "Niew" can also be found in Middle Dutch, "niewe" for example occurring on page 1 (column ii) of the Ghent Boecius. Van Loey (loc. cit.) also records the similar variants "gra, graeu, graeiu; bla, blauw". It is possible that dialect differences influenced the choice between '-u' and '-uw', for it is striking that after ca.1600 '-u' is largely restricted to the North. Here the Southern tendency to use the longer forms such as "vrouwe" may be instrumental, a good example of which can be seen in "Nog fragmenten van een gesprekboekje" (Van Loey in Revue Belge de Philologie, 1935). This comprises a Northern and a Southern version, the former consistently using such spellings as "vrou" where the latter
has "vrouw". In other texts however, where 'uwe' is not used, 'u' can also be found from the South.

The Exercitium uses only the "graecu - græuwe" forms, as do De Castelein and Lambrecht. The latter has entries in his dictionary such as "nieu oft nieuw; nieuweyt; schui". Beurier (1558) only gives examples of the inflected forms: "Il fiaminesco o Theodaco ritrouasi hauere in molti vocaboli tre vocali consequenti, come in questi & simili: 'couver, vrouwe, vlasuwe, crauuen, vrymbrauwe, urve, baure', quasi che volesse Toscanamente adagio pronunciare 'ca o en, vr o en' &c.". As each of these words has at least four consecutive vowels, even counting 'w' (=w) as one, the "tre vocali consequenti" must refer to the combination 'uwu'. This is the only occasion on which he deviates from the standard contemporary typographical practice of using the letter-form 'v' only in initial position, and 'u' only in medial position (cf. "hauere, ritrouasi"). The use of 'uu' for 'w' seems to be less common than 'uw'.

A little later in the same century Lucas d'Heere and Coornhert both use '-u', as in "vrou, vrouwe". The usage in the latter's "Voorreden" deviates slightly from that used in his Boccaccio translation, and often uses just 'v', as in "howt, vrouwe, vrowelijck, getrowelijken". These '-w(-)' forms are not very common.

Plantijn and Kilian both use '-uw', though in both dictionaries examples are elusive since both prefer the longer forms such as "vrouw, zenuwe"; the uninflected adjectives such as "nieuw" indicate the basic usage. Kilian had a positive preference for such forms, as is shown by the entry "lau . j. lauw" ("i . j. = id est" and refers to the main entry). Plantijn deviates slightly from this system when giving the plural of "zenuwe", with two different forms - "zenuwen, zenuen". This use of '-uen' is very uncommon, probably because of the danger of mispronunciation of the 've' as /ü/ or /v/, though as the use of the digraph 'ue' died out in later years, several grammarians felt free to moot this "vou - vrouwen" system.

The first book to actually discuss these spellings (Meurier is only concerned with the pronunciation) is Sexagius. On page 66 he compares "vrau, trau, baub" and "trouw, vrouw", etc., and decides that it is pointless to have two letters at the end for the /u/ sound (as in "trouw") "quum unicum sufficat". Of such the
same conviction was De Heuiter, who similarly proposed the '-u' spelling in "licia, nius". He extended this, however, to cover the inflected forms, feeling that both 'u' and 'i' was excessive — "Nieuwe, deuwen, vrouwen, buwen, vouwen, bowwen, touwen, bouwen, touwen, vouwen, weduwe", what they do in the middle of words, while 'u'... to the 'o'... to the 'u'... to the 'o'... to the 'u'.... They come from the proper names, and others are thus written... "Nieuw, zouden, vruwen, douwen, rouwen, vouwen, bowwen, touwen, ro Wen, weduwe" (p.8).

The usage in the Twe-spreak is a little irregular, causing Kooiman in his discussion of this book to write that "In the spelling ('eeu' and 'ieu') there were difficulties, which Sp. has never overcome. Sometimes he writes after 'ee' and 'ie' an 'u', and again an 'u', some both letters; such a considerable inconsistency as this with 'au'. Here his examples to decide whether he has a tendency for 'eeu' and 'ieu' to spell. Thus, when discussing the vowels, Spiegel writes that "Even also hoordyse (i.e. the 'a') in 'au' and 'aau', 'ick grau, sman, hau, kau, ghan', and 'blaau, graau, raau, paau'... 'De 'e' during some, hoordy in 'eeu, leeu, schreeu, sneeu'". This affirms the basic intention as being to use '-u', but, as Kooiman points out, other forms such as "niewe, nievicheid, vrou" also occur. Spiegel actually makes an intriguing and deliberate use of this variation in his declension of nouns: "vrouw" is nominative and accusative, "vrou" is vocative, and "Vanden Vrou" is ablative. As he cannot intend that all the examples given above are in the vocative or ablative, this must be acknowledged as an inconsistency in Spiegel's part, unless the irregularity of the whole book, including the declension of "vrouw(u)" is the fault of the printer alone.

The '-u' system is also used by Stevin in his "Sytspraak van de Weerdicheyt..." where he lists "leeu, nieu, vrou" amongst the monosyllabic words. Other users from this period include Van der Noot and Valcoogh. But by now, the end of the 16th century, the '-uw' system was becoming more widespread, though it is difficult to say what should have caused this increased popularity. Users of '-uw' from the early years of the 17th century include Van Beaumont, Roemer Visscher (though the pirated edition of 1612 has 'vrou, gau' etc.), and his daughter Anna.

Van der Schuere does not mention this spelling when speaking of "u Va ende Wa",
but when discussing dipthongs and triphthongs his usage is clearly seen as the
older ' -u, -uwe' system: "ieu", ... in 'nieu, hieu' enz, ... 'eun' ... in 'eewdig'
and most tellingly in the table

| baud  | kauwen |
| daut  | dawen  |
| praud | grauwen |
| hauwd | hauwen |
| schauwd | schauwen |

Usage amongst writers/ printers continued to oscillate between the two
systems. Van Borsselen often dropped the ' -w', especially in compound words such
as "blau-geschulde, schoo-spel, meu-boren", as compared to "trouw, dauw" etc.
Sayters uses '-uw' in his Epitheta, but also enters the word "sneeu". Van Santen
uses '-uw', as does Hooft in "Baeto", though his "Achilles" uses '-u', e.g.
"Ioffrou, verkouwen" etc. (from a different printer). Hooft's "Haeremningen",
which may be assumed to follow his own preferences, have only '-uw', as in "gaeuw,
zouw" (the latter in No.14). Coster and Heinsius used the older '-u' system.

The occurrence of "zouw" in Hooft is symptomatic of a not altogether new
trend, namely the addition of 'v' to 'ou, au' in all positions, whether final or
not, treating 'ouw, auw' as a single compound letter, or rather trigraph, for the
sound wherever it may occur. An earlier example mentioned above was "hout" from
"houden" in Coornhert's "Voorreden". With the spread of final '-uw' spellings
this internal '-uw-' becomes a little more common, though it was not used by all
'-uw' spellers. There is also probably influence from such forms as "houwen,
zouwen" where intervocalic 'd' has been dropped.

One of the few grammarians to support such spellings, a little later in the
century, is Van Engelen. He does this because he feels a need to distinguish the
two uses of the digraph 'ou' prevalent in Southern spelling - 'or /au/ or /oe/:
"Aangande de 'O' en 'U' (= 'U') de welke som-wylen oock genomen worden (maar zeer
ouredelyck) al of het een 'A' ende 'U' waar, gelyck 'au-lieden', instee van 'u.L'
want dit is tegenstrydende. Oock'men neeft de 'o' ende 'e' voor 'o' ende 'u'
'goet Hout, bonum lignum', 't kouwder eer eenen 'goten hout, concavum pileum'
ywt verstaan. my dunkt het beter is de 'u' een 'uu' te-galmen als voor een 'au',
ende te-spellen, 'gouwdt, aurum, gout, bonus". Thus, as can be seen in his
spelling "kouwder" (ik zoude er), he is deliberately borrowing the '-uw' spelling
and adapting it to a new purpose. He consequently uses such forms in his text as
"wouwd'ick, het wouwde" etc. It is doubtful if Van Engelen had any influence on contemporary spellings either in this respect or in any of his other suggestions made "Aan den onverdeelden Leser", mostly concerning the use of 'ii' for 'ie' in "niit, ziin, briif, di", and the use of "den" in the nominative.

The '-uw' system was by now just as common as the '-u, -uwe' system: Huygens, Bredero, Camphuysen, Bolsward, Krul, and others use the former, Starter, Revisus, Stalnert van der Wiel, Van Baerle, and just as many others the latter. Huygens also occasionally uses a '-w' system, as in "naw, nieuw" (both in "Scheepspraet") - see also the later section on '-eew'. Bredero and Camphuysen also occasionally use such forms as "souw, wouw", and some of the latter's early works (e.g. "Godt de Wraek") use '-u', as in "getrou". Bontekoe and De Ruyter, in what may be called a typical unlearned literary style, apply either system without consistency.

Amongst grammarians, De Hubert is not concerned with this spelling, but uses '-uw', and Van Heule does discuss it but can come to no definite conclusions. In the first edition (p.4) he mentions the diphthongs "Aeuw...Eeuw ofte Eeu,... ieuw ofte ieu", where he seems to consider the 'w' part of the diphthong (in the phonetic sense - he is not misled by the use of more than two letters). His examples only use '-uw', and this agrees with the listing of '-uw' before '-u' in the alternatives just mentioned. In the 1633 edition however he lists examples (p.9-10) of the various vowels in such words as "anau, gau, kau; blaeu, ...Leeu, schreeu, sneeu; Hieu, nieu", and on the previous page the alternatives are listed as "AEu of AEuw...IEu, of lEuw" and "EEu" with no '-uw' form. This reversal of policy is possibly brought about by a deeper acquaintance with De Heuiter's work and its avoidance of superfluous letters. This would explain the entries in the table "Van de veranderlicke Letteren ... Ooc zo schijnt onder deze veranderlicke Letteren de U te behoren, welke in eenighè woorden in een W verandert als in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leeu en Leeuen of ooc Leeuen</th>
<th>Zeeu en Zeewen</th>
<th>Blaeu en Blaeuen</th>
<th>Hieu en Hieuen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leen en Leewen</td>
<td>Zeeu en Zeewen</td>
<td>Blaeu en Blaeuen</td>
<td>Hieeu en Hieew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leewen</td>
<td>Zeeu en Zeewen</td>
<td>Blaeu en Blaeuen</td>
<td>Hieeu en Hieew</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of "Leeuen" he almost certainly borrowed from De Heuiter, as also the "Leewen" which De Heuiter, however, only uses after 'ee' (see below). Influence from De Heuiter is more often seen in Van Heule's second edition than his first,
and his new system is thus either '-u, -ue' or '-u, -we', as in "Leeu - Leeuen, Leeu - Leeuen", neither of which systems is particularly common. The only exception to his rule is in words containing '-ow-' which are always spelt thus e.g. "vrouwe" (p.53). "Analogous to the "leewen" system is the use of "kojen, hojen" etc. also allowed by Van Heule.

Three grammars come between the two editions of Van Heule: Daferne who uses the '-u, -ue' system (p.33: "'ieu' in 'nieu, schieu, hieu'"); Kemping who does not discuss this spelling but uses "vrou - vrouwe" etc (e.g. line 6); and Plemp. The latter is alone in using the '-u, -ue' system recommended by De Heuiter, and in this he precedes its adoption by Van Heule's second edition. Plemp uses such forms as "warschouinge, nieuwen, brouen, ouwen, stu'\n", all without a '-w-', which he feels to be utterly unnecessary. In support of this he calls on the Latin word "luere", which is not spelt "luwere" even though it is pronounced with this glide consonant; no more should Dutch use this extraneous letter he claims. Although comparing the orthographic conventions of two different languages is a dangerous procedure, this is a very justifiable comment, since, as mentioned above, the '-w' in "vrouwen" is as unnecessary as the '-j' in "maaijen". All that the Bible translators offer on this spelling is a comment on "'boude' et 'bouwede'", which implies a use of '-uw' in final position, since users of the '-u' system would have spelt "boude" - cf. Van der Schuere above.

A few years later Montanus developed his own system for these words. Realising like Plemp and Van Heule that the use of '-uw' is superfluous, he adopts the '-w, -we' system which had been used occasionally since Middle Dutch, e.g. by Spiegel and Huygens, though by none with total consistency. On page 71 he describes the '-w' in the following terms: "Een Platte Staege-uu is een vryklinkende platte en staege lipletter ... in 'sew, leewen, raw'", and on page 75 he explains that "Als men de Woorden in 'u' eindigende verlengt, zoo en geschiet dat niet met 'v', maar met 'w'; als 'weeu/veewen, ic bou/bouwen', en niet 'weeven, bouwen'". He is here demonstrating that the '-u' is related to 'w' rather than to 'v', which explains his inconsistent use of '-u' in the above words instead of his more normal '-w'. On page 26 he admits that his system is less common: "(ic) schrijf 'ooc, now, row': al ist datmen eigentlijker en gewoonelijker zou stellen ...

'now, row'. "Niewe" in the title of his book illustrates his normal usage.
When Hexham translated extracts of Van Heule's 1633 edition in the appendix to his dictionary of 1643, he seems to have modernised the latter's original suggestion of "Leeuwen or Leeuwen", as he now writes that "There is also some change in the letter 'u', which in the plurals is changed into 'w': as in 'Leeu', Lyon, 'Leeuwen', or also 'Leeuwen', Lyons; 'Leeu...Leeuwen' or 'Leeuwen'...; 'Blaeu...Blaeuwen' or 'Blaeuwen';... 'Hieu...Hiewen' or 'Hiewen'". He therefore considers the "Leeuwen" spelling out of date, though not the "Leeuwen" alternative, and this agrees with the usage in contemporary books. His dictionary entries, which rarely abide by the tenets of the grammar, have a consistent '−uw' system.

The other copier of Van Heule, Beyer in 1661, deviates almost completely from his source in adopting '−uw' as an alternative in the uninflected form: on page 123 he gives "nieuwe" as masc./fem. with "nieuw of nieu" as the neuter of the adjective, and on page 111 he writes that "Eenige woorden laten in den Roeper de 'e' bequamelik achter als 'Heere, ð Heer; vrouwe, ð vrouwe'; of noch beknopter, 'vrouw". Van Heule gives only "vrouw" (p.56). When giving the spelling rules he gives the same rule as Hexham: "de 'y' (= 'u') verander in 'w' of 'uw':... 'Leeu, Leew, en Leeuwen'" (p.114); this latter should read "Leeu, Leeuwen en Leeuwen" as the French and English versions show. Corresponding to this system are such spellings in the text as "nieuwe" (p.115), with "des vrouwe" agreeing with Van Heule.

Kok, the year after Hexham, uses the standard '−uw' system, as does Leupenius who, like Van der Schuere and many others, only shows his preference when discussing the diphthongs: "'au' in... 'graauw, blaauw'... 'eau' in 'leeuw'... 'ieau' in 'hienuw', and in the declension of nouns such as "vrouwe" (p.44). This is in fact the most common system to be put forward by grammars from this date onwards, though the '−u, −we' system was far from obsolete. Van den Ende may have adopted the latter system deliberately in his avoidance of "overvloed van lettren", though he may equally well be following tradition. Bolognino does the same in 1657 (pp.22, 31), but Binnart uses '−uw'.

When Vondel changed his spelling system around 1660, the spelling of the words ending in '−u(w)' was also affected. Whereas before this date he had regularly used the '−uw' system, he now simplified this to '−u' in "leeu, sneeu, naeu, vrou, klaeu" etc., retaining the 'w' in inflexion (klaeuwen). Although this does represent a simplification, it is, as noted above, going against the contemporary
trend from ' -u' to ' -uw'. This ' -u' system was also followed by Cats, and these two eminent writers brought about a new spate of ' -u' spellers amongst their followers, e.g. Croom, Brune, Ansclo, Transit (Brune also used ' -uw'). Others continued to use ' -uw', e.g. Dullaert, De Witt, Broekhuisen, Pels, and Kil Volentibus. Luyken, as with most other spellings, follows both systems: "rouw, dauw, hou, grauw", also using such spellings as "voou" (Duitsch Lier p.26).

For Hillenius (like Van Heule who he was greatly influenced by) the forms were alternatives: "'aeu' or 'aew'; or 'asuw', in 'slaew, blaeu, graua'; or 'blaauw, blaeuw, grauw, raaww, Pasaww'. 'ceuw' or 'ceu' in 'leeu', or 'leeuw, schreew, sneeuw', 'ieuw' in 'liew, nieuw', or 'hieu, nieuw" (p.7). The third edition (1670 & 1686) reject the ' -uw' alternative after 'aa/ae'. "Laconis" (1656) uses ' -uw', but Van Kolderen once again gives alternatives: "Zoome die in ' -u' eindigen, mogen in 'uw' eindigen... maar om kortheid laat men de ' -u' agter" (p.6); "mistroug" occurs once in his English grammar, but is exceptional.

The next grammarian to give this spelling anything more than a mere passing mention is Wisschoten in 1683: "Ik soude van gevoelen zijn, dat de W in veele woorden overtollig is, want wie soude niet Icunnen toestaan, dat men voor 'Brouwen, Trouwen', soude noogen schrijven 'Brouen, Trouen', voornaamelijk als agter de U volgde een ander Needeklinker, als 'Broude' voor 'Brouwe': 'Troude' voor 'Trouwe'. Søo speld men (ook)... 'graau, leeu,... nieuw, hieu', en het Amsterdams 'Lieu' voor 'Leeuw'". He would therefore like to see the reintroduction of the ' -u, -ue' system of De Heuiter, Plemp and Van Heule. It would seem however that he had second thoughts on this, since his dictionary the following year has ' -uw' as in "graaw, naauw, sneeuw, ceew".

In the same year as Wisschoten's dictionary La Grue records that both ' -u' and ' -uw' are still current: "'blaauw, graauw, laaww';... qui s'ecrivent aussi 'blaauw', & quelquefois sans 'w' comme 'blauw, graau, laau' on 'blaeuw, graue, laeu". Normally he uses ' -uw' himself, as does the similarly titles anonymous grammar of 1701, subtitled "Grammaire plus exacte...", which, judging by many of the comments in it, was written in competition to La Grue, though this did not prevent the author from copying many portions of his predecessor. Sewel and Duikerius in the North support the now almost standard ' -uw' system, though the
did consider 'u' feasible, though inferior — "men doet altijd best, als die slag
van woorden op haar salven worden geschreven, dat men de 'u' daar agter aan voegt"
(p.12); this also included such words as "son".

The 'u, -ue' system continued in use, for example by Van der Linden and Van
Hoogstraten, the latter both in his edition of Hannot's dictionary (see, nieuw) and
in his own gender list, where the "Berecht" gives the declension "vrouw, vrouwen..."
The actual entries in the list use 'uw' however, e.g. "eeuw, vrouw".

The 'u, -ue' spelling was shortly to gain fresh impetus from an influential
grammar, but before then there seems to have been a short period of popularity for
the 'w, -we' spelling. This is seen already at the end of the previous century
in Hilarides's Phaedrus translation, with such words as "howden, eewen, gebow,
geschreew, leew, wow, sow". It is even used in "nuw" and doubled (presumably by
analogy with "bed, bedden") in "betrowwen, vertrowwen" (cf. De Neckere below).
Similar spellings in his "Taalgronden" of 1705 include "Niewe, owd, bowden". This
spelling seems to have been shared by the printer of the latter work Horreus, for
in 1720 he published Robbert le Canu's "Korte Inleiding, Nuw verbeterd..."
Earlier publications of his (e.g. Josua Placeas, 1703) have normal spelling. A
further example of this contemporary 'w' can be seen in Van Rusting's book "De
gehoornde Duivel" (1704) e.g. "blauw". His "Volgeestige Werken" (1699) sometimes
have this same spelling, though it is here restricted to words with 'eew', other
words such as "trouw, blauw, touw" having 'uw' (cf. below).
Two other users of the 'w' system were the literary friends Cornelis Boon and
Willem den Elger. Den Elger uses in his "Zinnebeelden" (1703) such spellings as
"Leew, bleaw, verflaawing", but usually retains 'u' in "vrouw, vertrouw" (alongside scattered and irregular "nieuw, berou" etc.). Boon, in the introductory
poem to the same work, uses "naaw, nowelyks, flaaw, Leewendaalschen, Goudeew", and
has similar forms in his play "Zewepl" of 1700, from a different printer (Bos).
As the printer of Den Elger's book (Van der Aa) uses "vereuwigt" in his
introduction it is probable that the 'u' spellings were due to both Den Elger
and Boon, and are not chosen by the printer. Major also uses 'uw' (see below).

Just as when Vondel adopted the 'u' spelling 45 years before, many others
immediately followed him, the same was now to happen following the example of
Moonen. It is possible that Moonen was in turn emulating Vondel, as similarly
in his adoption of final 'gh' (see chap. 3), though Lindeboom thinks such a view unfounded, feeling that Moonen was emulating Hooff. It is often impossible to distinguish the two. It is also possible that his source was neither of these since he clearly states in his introduction that "ook staat my ... de Hollantsche Spraekkunst niet te vergeeten van wylen den heere Geeraert Brandt; die, zich niet verder dan tot de Spelling uitzetendende, een taemelyk gedeelte van den inslagh der acht eerste hoofdstukken dezer Spraekkunst maekt". This work (possibly in manuscript) unfortunately proves untraceable. That Moonen was interested in Vondel's views on spelling and language use is shown by the linguistic questions which he sent to Vondel for comment in around 1671. In these he used the 'u' spelling for the most part, alongside "daau, jongvrouwe, eeu" (see below).

In his grammar Moonen now recommends the adoption of this 'u, -uwe' system, and also rejects the 'w' system of Hilarides and others: "In het spellen van 'vrouwe, leeuw, eeuw', &c. is de W overtolligh; en het is hier genoeg, datmen schryve 'vrou, leeu, eeu', maar in het Neervouwige Getal wordt zy'er welluidendheits halve by gevoegt; als men schryft 'vrouwen, leuwen, eeuwen'. En dit geschiedt ook in de Werkwoorden 'bouwen, brouwen, schreeuwen', van de Wortelwoorden 'bou, brou, schreeu' afkomstigh.

"In de Twa of Drieklanken, die met eene U eindigen, magh de W de stede der U niet innemen; als zonder oirzaeke en gront geschiedt, wanneer sommigen voor 'bou, trou, flaeu, nieuw', schryven 'bow, trow, flaew, niew'. De U is een Klinker, de W een 'eklinker, die zonder misbruik hier niet geplaatst kan worden" (p.14). Later, on page 36, he repeats this condemnation: "Met het oogmerk om letters te sparen ... wordt ook van sommigen eene vreede spelling ontrent de woorden met Drieklanken 'eeu, leeu, nieuw, flaeu' en diergelyke ingevoert, als zy die in het Neervouwige Getal dus spellen, 'even, lewen, nieuw, flaeu'". Such a spelling, he claims, is undesirable as syllable division gives "e-wen" etc., which does not represent the true sound (Schönfeld thinks it does, see below). Unfortunately on neither occasion does he name these people he is criticizing, so it cannot be known for certain how widespread the 'w' system was, nor even if he is referring to the contemporary use or the earlier use.

Nyloë agrees with Moonen: "Dat de 'w' in 'eeu, leeuw, nieuw, vrouwe, getrouw', enz. in het enkel getal dier woorden overtollig is, stemme ik ook niet ongearne..."
toe, Schoon is die tot nu toe al toes gebruikt hebben, maar in het meervoudig getal wordt duidelijk gehoord 'eenen, leeuwen, vrouwen' etc. gelyk ook in 'achter, ruw, weduw, schaap', ench dus, dat men in het werkwoord 'hewt' de 'w' wel mag behouden, en schryven 'hy hewt hout; hy hewt een hou in het hout'". This is undoubtedly a response to Moonen, as the comment first appears in the second edition (1707, 1711, 1721)—the year after Moonen—and the first edition of 1703, published anonymously (though Moonen refers to him as the author), not only does not discuss the spelling, but uses '-uw' as he here admits. Dewel realized this influence immediately, mentioning that "'w' overtollig xy, als Nyloë met Moonen toestemt" ('Boekzaal 1707b, 31).

The '-u' spelling now underwent a moderate revival, under the joint influence of Moonen and Nyloë. It can be found for example, as a minor spelling, in Verwer, e.g. "de/het sneeuw (p.16), rouw (p.13), vrouw (p.24), het vroutje (p.64)" etc. Poeret, although defending '-u', adds "maar echter zondigt men niet tegen de zoetvloeiendheid, al doet men 'er de 'w' by". Writers with this system include Van Gaveren (in his editorship of the Boekzaal), Rotgans, Poet, Scherman, Zeus and Hooyvliet ("houen" in Rotgans's "Scylla" is probably a misprint).

Others still continued to use the '-uw' system, e.g. Saids, Pars (also using "wouw, sowuw"), Van Alkemade, Langendijk, and in their grammatical writings E.C.F. Steven, Kramer, De Vin and M.E., the latter with occasional '-w' spellings such as "sow, nieuw, geschrew" (pp.2, 12, 33) possibly influenced by Nager who had regularly used forms such as "getrow, nieuwig, wiglyk, blaaw, leew, nieuw, sow, agost". E.C.F. like so many others merely records the use of "'au' in 'gauw'... 'sow' in 'leusw', 'iaw' in 'nieuw'" etc. Kramer uses only '-uw' but mentions the possibility of '-u' when discussing apocope: "'Naau, U'... an statt... Naauwelyk, Uwe' &c", adding disapprovingly that this practice "finzet wohl Statt in roden, doch sie wird im schreiben bey wenigen guten holländischen Schreibern gefunden". He also mentions '-w' spellings, when, after discussing the diphthongs, he goes on "Es gibt in dieser Sprache und ihrer Schrift einige Triphtongi... als 'sei-, sow-, sow-, lew-, oei-, oeu-', und 'ouw'". This is in defiance of his own system. De Vin's usage is irregular, using "geschrees, Zeus, nieuw" alongside "nieuw, Zeewsw", and only commenting on 'sew-' (see below).
The heax to comment on the correct form for thin spelling was Ten Kate (1.127). He utterly disagrees with Moonen's comments given above, to the effect that 'v' cannot come at the end of a word. But he is not altogether in favour of the 'uw' spelling either: "Het algemene Gebruik van U in stee van W, ten einde eenere Silbe, als ROU, HONYEN, AU, LAAU, EEU, ens. in plaats van RO, HONYEN, AU, LAAI, EEU, ens. kan mijns bedunkens, in 't Critique op verre naa geen proef uitstaan; gelijk ook onze teets aanwijst, als HO-UDEN, RO-W, ens. Want zo OU een Tweeklank is, zo moest hij smijding kunnen verdraagen. Dat de Klanken van RO, HO, ens. op geenen Klinker eindigen, blijkt ontwijfelbaar, als men aanmerkt, dat dit woord, of deene Silbe, op het einde geene heldere en volstrekte verlanging' toelaat, 't welk nogtens alle Klinkers lijden kunnen: én, dat de Heede-klinker, op welken de stuiting valt, een W is, leert zo wel de nart van den Klink als de plaats en manier van de Vorming. Het invoegen van de U tussen O en W, als ROU, HONYEN, ens., scheen minder schandelijck als eenige andere letter, is egter niet vrij van overtoilligheid". He does not mention other writers, or any historical precedent in support of this usage, but does compare his spelling "H0J" etc. with English words such as "law".

One user of 'w' from this period of the century is Van Overschie. He finds himself unable to use 'uw' since it would clash with his use of 'ou' for /œ/ (cf. Van Engelen above), as in "ik dou". Since for the lengthening of vowels he used 'i' (not 'ei') in the manner of some Middle Dutch and 17th century texts, he introduces such spellings as "geboiiw, onthoiwdenhyt, stoiiwt", and in the title of his book "Oiwd Niiv/s". The same spelling had been used in his earlier poem "Aan 't Hooft der Land-Boeten onser tyd, HUYBERT XORII' FOOT" in 1716, and was mocked by many contemporaries, as in the poem "Op de lang oldbacke niw gevonde speulkunst van F.J.V.O.R.O." (...Rechtsgeleerde), by "Enos" and others in the anthology "Achtste Vervolg van de Latynsche en Nederduitsche keurdichten" (1734).

His use of 'w' without a preceding 'u' therefore well predates Ten Kate, and reaches almost as far back as Hilarides and those others mentioned above. There was therefore probably a continued, though minor, use of this system throughout the early years of the eighteenth century.

After Ten Kate however, no other grammarian objected to the now accepted
Van Belle (1743) writes extensively on the subject, quoting and comparing the conflicting views of Moonen and Ten Kate. Like Schagen he compromises: "Zo is't doch best met A. Moonen de U, en met Tenk. voorn. de W daar in te behouden", and thinks the "kleine overtolligheid ... 't geen wel gezaid maar nog niet beweezen is" (cf. Ten Kate) useful to distinguish "'hout' (timmer- en brandstof) en 'hout'; (als van 't Werkwoord 'houwen', 'af of doorhouwen') en in: 'hy heeft eens dögtor behoud' (behoulwykt) en 'hy behoud', (als van 'behouden)". He also disapproves of the intrusive 'u' noted above since early times: "Van owds, sow, ik wou, te spellen, voor 'van owds, ik zou, ik wou', enz. daar nooit, ten minste volgens het algemeen gebruik, eene W in geduld kan worden, wilks is niet van 't oud, maar zeekerlyk wat nieuws, daar ik voor my altans niets goeds in kan vinden".

De Haes voiced the now standard argument for the retention of 'u' - the inflexion in "blaue" was 'e', and in verbs it was '-en', and not '-we, -wen', so that the 'u' must be part of the stem. This is also true of Zeydelaar: "Schreeven (zoals HOOG/LIET doet,) 'eeu, leeu, vrou' &c., dan moest men in 't meervoud 'wen', 'er bijvoegen, om te maken 'eewen, leeuwen, vrouwen', &c., of men moeste goedvinden te schrijven 'eeuwen, leeuwen, vrouwen' dat zekerlijk af te keuren is". As he includes De Heuiter in his appendix on spelling books he may have met these latter forms in that book. Van der Palm, like Zeydelaar, alludes to a continued use of 'u': "De 'w' is ten hoogste noodzakelyk ... hoewel 'er sommige Schryvers, anders zeer kundig, gevonden worden, die, tegen allen grond van spellings, de W uit alle woorden laten, en 'eew, leeu (flaeu, gaeu, nieu, vrou)' schryven" (I.26). He also refers to the use of "eew, leew (flaeu, nieuw)", but suggests that "het gebruik (heeft) deselve niet willen wettigen".

Des Roches and Janssens (both in English and in Dutch) use '-uw', as does Kluit, though he voiced a preference for '-u'. Stijl also held this view, though he rejects the parallel spelling "baaijen" as having a superfluous letter.
could not be used since there is no 'j' in "baai", yet accepting the 'w' in "bedauw, bow" because of the 'w' in "bouwen". He probably merely wishes to reflect contemporary usage. In his commentary notes Bolhuis mentions Ten Kate's use of '-w', and the use of '-u' by Moonen and Nyloë, as many other grammars did.

A further echo of Ten Kate's usage is to be found in C.W. Holtrop's work of 1733: "(or zijn) 2 halve medeklinkers de J (= I) en U; die op het einde der twee- en drie-klinkeren bij lens als J en W klinkt (sic); gelijk blijkt in TOU, LAAW, LEIDEN ... als ...ZOU, IAAM, LEIDEN. Tegen den regel der kortheid (schijft men) ...TROU in sted van VROU, EEGN in sted van KEU, NIEUW in sted van HIEU", even though, he claims, "nieu" would be more in accordance with the pronunciation. He rejects "vrou - vrouwen, schrei - schreien" as causing difficulties with the rules of gelijkvormigheid, since an extra 'w' and 'j' have to be inserted. Thus he prefers "nieuw, laauw" etc. to "niew, laau", but finds "nieuw, laauw" more regular since only '-e(n)' needs to be added in inflexion (p. 7 & 17). A single later example of '-w' ("trow") is to be found in Schwiers (p. 61), but is possibly a misprint since he normally uses "touw, leeuw" etc.

Despite this minority view, the '-uw' system was now accepted unopposed as the normal spelling by the vast majority of grammars, though not always without some hesitation. Siegenbeek was not unduly attracted to the '-uw' spelling - taking into consideration the origin of 'w' as 'vv' or 'uu' he felt its addition to the 'u' in "daauw, row, eeuw, ruuw" to be "wanstaltig". In support of these feelings he quotes the usage of Vondel and others who had rejected this superfluous 'w' in the uninflected forms, which "nog in de achttiende Eeuw bij nette schrijvers niet geheel vreemd is". But since '-uw' was now accepted it should remain so; this is not the only occasion on which Siegenbeek let his ideals be overcome by the weight of "gebruik". In the South this decision was supported by the influential grammar of Behaegel.

Whether reflecting these emotions, or merely considering the two alternatives to be still current, the Nut's "Spelboekje voor Eerstbeginnenden" (4th edition 1808) gives both forms, often for the same word, in its list for "Oefening met twee, dubbele- en drie klinkers", including "nauw, mou, row, stou, pau, leeu,
Taking into consideration the order in this list the first must be "drieklinkers" and the others "drieklinkers", hence the inclusion of both '-u' and '-uw' forms, which must have been far from illuminating for the primary school users of this book within the Siegenbeek era!

In the early 19th century three proposals for reform appeared; all proposed replacing 'au, eeu' etc., by 'aw, eww' etc. The first was Van Daele, who uses "nieuw, eeuw" (alongside "vrouw"), though he does not discuss this system. The second is De Neckere in 1315 who is quite extensive on the subject. On page 4 he lists several spelling "leew, leew, leeu,...vrouwen, vrowen, vrowen, vrowen, vrowen", etc... Sonder dat het oor daer ontrent eenig goeellyk verschil kan, of soude kogen waernomen". This being so (and all these spellings seen to have been encountered by him) he opts for '-u', or preferably '-aw': "AEU of AEU...

Blaeu, Cruve... AU of AU... Paus... Flauw, Flauwe, Blauw, Verblawd,... EEU of liever EEU... Eau, leeu, sneeu... ISU of IEW als Niew, Niew,...OU of OEU...

Vrouw, Vrouwen, Trooven, by Trot, Rowen... In dese laste woorden sluyle ik yit de U die wen hier voor de W pleeg te stellen, om niet te véel letters U op een te stapelen" (p.42-7) - cf Krom's earlier comment. In this usage he was probably influenced by Van Daele, as he was in other spellings.

The third reformer was Smit (1824), who was just as radical as De Neckere. He rejects the superfluous '-ij-' in what he spells as "zajen, koejen", and by analogy also the superfluous 'u' in "lewen, vröwen" (just as Van Heule had done exactly 200 years before, see above); for this latter he has additional support from the words "muy, muy, huw, huvem, huvem, schuwen". By analogy with these he spells "daw, da-wen, hówden, zówen",... inagelijks 'leu, le-wen, snéw, sné-wen; vów, vó-wen, kiew, kie-wen; niew, nie-we". This spelling has one distinct advantage over contemporary use - in such words as "vówen, zówen, gówen", if it was desired to represent the elision of the '-d-' which occurs in speech, the orthographical change is quite regular and parallel:"vówen, vówen, zówen, zówen", where only the '-d' is dropped. In the Siegenbeek system (vouden; vourven) the 'u' has, in addition, to be inserted, thus clouding the true tendency."
Further to these wishes Elector also considered it possible and desirable to spell "uw" when the 'w' drops out of "neduw" (cf. "weesu"), and also such spellings as "zwaal"; "zwaalwen"; zemne; zoonen; zedu; zeevéen; zurrve; nurve; gelin; gezlee; zelme; zoolven" (cf. "zeman" in Plantijn). His main objection to the contemporary spelling, apart from superfluity, is the fact that the sound normally represented in Dutch by 'u' is not present in words ending in '-uw'; instead /oe/ is heard. "Men heelt goede uitspraak in 'doo, lóe, zóe, moe'; maar men schrijft met 'dau, lóé', en men hoort geen 'u'; schrijf dan zo als gij spreekt, 'dau, lóé, zóé, moé'" (p.73). Although his "zwaalwen" forms may be unacceptable (there is however no cogent reason against them), his defence of the '-w' spelling as the simplest, having as it does the backing of two excellent phoneticians Ten Kate and Hontanus, can hardly be rejected out of hand.

Following Siegenbeek's pronouncement that the '-w' is really superfluous a minor argument developed as to whether this was so or not. Oosterzee in his book on pronunciation (1843) argued that "Of men 'leeuw' of 'leeu', 'nieuw' of 'nieuw' schreef, zou in de uitspraak geen het minste verschil maken" (p.21). Bomhoff agreed with this: "Leeuw is een lange tweeklank ... ee + u". On the other side stood Bormans (Belgisch Museum III, p.293) and the anti-Siegenbeek speller Corlebu, who wrote that "De W is tegenwoordig geen overgangsletter, noch is vulka ooit geweest. Wensprekeit in 'vrouw' de W uit".

These arguments had little effect on the De Vries/Te Winkel system, where it was realised that the use of 'w' was really superfluous and, given "braden" without '-j-', ana-salve: "Ten aansien van de verbruigbare woorden, die in de laatste lettergroep den klinker 'u' of een der tweeklanken, 'au, een' of 'ieu' hebben, wil het Gebruik, op grond der uitspraak (nb) en der afleiding, anders gehandeld hebben. Reeds de onverbogen vormen worden met eens 'u' geschreven". This did not apply for "nu, mu", en... overzein 'kou, zou'...en 'heuw', not being included amongst the "verbuiigbare woorden" mentioned above.

A few years previously another proposal for the use of '-w' had come, though this time only in certain words. This was from Van den Hoven in 1344. He felt that "eeuw, vrouw" were acceptable, but not "nieuw, huis" where he felt the 'u' superfluous, using in preference "nieuw, huis". He argues this starting with the
diphthongs ending in '-au', '-ou' - which have 'w' added in "vrouw, dauw" etc., '-eau' then has '-au" per 'analogie de 'anw"", but why this analogy is not to be extended to '-leu' is not made clear, and the latter spelling is rejected in favour of '-iew'. He does actually use this spelling in practice, as in his treatise on "De ververing der ouw- middel- en nieuw-nederduitsche sprake" (1830). It is noticeable that all these early 19th century pleas for '-w' come from Southern writers - Van Dale, De Neckere, Saits, and Van den Hoven, and it is possible that a dialect feature of pronunciation lies behind these suggestions, and behind the apparent anomaly in Van den Hoven (cf. '-eau' below).

There was to be very little challenge to the accepted '-uw' spelling now for almost a century. Hettema defended "tou, eeu" at the turn of the century, but had little support from the rest of the Kollewijn movement. Not until 1934 did any reformer attempt to reintroduce the '-w' system; this was Dixi, who also favoured the '-j-' system (cf. Van Heule and Saits above): "De lange tweedklinken 'aal, eeu, leu, ool' en 'ool' vervallen. Mênu schrijve dus ... 'en eeu lang, óven hêr, leu, lêven, méven die schreven, sneeu, snéven, kieu, kieven, niew, vernieuwen". 'Ouw' is apparently excepted from this, for he does not mention it. He seems to have received no support for this suggestion.

In 1954 the official Woordenlijst felt obliged to dissuade the dropping of 'w' internally: "niet'(hij) brouwt', maar '(hij) brouwt', wegens 'brouwen, brower' ons. ... U-tweedklinken worden vóór klinkers steeds, aan het eind meestal ('ieu' on 'ieu' steeds) met 'w' geschreven"; the 'w' was omitted only in contractions after 'ou' (see De Vries/ Te Winkel above). The dropping of the regular '-u' as described here was fairly common in early times - e.g. Vondel's "verflout" for "verflauwt", and was naturally standard practice for '-u, -ue' spellers.

The first of the post-Woordenlijst reformers, Klîck and Rombouts resurrect the possibility of the '-w' spelling. Klîck spells "trawt, gaw, sGuw" ('G' = 'ch' see chap.3), but Rombouts also considers dropping the 'w' after 'u': "met spellingen als 'nieuw, kieuw, vernieuwing, eeuw, meeuw, geeuwen', maken we ons aan overdaad schuldig: als hier een 'u' staat is de 'w' overbodig, en als er een 'w' staat, kunnen we de 'u' missen. Schrappen we de 'u', dan wordt de schrijfrijke soberder, en natuurlijker: 'niew, benieuw, nieuws, eeuw, leew, lewen, ewig" (p.33). He too makes an exception for 'ou' ('au' is replaced by 'ou'):
"Paus, sau, dau... zullen plaats maken voor 'pou, sou, dou'... Het half-
soortig voorvijes op 'ou-somer'-... noemen we als uitzonderingen... 'sou, sou, 
sou, bou... bou, kakou, kuracou' - i.e. except for 'ou' instead of 'au'
the same rule for 'ouw' as in De Vries and Te Winkel (p. 44-5). On the same page
he goes on further to say "In het Nederlands zijn, afgezien van 'au',
teoretisch nog drie verschillende spellingen mogelijk: 'vrouw' bijv. kan ook als
'veuw' en als 'vrou' worden aangeduid. 'Vrou' geeft de klank niet slecht weer,
maar 'vrou' doet het toch beter". But since the glide '-w-' is heard in the
inflected forms the spelling "vrou" is less desirable and less simple than
"vrow"; yet analogy with the 'u' in "ieu(w) en 'eeu(w)" demands the 'u' in 'au',
thus necessitating both 'u' and 'w'. This apparently anomalous defence of the
'-uw' spelling is only temporary, for Rombouts then points out that if the 'u' is
dropped in all such words - also in '-ouw' words (including what are at present
 '-auw' words), no problem arises: "Dus 'niew, kiew, hiew. Op overeenkomstige
wijze wordt '-eeuw'... tot '-oew' teruggebracht, dus 'eew, leew' etc... 'Niew' is
dan ook de meest efficiënte spelling".

Against the argument that the vowels in "lewen" and "leven" differ, Rombouts
points out that it is merely a consequence of the following 'u', as also happens
for example with most vowels before 'r', e.g. in "veer en veen, in boor en boon" -
the difference is non-phonemic and need not be represented in the spelling (p. 46).
Therefore Rombouts too is in favour of the ' -w' system.

This is also true of the WS, though the latter are not quite as consistent
as Rombouts and have two systems - one with ' -w' and one with ' -u'. The
different function of the two is that no 'w' is added to diphthongs ending in 'u':
"Na 'ou' geen 'w', net zoals na 'ei' geen 'j' nodig is; b.v.: Lou - loute, nou -
nouve". This is reasonable in itself but it would have been more consistent to
bring these words into line with 'ieuw' and 'eeuw': "Overbodige letters zijn
onverenigbaar met het wezen van spelling... 'u' in 'nieuw - nieuwe, leew -
leeuwen, sneeuw - sneeuwen' enz (worden) 'niew - niwe, leew - lewen, sneew -
sneewen'". The WS thus adopts the ' -w, -we' syste when the preceding diphthong
does not end in 'u', but the ' -u, -ue' system when it does end in 'u'. Yet all
the diphthongs "au, ou, eeu, ieu" can be argued to end in ' -u', the only
difference being that the latter two need more letters to spell them: there is
little justification for dropping the 'w' of 'ouw' but the 'u' of 'ieuw, ieuw'.

Modern Afrikaans has a similar split, using '-u, -ua' for all words except those ending with only '-u', such as 'ru, nu, lu', which have 'ruwe, nuwe, huwelijk' etc. There is more justification for this system.

Also inconsistent within this dyadic system is the spelling "ruuw - ruwe, duuw - duwen" - if the 'w' is superfluous after the 'u' in 'ou', then it is also superfluous after the 'u' in "ruuw", and consistency would demand the spellings "ru - rue, du - duen". Much better, as Rombouts (Montanus, Ten Kate etc.) realised, is to avoid these difficulties by adopting the '-w' system in all cases, even though it is slightly inferior to the '-u' in certain words in accurately giving the pronunciation (see Rombouts - "'vrou' doet het toch beter"). The Eindvoorstellen had no recommendations on this spelling, and the '-uw' system remains official.

The spelling '-ew'

There is very good reason to discuss this spelling separately. There is a strong tendency in some dialects to resist diphthongisation in certain combinations ending in 'u'. This often occurs with 'iew': /i:w/, and examples of '-w' spellings in certain words where the writer otherwise used '-uw' almost certainly "vormen aanwijzingen dat voor 'w' geen standdiphongen werden uitgesproken" (Weißen 314), rather than adoption of the '-w' system described above.

This is probably the case with the instance of "nieuw" in the Tweespraak, as the '-w' spelling is only to be found there in "nieuw(e)", and it is probably also the cause of the divergent spellings "neve, niev, nuwe" noted in Middle Dutch. Huygens also used "nieve" almost as often as he used "nieuwe", and also on occasions such forms as "nieu". In the other cases of '-w' spelling noted in the previous section it is almost certainly a question of the application of a consistent '-w' system, though on occasions the motivation for its adoption may well have been the particular manner of speaking of the writer (cf. the different views of Noonen and Ten Kate as to whether the diphthong ended in a vowel or a semivowel/consonant). Van Heule's alternatives "leewen/leeuwen" may similarly point to a different pronunciation, respectively /læ + wən/ and /læ + ə + ən/.
The most common case is however in the diphthong '−eew'. It is debatable whether this is a question of de-diphthongisation, or retention of an older undiphthongised form: "In 't oomf', ontwikkelde zich tussen vocaal en inlautende bilabiale 'w' een 'w'-achtige klank, welk zich met de voorafgaande vocaal tot een diftong verhond; dus k.w. 's + w > ouw; ë + w > ouw > in de jongere taal 'ouw' (geeschr. 'ouw!') en ëm. ai + w > ougm. ë + w > eeuw (ai ausl. 'een', incl. ë met ë in de volgende syllabe); ë + w > insgelijks 'eew'; ë + w > ouw > ouw (brab, holl. 'eouw')" (schrijnfeld). It is not the place here to discuss the extent of use of such non-diphthongised forms, merely to record some instances of their effect on the spelling. For it is remarkable just how many writers, especially in the 16th and 17th century, used the '−w' spelling in '−eew' alongside '−iew, −ouw, −auw'.

In Middle Dutch the Ghent Boecius uses "eeuwen" and "sne" (the latter being a standard Middle Dutch form — cf. Sayters's Epitheta records "sne of t sneu"), alongside much less common "nieu" spellings. Coornhert in his Boococco translation uses "eeuwelijk" alongside "vrouwen, vrou, nieuw", and Marinus does the same in his Bijencorf, e.g. p.147 — "Het was een dag een alderdomm". De Heuiter also records examples from Gnapheus. Still in the 16th century Plantijn has the entries "eevich; eewich vide eewich" (alongside "nieuw" etc.), and Kilian has several spellings — "nieuw; eeuw; eeuw, eeuw, eeuw; ein (vetus);... eeuw, eewich, eewich; eewichheid; eewichlik" etc., though '−w' seems to be his preferred form.

De Heuiter even discusses the two different pronunciations, and accepts that the choice will influence the spelling: "Ieau', Is gemeen den Flaminc en Hollander, almen klaerlic hoort in 'bleauen, geauen, meauen, reauen, schreauen, teau, teauen'... nohtans bezige ic hier voor liever met den Brabander die lange 'e' als: 'gewen, prewen, newen, roewen, schrewen, tewen'. Igelic volge dat hem tzoutste schijnt en best behaeft". He only discusses this phenomenon for 'eew'. It is possible that Stevin heard the non-diphthongised form in all words, as he lists "leeu, nieu, vaau" as monosyllables, but this is inconclusive.
Vijzelschaeu uses "enich" but also "eaeuichlijke" so it is possibly a type-setter's spelling. One of the most striking users, and one of the most consistent, is Huygens, who almost invariably has the 'eew' form, and only rarely the 'e-w' alone in other words; when such forms as "gaw" appear they may well be analogical extensions from "eew". Thus alongside "nauw, nieuw, berouw" etc., he regularly uses "leewen, Apósw" etc., as for example in the poem "Aen Joost" Tanselschade

Vijzelschaeu onder Trouw", verse 3: "Stuursche buyen
Die sich ruyen
Tegen 't Suijen
Tegen 't West,
Hoor het schreewen
Door het sneeuw,
Somer-spreewen,
Houdt uw' nest".

Dubbels uses "eewigheden" alongside "verkrow, graeu" etc. in Elloos Kranz II,
Ernus uses "leew, Zeeu" in the poem "Winnepraat" (ibid). Gargen regularly uses "ewig" (p.43, 877f), and F. & J. Huygen have "ewig, eegheid". In the light of what Moonen had to say on these spellings (see above), it is perhaps surprising to find him regularly using forms with 'e-eew'; but this is exactly what can be found in his "Vragen aan den Hert J.v. Vondel", where alongside "trou, daw, benaut" etc. he consistently uses "eewig, leewemalp, leew, easeu". It is also noteworthy that Vondel raised no objections to these spellings, or at least makes no adverse comment (though the comments are thought to be not in Vondel's hand).

Much the same comment as that of Moonen - that "e-wen" did not accurately represent the true sound - is given by De Vin in 1716: "Ie aanmerkt de nieuwe (1) veranderinge in de spelkonst, die zal bevinden dat het niet al en kan bestaan zonder dat onze tale daar door lijdet. Tot een staaltje wil ik naar U.e. deze veranderde woordenspellingen aanswijzen, en U.e. zelve daar over laten oordelen, of de klanken van die vokalen akkoord kunnen worden gebracht met de uitspraak van de woorden ... 'enige', voor 'eenige'; 'bekere', voor 'bekeere'; 'eewige' voor 'eewige'...". All the examples given have a single vowel instead of a double, but only in the case of "eewige, eewige" is any potentially different pronunciation actually implied. His comment is important however in that it indicates the continued use of such forms. Although they were still to be found at the turn of the century (e.g. "eewig, leewen, schrewen" in Van Rastings, p.381,531,632), they were by now elusive. An isolated example can be found on page 152 of the 1762 edition of Sewel's revision of La Grue; 1719, 1723 (p.150),
By now, however, standardization had set in, and most writers followed the normal spelling, be it ‘-uw’ in all cases, or ‘-u’ in all cases; contributing to this was probably a feeling that an /ee + w/ pronunciation was too dialectal or “onbeschaafd”, so that any spelling which might suggest that the writer used such a pronunciation was avoided. Stijl condemns the (apparently still occurring) spelling: “De twaklank van het eenvoud moest in ‘t geavondig voldadig blijven. Men moet dan van ‘koel, paauw, leeuw’ niet schrijven ‘kojen, pauwen, lewen’.

Van den hoven’s comments in the 19th century have been mentioned above: he certainly hears no diphthong in “nieuw, hieuw”, nor after ‘ee’, since he writes, in justification of the retention of the ‘-u’ that “Dane ‘eeuw’, laa! peut se justifier par l’analogue de ‘ame!”, thus only by analogy, not because of a pronunciation with a diphthong.

But by far the most significant comment on this feature comes from Krom in his answer to the “prijsvraag” on education set by the Zeeland “Genootschap der Wetenschappen”, published in 1732: “Verscheiden dingen zijn ‘er, ... de orthographie betreffende, welke een leerzaer syn leerlingen niet kan leeren, en al oeffende by zich naerstig, zelf mocht het sekerheid kan weeten, of men, by voorbeeld, moet schryven in somige gevallen, ‘bemint’ of ‘beinid’, ‘gevreest’ -I ‘gevreest’, ens. ... Zoo ook moet een schryven ‘eeuw, leeuw’ of ‘eew, leew’, wie zal het zeggen? het oud gebruik plaat voor het eerste. Taalkenners echter meenen dat de ‘w’ reeds hetzelfde is, als een dubbelde ‘u’, waarby men geen derde voegen mag”. These “taalkenners” may refer to Ten Kate, though the argument is not exactly the same; indeed the argument that the ‘u’ may not be used before the ‘w’ because the latter is “hetzelfde... als een dubbelde ‘u’” does not seem to be traceable to any previous grammar, though some referred to it later on, including Slagenboom (see above).

Such an argument would, moreover, tend to argue for a ‘-u, -we’ spelling (vrouw - vrouwe, eeuw - eewe) or rather ‘-u, -we’ as used by De Hauüter (the "doubling" of ‘u’ to ‘uw/w’ being unnecessary after a long vowel); in any case it cannot be used to defend a ‘-u, -we’ spelling. For if "’w’ reeds hetzelfde is, als een dubbelde ‘u’", this would mean that "eew, leew" were really spelt
"eou, leeui", which does not seem to have been used by any writer. Indeed the use of 'uy/vu' for 'w' may well have been the cause of the absence of 'w' in earlier times. Several later books (16th century) have "leeuw, nieuw" especially before 'w' as such was used in all type fonts, but '-uw' was hardly ever used in final position for 'w' (see Heuier above).

No consent on the exceptional use of '-w' is seen after Krom, when strong analogising tendencies made "eou" etc. adopt the '-uw' system of the other diphthongs.

'w' followed by 'r':

"De labiodentale uitpraak (van 'w') leidde (voor 'r')... tot een overgang in 'v' zowel in de algemene omgangstaal als in een uitgestrekt dialectisch gebied;... Doordat men echter de 'wr' bleef schrijven, handhaafde zich de 'w'-uitpraak vaakal in woorden uit de literaire taal... De overgang van 'wr' tot 'vr' dateert minstens uit de 16de eeuw; reeds Kilian kent 'vrijten' naast 'wrijten', 'vrijven' naast 'wrijven', 'vreten' naast 'wroeten'; in het 16de eeuwse 'Spel van de Groote Kiel' vindt men naast elkaar 'vervred' (vs.477) en 'vervruet' (vs.433)... Hypercorrecte spellingen als 'wreckaerd, wrackhayt, wreten' e.a. komen in de 17de eeuw voor" (Schönfeld §45). Schönfeld was taken to task for this statement by Wille (Taalbederf,49), who claims that as the change from /wr/ to /vr/ is only Hollands, being the reverse in other dialects, which Schönfeld himself admits, it is preferable, and laudable, that the written form should support the "correct" form of pronunciation. Above all, however, he fears that with this expert statement behind them, radicals would press for the spelling to be amended to 'vr' (see his comment given in chap.1).

Further examples can be found in the texts here examined which show this transition, and several grammarians have discussed the alternative pronunciations and spellings. The labiodental pronunciation of 'w' probably caused its incorrect use in such Middle Dutch words as "van, vrouwe, hevet" (=van,vrouwe, hevet). Kilian, as Schönfeld mentions, lists alternative spellings with 'wr' or 'vr', but in addition he sometimes gives a third alternative with 'f': "wreuel, vreuel, j. freuel, freulen;... freuel, wrevel". Plantijn lists no alternatives.
The "vr"-speech is quite specific (p.46) that 'w' and 'v' are not pronounced the same, yet Spiegel himself in prose to use a hypercorrect 'wr' spelling - "wrevelheid, wreveligh" in his "Hortspiegheal" (VI.377,511), though Schöpfel (p.234) doubts whether these are valid examples, - they are rather to be considered as deriving from "wrijven", though this does not explain Kilian's "vrevel" alternative. Jacob Duyts is recorded as having used "vreken" in 1606 (WHT), and Breders (Nauta 537) often uses such forms as "vrogen, vrosten, gevrij". In Van Engelen can be found such spellings as "zoo vreeden aert; O Herder my zo vreet" (p.33). De Ruyter also makes widespread use of the 'vr-' forms.

The Bible translators are the first to condemn such a usage: "F.12. 'vrevel' scribendum, non 'wrefel' nec 'vrewel'". As Montanus follows the standard distribution of "vr/wr" it can be assumed that his expert ear did hear some difference. Two Southern writers, however, diverge from this and adopt the 'vr' spelling. Bolognino uses 'vr' in such words as "wrae, wraed", and Binnart does not have a single entry in his dictionary with 'wr' - all have 'vr', e.g. "vraedt, vringhen" (Van Engelen mentioned above is also a Southerner). Luyken's "Duitse Lier" contains the spelling "vrijft" (p.51), and Van Helderen's English grammar of 1675 has "vrijgen, gevrownen" on page 52. La Croix uses "vreven" in 1655.

Possibly the only grammarian ever to propose abandoning the 'wr' spelling in favour of 'vr', to accord with the change in pronunciation, is Winschooten in 1683: "De Hollandse Taal haat alle hardighed en daarom soekt zij alle harde Letteren, of te versagen: of saget Letteren te gebruiken, gelijk uit de volgende staaltjes openbaar is. De oude pleegen te schrijven, 'Wreken, Wrijven, Wraek', liet: 'Vreken, Vrijven, Vrigen, Wraek, Vreogen'. This, he claims, is because 'w' is "bij de Hollanders een afgaande letter". This rule is abided by in his dictionary the following year, with "vraak, vrijven" etc.; the lone "entry 'vreed' may be for differentiation with 'vrede" (peace).

Support for this pronunciation-based spelling in the South comes from the "Graamatica plus exacta" of 1701 ("vryven" p.103), Van Geadalle, with "gy vrijf, ik vreef" in 1700 (p.97), and Marin's dictionary ('vryven' zie 'vryven'), although the latter is the only 'wr' word to have such a cross-reference. Falma
on the other hand has "vrijen die vrijven" (cf. the comment on the differences between Nelen and Marijn in chapter 4). Kramer in his grammar is similar to Marijn: "Wroekten; Wringen; Wryven s. vryven" (Von Leersheek ed. p.75); his dictionary of 1719 does not list this word with either spelling, but does list "vrong, vrong" (noun).

One of the most precise comments on the exact pronunciation of 'v+r' comes from E.C.P. in 1713: "Of de W. een volle klinker ofte volle sedeklinker (= bilabial semi consonant or labiodental consonant respectively) is, zou men ... wel kunnen in 't twist trekken. Want de Cade plaatst 'vt' voor 'uyt' te schrijven; en wanneer men er een en ander oplet, schijnt 'er ten minsten in de zelfde een V. klinker en een V. sedeklinker gebracht te worden (i.e. the lip-rounding of 'u' becomes almost closed just before the 't' causing an intrusive fricative in /v:vt/). Dit schijnt men nog meer te asbooren, als sy voor de sedeklinker R. geplaatst wordt in 'vraak, vreeds, wringen, wryven' ens. Want 't is by-'ns, als of een 'vraak, vreedt, wringen, wryven', kortelijk afbeet". The effect on /v:w/ if one "(het) kortelijk afbeet" would be to produce /v/ with lip-rounding, viz. the labiodental /v/ which had caused the 'v+r' spelling with other writers. E.C.P. has no desire to change the spelling, and in fact does not seem to be aware of the existence of 'v+r' forms.

Tuinman, like Winschoten, notes the general spread of the 'v+r' pronunciation: "echter hoort het oor in de dagelyksche spraak 'vryven' voor 'uwyn', 'vreken' voor 'wreken', 'vrvikten' voor 'verwrikten', 'vrewel' voor 'vrevel' (nh); 'vrok' voor 'wrok', 'vraak' voor 'wraak" (No.124). He did not think that the spelling needed to be amended accordingly. Ten Kate was a little more disposed towards the use of 'v+r', though he himself only uses 'w'; he speaks (II,63) of the prefix "V of W voor de R..."of 'uvreken' of 'vrekken"; and similarly for "vryven, wringen, wryten" etc. In 1798 Schwiers uses "vrijen, vrever" alongside "wringen".

Very little more is heard of this alternative pronunciation until the next century; Janson uses "vraen" for "vroon" (p.22), and both Van Daels (1/16) and De Neckere (p.70) use "gevrogen/gevrogt" as the participle of "werken", but such are not common. Renier, in discussing 'w/r/vr', decided that the former is used where there is "geweel,...(in) 'vreed, wreak, wryven'", otherwise 'v+r' is
used, as in "vracht, vrede". This seems a little whimsical, and is probably due to the side-by-side existence of "vrede" and "vrede"; there is no linguistic backing for such a distinction (Zeysloer too had felt that "vr beet een
wrang geldin"), based on sub-suggestion.

De Sippele was the first to resurrect the discussion with reference to a
possible tendency to difference of spelling: "De W wordt thans meermalen voor
de R in plaats van de V gebezigd, als: vrack, vringen, enz." - nb he considers
'vr' to be the natural spelling. In a footnote he adds that "De Vlaingen die
'verek, vringen', enz. schrijven (nb) kunnen niet witten waarom de Hollander de
W bezigen. Dit geschiedt, om dat toerelijche woorden alle een geweldigen
drift, of een geweldige werking, hardeid, scherpte, enz. aanduiden, als 'vraak,
vreel, vrijen, wroten' enz.. Waardoor zij zeer eigensardig van de woorden 'vrede,
vreel, vreien, vreugd', enz., onderscheiden worden". "Apart from this
modification of Renier's view on the function of 'vr/vr' to express emotions,
the most important word is "schrijven" - such spellings were thus still well-known.

Further on he comments that "De Vlaingen schijnen regeert te hebben met 'vrek,
vrecken, vringen' enz. in plaats van 'vrek, vrecken, vringen' enz. te schrijven,
omdat de 'v' hier zoo wel of beter aan de uitpraak voldoet dan de 'w')(p.242).
That may well have been true for the South, but it could not be said for the
whole of the Netherlands.

As might be expected, almost all the people who used, or mooted, the 'vr'
spelling, come from the South, with a few Hollander, - conforming more or less
to the distribution of labiodental /w/. The difference in pronunciation between
labiodental /w/ before /v/ and bilabial /w/ in other positions encouraged the
use of 'v' in the former in those areas which had the bilabial /w/. Areas with
labiodental /w/ in all positions would naturally spell 'w' in all positions
without hesitation. In relation to this it may be thought puzzling that
Winschooten felt 'v' to be "sagter" than 'w'!
Late Middle Dutch to the present day

North:
- Da Hubert, Bible, Mol, Longchamps, Swart, Duikerius, Nylove (1703),... Kramer, Swart/La Guerre, Haylesoper, Schagen, Cuijk, Van Belle; Elysevier, De Haes, Zeylemaer, "Kunst...", Stijl, Rut, etc.

South:
- Plantijn, Van Dam, Gayter, Van Engelen, Huwart, "Laconia...", La Guerre, Van Geesdale, Grammaire plus exacte, E.O.P., Steven, F. S., Des Rocher, etc...

Middle Dutch to mid-17th century

North:
- Progrers, Van der Schure, Barriere, Amsing, Van der Heyden, Van den Ende, Hervey (both editions), Van Alteveld, Van der Linden, Nylove (later editions), Hooven, Haagenaar; - Hettens

South:
- Leibracht, Stelvin, Bolognino

-u, -we changing to -uw, -we: Hoofd, Camphuyzen, Winschooten, Van Heestraaten

-U, -we changing to -U, -we: Vondel c.s.

-u, -we

- -P - Plantijn) only for consonant -uw!

- -P - Knits

- -P - Van Heule (1625), Millenius, Van Helderen, Kuyper, Peersel, De Vin; Rut

- -P - East, Kuyper

- -P - East, East: Van Heule (1633)

- -P - Sexagius, De Huiter, Plenne, Van Heule (1633), Winschooten, W.M.S.

- H, -H

- Voorreden, Montanus, Hilarides, Nijkerk, M.S., (Kramer), Ten Kate, Van Overschelde, Holtrop, Van Deele, De Neckere, Knits, Van den Hoven, Dix, Kilij, Romboute, W.M.S.

Noted users of 'vr' for 'lv'!

(degrees of consistency vary greatly)


opposed: Bible, Willem.
There are few if any native Dutch words in which the combination /ks/ can be considered part of the stem, historically speaking. Almost all of the words in which /ks/ appears seem to have acquired the /s/ by the addition either of suffixes, as in "blik-sem", or of inflectional endings, as in "strak-s, reek-s, link-s", sometimes involving a sound change, as in "fluks" from "vleug". In such words it is not immediately obvious to the etymologically inclined eye that inflection or derivation is at play, unlike with a much greater group which includes such as "ondanks, jaarlijks, nauwelijs, lange, deksel, haksel", and the even more numerous "(iets) antieks, unieks, lelijks, heerlijks", plus the single example of a plural "koks". This leaves only very old loans such as "heks, buks(boom)", and the words "feeks, aaks, ekster", the first of which has no clear etymology, and the other two having the historical forms "agastria, acus" so that here /ks/ is produced by contraction. The only conclusion to be drawn from this is that outside inflection the sound /ks/ is not native to Dutch, the consequence of which is that the letter 'x' should have no place in the spelling of native Dutch words.

However, with the adoption of the Latin alphabet by the early Dutch scribes, the letter 'x' was automatically taken over and applied wherever possible, thus not only in loan words but also to native Dutch words both with and without the inflectional '-s'. Whilst books were handwritten this usage had the admirable advantage of being shorter than 'ks' or 'cs', and the same argument, along with tradition, no doubt weighed heavily with the early printers. It is therefore not only common but normal to find in Middle Dutch such forms as "coninx, lanxt, danx" and (for example in Boecius) "blexem".

Well into the 16th century such usage is still normal. Kilian has "axe", the Voorreden has "grootelyx, allerneerstalixe, nootelixe, Blixemen", in the Tweespraak are "zulx, maxel" etc.. Very early on a secondary, and progressively more common alternative arose. Because of the uninflected forms ending in '-k', or more usually '-c', this letter was kept in the inflected form, even though
the 'x', with its now superfluous /k/ element, was still added. Later Middle Dutch has forms such as "onlancx, danex"; the Boecius translation "mijns ghelucx", Van der Werve "coninx, des cininx nijcx" (in the entries for "Throon, Regnatie"), Plantijn "koninx", the Zwe-spraack "volcx, daghelynx, elcx, sulcx", Stevin "bequaemellicxt", Goornhert "eocx, sulcx, elcx", etc...

With the rise of the ending 'cck' instead of '-c' (see chap.2) it becomes more common to find '-ckx', such as Coornhert's "lanckx". These became especially frequent in the first half of the following century, being used for example by De Ruyter in "laenckx, stuckx", by Huygens in "struckx", and by innumerable others. Because of the less obvious derivation it is more usual to find the simple 'x' than 'cx' in "blissen", and conversely more usual to find 'cx' in inflexion than just 'x'.

The various grammatical works of the 16th century reflect some of these trends. Lambrecht wrote that "ics, werd uytgesproken ghelic 'ks', en es in Tneder, altijd finaal". He thus disapproves of its use internally, a theory which he carries out in his dictionary, spelling "aeco, aecster", referring from "exterooghe" to "aseesterooghe", and giving the variants "flouckx, flux of vullicks"; one exception is to be found in "exsel" (ornament), but otherwise he is faithful to his rule. Kilian similarly gives "ackse ... aeckse" and "bokse" as alternatives to "axe, boxe", alongside "blicksem". It is not possible to tell what Sexagius felt on this as neither 'x' nor '-ks' figures in any word used by him.

Lambrecht's rule is echoed some thirty years later by De Heuiter: he too dislikes 'x' within a word, but prefers the simple '-x' spelling at the end, in emulation of Latin usage - "welke Latinen wij in gelijk luidende woorden behoren te volgen". This gives "des toinx, slainx, rox, elx, Griex". One exception to this was in derivations, where 'x' could appear within the word, as in "bouxken"; Lambrecht too had spelled "clerxken".

But the use of 'x', with or without 'c/k', was by no means unanimous; it is very common to find 'cs', or later 'ks' being used as early as the 15th century. The Exercitium uses "docesel, volces", and avoids 'x' in Dutch words (in the Deventer edition). Boecius uses "meinschelics", Coornhert's "Voorreden", a
century later, uses "volmaekste, daghelycke, Grieks", and Stevin has "maescel, schiesel"; by this time such spellings are quite common. The recurrence of the same texts in the examples just given underlines the lack of consistency in most writers/printers. Some trends are apparent however: "maescel, schiesel" and other words with the suffix '-sel' are less frequently spelt with '-x-' because of the force of the final '-e' in the root word and the 'e-' in the easily recognised suffix. This compares with "blixem" where 'x' is the more common spelling due to '-se' not being read as a suffix. At the end of a word (e.g. "vol(c)x") the form with 'x' is just as common as that with '-cs', and in derivation ("maexken") the '-cx-' form is the commonest.

When Van der Schuere described these alternative spellings in 1612 he did not say which form he preferred, though the implication of his statement is that the form with 'x' is less fundamental: "De 'x' komende t'synden in de Sillabe, bediend daer de plats van 'ks' in 'gelux, paxken, stoxken', ende vel meer ander; ende koster noch een 't' achter aan, zoo bediendze de plats van 'gs' in 'anxt, hemxt', ende dergelijke. Want sy wordt alleen om kortheyds wille inde plats van 'ks', of 'gs' gebruykt, anders en kost sy in geen Nederlandsche woorden". He does not mention '-cx' or '-clcx' because he is also arguing for the replacement of 'c(k)' by 'k(k)'. His comment suggests that he prefers '-ks' except where a shorter form is deemed necessary.

The next to comment on such variations in usage was Van Heule. He regards the addition of '-x-' as the normal inflexion: "Ook hebben sommige woorden in de plaatse van de S eene X als 'Vole' heeft 'Volkx, Lijlkx', dit schijnt te zijn, om dat de uytpraak wat lichter zoude vallen". That Van Heule is little convinced by his own explanation is shown firstly by his use of the word "schijnt" and secondly by his later comment (p.81) that "In veele woorden konnen Letteren uytgelaten worden, zonder dat de uytpraak der woorden verandert,...'Zulckx' ende 'Zulx', 'Konincks' ende 'Koninx', 'Eerlickx' ende 'Eerlix'". His own usage is as given — i.e. with '-lx-' in "boulcx, spraelex" (pp.16,23), but he uses the simple 'x' in the exclamations "Fix, Flux" (p.71 — cf "Fluxx" p.63).

In the second edition of his grammar the forms given are somewhat different. On page 77 he gives the following genitive forms: "Welc...Welx,...Igelic heeft Igelix,...Eic heeft Elix" (another instance of the second edition resembling De
Heuiter). Later (p.146) he gives the same comment as in the first edition on the shortened forms, slightly paraphrased, and with "Zulcks, Konincks, Eerlicks" as the longer forms. It is not clear what implication is to be drawn from this.

Usage in the second edition is a little less regular than in the first; amongst such forms as "gebrecx, Rijcxt, gebuyx, Grioxsche, Roccx" there is a slight preference for '-cx'.

This usage of Van Heule's deviates from the rules laid down by the Bible translators in 1623. They rejected the use of 'x' in inflectional forms such as "conicks/conincs, dagelicks", but allowed it in adverbs such as "stracx, strax", in the noun "blixem" and in the diminutives "volckens" alongside "volcsken". Their comment on the adverbs is inconsistent as they say that "'stracx, Inegelyox'... etc. talia adverbia poterunt scrib. per 'cs' vel 'x'"—they do not mention the '-cx' of their own examples, nor do they explicitly reject it. They do reject "coninx" with just '-x', even though they allow it in the adverbs. The New Testament revisers made these rules more consistent by amending the second comment to read "praeferunt 'cs' vel 'cks', vel 'stracks'"; thus bringing the adverbs into line with the nouns. Similarly the Old Testament revisers added the alternative "blicksem", to which the New Testament revisers also added "blicksem". The final result is thus in favour of '-cs' or '-cks' and the avoidance of 'x' except in diminutives where it is optional. They express no preference between 'cs' and 'cks', which fits in well with contemporary practice.

Many writers continued to add 'x' in the inflected forms however, adding it to '-c, -k, -ck' according to their system: Ampzing spells "sulkx, grotelijcx, flukx", Hooft (in "Achilles"), Coster, Cats, Bredero prefer "Griexsche, swexst; sulox; nulijcx; flucx, volckex, koninckex, quix" respectively, and De Ruiter uses 'ckx' at the end of a word and (usually) 'ckx' within it, as "laenckx, stucx, criexkx, sulckx, grootlyckx; blayckxe, instruckxve, ockszymysemen, hackyex, twucxjxeche" etc. (though also "swykxeex" without 'x').

The simple '-cx' spelling continued in very widespread use, both before and after its rejection by the Bible translators: Hooft has "Inegelyx, oversulkx, Henrix" in his Waernemingen (and no examples with '-cx, -ckx' etc.), Dafforne has "sulkx, Vonckex, boexken, daghelyxvexex", Starter has "flux, onlanx", Bontekoe
has "kox" or "kox" as plural forms, Camphuysen has "flux, blixem", etc. "Blixem" is also used by Huygens, although he usually has '-ckx' in his earlier works, e.g. "straxckx". In the "Oogentroost" (Korenbloem 1653, p.443) he has "ghext" which may be for visual rhyme with "Text". As several writers who used '-cx' normally used '-ckx' in the uninflected forms it is clearly a case of dropping the '-k' rather than merely adding '-x'; Valcoogh in the previous century, with "boexck, boexcken", is one instance of this.

The alternative "progressive" (though not new) spelling with '-cs' recommended by the Bible translators, is used by Ploep, e.g. "lines-luxe" in the "Herdooperen Ansche"; and similar forms avoiding '-x' come from Montanus writing only two years after the Bible translators resolutions were formulated. He actually allows both forms when speaking of the misprints in his book: "Ooc hobje...'-cx'...voor...'-cs' of '-x'; this is the sort of logical decision to be expected from him - either the phonetic '-cs' or the shorter '-cx' but certainly not the superfluous '-ex'.

Alongside the older '-c(k)x' and the relatively newer '-c(k)s' the well established '-x' form continued to be popular, no doubt for the not insignificant reason that it gave shorter spellings, meaning less effort. In a time when all sorts of contractions and abbreviations were used both in written and printed forms, it is understandable that a ready-made and historically venerable shortening by using '-x' should be willingly put to good use. Vondel preferred the forms with '-x' ("glimpelijx" in Lucifer, 678), as did Bake ("strax"), the younger Brune with "hauex, reex, werx, anxt, treffelix, blixem", Jan de Witt with "sulx, oorbaerlijxste", De Becker with "flux, strax", etc. Possibly Vondel's usage was of influence here.

But such forms were beginning to lose favour in the eyes of the writers of spelling books and other grammatical works. A few still recommend it: Van Attevelt considered it quite acceptable in "strax, grotelix", but not in "maаксel, haексel, deексel" where the '-k' of the root should be preserved. This is also the view of Van der Weyden, using "billix, paxen" with the same rejection of "maаксel, haексel". It is not clear though why it is permissible to drop the root '-k' of "pak"! Some writers thought that '-x-' could rightly be used in these words named by Van Attevelt and Van der Weyden, - Kok preferred to spell "maаксel", possibly being influenced by the newly reprinted Twe-spraak (cf.chap.3).
Leupenius, two years after Van der Weyden, is more progressive, though he has a certain liking for the shorter and older form: "de 'x' doet zoo veel als 'ks'... (waar hooft) wy de kracht van de selve door twee medeklinkeren ten vollen kunnen voldoen, zoo heeft het nochtans den Voorouderen behaaght de selve ... te behouden. Daar is ook meer seectigheid en korthed in eene dobbel, dan in twee enkale letteren gelegen". He also draws a parallel with the Greek which similarly has a letter for /ks/ as well as separate letters for /k/ and /s/. The only example he gives is "blixen", and elsewhere he uses only 'ks' - "kerksken, werkken, balsken" (p.32), Grieksche, dagelijksche etc... The same reasoning is later echoed by La Grue in 1661 (who seems to have used Leupenius several times). In fact Van der Weyden was the last of that generation of traditional '-x' spellers amongst grammarians, later works nearly all rejecting it. Some mention it as a minor usage, e.g. Beyer: "Men kan ook 'ks' door het zetten van de enkele 'x' verminderen; 'Koninks, Koninx'" (p.99). It is noticeable that 'x' is now given as a variant of 'ks', whereas earlier the situation was reversed. Hillenius (p.97) has a similar comment, but these are mostly mere echoings of grammars such as Van Heule, used extensively by both Beyer and Hillenius.

The new generation begins with Leupenius and proceeds with several more minor works. Bolgnino uses only "Grickse, Grice, oversulcke, deckse" with '-cks' or '-cs'; Binnart believes that "behoormen ooc op't endt van de worden, in stade van de 'x', te schryven 'cs' (als 'straes' in stade van 'strax')", and spells "blicksem" alongside "exter, here"; Bilius prefers "Dagelyse" to "Daeghelycksche" (not without reason!), and "Laconis..." thinks that 'x' Helius suppletur per 'cks': 'daghelijcks, blicksem'. All these comments covering a mere ten years from 1657 to 1666 are ample evidence of the contemporary tendency.

A lone voice is that of Van den Ende, only three years after Van der Weyden, yet with sufficiently different motives to mark him off from the mere traditionalists. His motivation is a far-reaching economy of letters: "Die overvloed van letteren heb'ik geschouwd ... Derhalven spelle ik bondig en kort: Aldus... 'Grotelijx, Strax, Sulx, Beckken, Taxken, Strixken, Kriexken'; Ende niet na ouder gewoonte ... 'Grotelicks, Strackx, Sulckx, Beckxken, Taxckken, Strickcken, Kriexckken'. He is correct, by most standards, in thinking this an improvement, and although his conclusion is different from Bilius's his motives..."
are the same, merely going one step further in shortening the word-form.

Until the end of the century no more works were to advocate the use of 'x' in Dutch words. The society Nil Volentibus Arduum rejected 'x', as expressed in the words of their spokesman Pels: "De 'q' en 'x' versmyt ik... en zet' er 'ks', en 'ks', voor het welk onze natuurlyke letters zynde, geen andere klank uitbeelden kunnen, en nu al veel gebruikt worden". They already consider the use of 'ks' for 'x' a common practice. By 1683, six years later, Winschoten considered it standard: "deese letter werd van de Neederlanders nauwelijks anders gebruikt als in uitheemse woorden, soo dat men zeggen mag, dat de Neederlanders deese letter in haar Neederlandse spelkonst missen moogen". In 1691 Sewel does not even think such a usage merits comment in his treatise on spelling contained in his dictionary. Even ordinary writers began to express their opinions: Salomon van Rusting, in his "Volgoestige Werken" of 1699, composing a "Gulden ABC"(p.683) gets as far as 'v' and then writes that

"Met X, en Ypsilon, is niet veel te beginnen:
Men laatze, in onse taal, met weynig reden binnen,
...Wy kunnen evenwel wel schryven zonder die".

Although "beginnen" is here probably deliberately ambiguous, one suspects that he is not only inspired by the impossibility of finding words beginning with 'x'. As he also rejects 'y' and 'z' it is part of a valid comment on contemporary spelling practice, or at least on his own practice.

The "Grammaire plus exacte" of 1701, commenting on alternative spellings, gives "flux ou flucs, vite; blixem ou bliksem, éclair. Et cette derniere façon d'écrire est la plus autorisée". Other spellings were still in use, as hinted by the author of this work. The simple '-x' continues to be fairly common in the latter half of the 17th century: Van Helderen spells "anxt" in his dictionary, Dullaert spells "reex", Bogaard spells "krijgx-luy" (Kloos Kraam I), Van Alksmae uses "insgelijx" in his edition of Melis Stoke. "Blixem" is very common, being used by Luyken, De Swaen, Dullaert and many others. Hilarides, both in his Phaedrus translation and in his later "Taalgorden", consistently uses such forms as "reex, sulk, grootelijx, elx", and Van Hoogstraten uses "dagelijxen, Griexen, naeulijx" (alongside "reeks") in his list.

In the South especially the '-cx' and '-ckx' forms survived, and in 1700
Van Goesdelle felt it necessary to condemn them. Having just spoken of the use of strange letters in foreign names he goes on: "Dog is het wel eene wonderbaarlijkere sake, ende meer tegen den reden, dat sy sich dienen van... 'ckx', over al daar eene letter gevoegzaen soude zijn. Ten opzichte van 'ckx', souden zij beter 'ks' enkelltijd gebruiken; engsten dat 'x' ook eene overtollige letter is in de Vlaamsche letterkonst" (p.42).

Just into the new century however, the forms with '-x' underwent a moderate revival in the hands of Nyloë. It was mentioned above that such forms were still current at this time in the writings of Hilarides and Van Hoogstraten, but now they received the blessing of a grammar. Although in his first edition he uses such forms as "des werx", he decided to moderate the rule somewhat, so that "De 'x' wert by verkorting voor 'ks' geschreven in 'volx, ryx, elx'. Hoewel andere oordelten dat men de 'ks' hier diende te behouden tot een konteken van den genetivus; het geen echter in 'reex, dagelyx, naulyx, protelyx' en die reden niet nodig is". Nyloë's motive (like Van den Ende and Bilius) was what Poeraet called the rule that "het geen men doen kan met weinig, moet men niet doen met veel letteren. Zene stelling, die vy meenen, dat met ter tydt zoude worden de onder eng van alle oorsprongkelykheden en taelgrondinge, en doen verliessen ut het oog de waere stam- of vortelletters" (Boekzaal,1722, p.230).

Earlier criticism of this revival of '-x' came from Koonen: "Zommigen gebruiken ook de X. voor KS, in het spellen van de volgende en diergelyke woorden, 'Zulk, schrix, blyx, ryx'. Den dit is, wyns oordeals, een niemdigheid, die onnoodigh en ondienstigh is. Onnoodigh; want wat behoert men zich van de Grieksche X. te bedienen in woorden, die men met de duitsche KS bequaemelyk kan spellen? Ondienstigh; dawyl het spellen van zulke woorden met eene X hunne betekenis voor de uitheemschen verduistert... Derhalve is best, dat men de KS in het spellen van zulke woorden, die ze uit hunne aert vereischen, behoude". This argument, at first sight reasonable, is inconsistent within Moonen's system since he defends the use of 'q' in Dutch words simply because the letter is also used in Latin, yet here he rejects such a motivation for the use of 'x'.

Notwithstanding the authority of Moonen the use of '-x' continued, possibly under the influence of Nyloë, who was reprinted more times than Moonen (seven and five prints respectively): Van Caveren, in his editorship of the Boekzaal,
uses such forms as "uitdrukkel", Foot uses "elx", Zeeus has "smex, uitwerxelen, zuix", Vermer uses "laax" (p.65) and gives "beexken" as the diminutive of "boek" (p.26), Kramer uses "achterbax" alongside "reeks" in his dictionary (1719), and the 1743 edition of Harvaert has "beexken" where the earlier edition has "beexker". The adding of 'x' after 'k', instead of replacing it, also continued, though it is less common; F. van der Schelling regularly uses it in "jaerlykx" (in "tijdenricht").

In the South the traditional systems with '-ckx' or '-cx' were still the more normal forms. In 1712 E.G.P., probably influenced by Northern usage, tried to amend this: "De X... zou men gemaakelyk komen derven; en Ks. de bezittinge doen nemen in haere plaatsen. Want (by voorbeeld) 'blicksem' is zoo een goede spelling als 'blixam'; en 'rijkx-dag' een veel beter als 'rijnx-dag' enz." This wording suggests that he finds forms with '-x' more often than those with '-ks'. This may either reflect Southern usage (though the statement from Steven given below would gainsay this), or be a reaction to Nyloe, whose work he certainly knew (see chap.2).

Steven is certainly reacting to contemporary Southern usage (and also certain Northern usages) when he writes that "Dit Letter zoo veel macht hebbe als KS, zoo en is voor die geen K nodig in de bywoorden, als: 'namelycx, dagelycx, wekelycx, desgelycx' enz. ja sommige net de Hollanders, en stellen der geen c. voor meer schryven 'blíxam, flúx', en alle andere". He is condemning final '-ckx', and medial '-x-', and recommending '-cx'! The implication of his statement is that '-cx' is the form which he most often sees. His revised spelling with '-cx' does not apply to the genitive of nouns, where he preserves the '-k-', as in "rykx". "Zulcx" can also be found in his work, though less frequently, and against his rules. However he is certainly identifying the simple '-x' form as being restricted to the North, with '-c(k)x' being preferred in the South.

But despite the frequency of the appearance of forms with '-x', with or without a preceding 'k', no more Northern grammars are to propose anything but the "Dutch" 'ks'. This applies to Sinds: "my kommen ('x') in 'Saxen, Hexen, Blixen, Boxvoet' als gemaklik uitvagen, net daar weder inplastende KS. Hier hou ik de tyds van de Heer ANDRIES PELOM (a comment in his Schatkamer, opposing
Moonen's use of "fix", e.g. p.61); and also to Neugelenburg, Tan Kate, Van Belle, Schurtz, De Haes, Van der Pals, etc. Each of these contrasts the use of 'ks' in all Dutch words with the use of 'x' in all loan words (see below), drawing a very firm line between the two usages, even rejecting "blixen" and (usually) "hex, flux", though opinions differ on the latter. Moonen felt that "fix", ... van het Latynsch 'fixum' aflkomstigh...wordt met de 'x' billyk en natuurlijk gespelt". Others preferred 'ks' in this word, even adding '-ch' ("fiiksch") to make it conform with other adjectives. This was done by De Haes (p.11), and later echoed by the grammar of the society "Kunst wordt door arbeid..." and the Nut works. No doubt influential for one word at least was Huydecoper in his rejection of "blixen" (VIII, 463) on the grounds of its derivation as "blick + semen". Van Belle opposed the 'x' in "ekster", and in "heks" which he did not consider a loan word. Some writers earlier in the century continued to use "blixen", amongst whom were Poet and Langendijk.

Southern usage continued in its traditional paths, preferring '-ex' as recommended by Steven. But here too opinions were now changing and the "Snoeijmes" came out against such forms, which can still be found in 1766 in the booklet on "Aerschot" with its "suylex, nauselijcksx, desgelycksx" alongside the diminutives "joncksen" etc. Des Roches too preferred the '-ks' forms, even in "blixen, exporter, hex", ... die ook zeer wel als dus 'bliksen, ekster, heks' worden geschreven". Other Southern grammars followed suit: Janssen recommended '-ks' and the "Inlayding" wrote that "De X is in onze Taal teensmael onnooddig, alsooc men K en S daer voor behoorelyk gebruikt, als 'Bliksen, Ryksdag, grootelyks', voor 'blixen, Ryksdag, grootelyks' enz.".

It is still not uncommon to find "blixen, hex, exporter" with 'x', for the reasons stated above, namely that there is no existing root word ending in '-k' to support the newer '-ks-' spelling. Some, such as Zeydezer, preferred 'x' in individual words for other reasons: "Hex, toverhex' &c. schrijvt mén nêé 'x' ter onderscheiding" van 'heks' of 'van't hèk'. Otherwise he preferred 'ks', even in "bliksem". On the whole even for these few words 'ks' was now unanimously advocated, e.g. by Cramer, the Nut, Wester, Stijl and Bolhuis. Some spelt "blikzen" in line with their use of 's' and 'z' (see chap.11), including Schuiers.
and C.W.oltrop. Palma (and consequently also Windelam) in his dictionary, allows the Dutch spelling for the three loan words "Fix, Hex en 'Text', die men ook schrijft 'Fiks', en 'Heks', als ook 'Tekst'. After Siegenbeek the 'x' forms are no longer encountered. In fact some grammarians (e.g. Van Daele and Jehaegel) did not even include the letter in their alphabets (see chap.19).

A solitary exception, in a small way, was Bilderdijk, who prefers 'x' in "flux" (Spraakleer,57). This was criticised in 1856 by Carlanur: "in...'bliksem, Flaks, straks', enz. moet men niet, soo als Bilderdijk doet, de 'x' aannemen om het ontstaan des 'ks'-klanks uit 'gs' aan te duiden". This can refer only to "flux" from "vlugs", not to the other words (cf. also the form "krijggs" quoted above from the mid 17th century, and the comment of Van der Schuere on "lanx, anxt"). It can therefore be given as a broad generalization that the use of 'x' in native Dutch words was extinct well before Siegenbeek's reforms, with a slight tendency for retention in "blixen, flux, exter, fix, hex".

'x' in loan words

Amongst loan words of Romance origin there are a large number which contain the element /ks/. In common with all other loan words these long retained, as far as compatible with Dutch methods of representation (cf. "mirakel" chap.2), their native spelling. The only exceptions are a few words, usually of Germanic provenance, which quickly became absorbed; a notable instance of this is the word "heks" from Swiss German "Hexe" of the 15th century (W.N.T.). Its similarity in sound to Dutch words such as "recks, des heks" caused it not to be felt too foreign to have a Dutch '-ks' spelling.

Most early grammarians - i.e. until the mid 13th century - when proposing the change from 'x' to 'ks' either make an explicit exception for loan words, or do not mention them at all, evidently regarding the exception as automatic. This is a feeling which, if usage is an accurate guide, the majority of writers and printers shared. In fact 'x' in loan words proved if anything more tenacious than 's' for /k/, and 'ph'.

This is not to say that other spellings did not exist; some examples can be found at an early date from less well-educated circles, as can be seen from the usage of De Ruyter in the words given earlier. But these are far from common,
and even those (amongst whom Vondel) who advocated such Dutch spellings as "Febus, Faeton, Cesar, Cezar" did not attempt to change the 'x' of "Xerxes, Xenophon" etc., even if it involved them in hybrid spellings such as "fenix". Pels felt that "Alexander could have 's' when used as the Dutch name "Sander", but that was his only exception; Winschooten later spells "hekse" though for the reasons stated earlier this cannot be categorised in quite the same class as the Romance loan words. It is not clear how much must be read into the not infrequent spelling "Teksel" (e.g. Van Alkenade in his "Kuten").

The first radical pronouncement against the use of 'x' in loan words is found in the Flemish "Snoeijmes". Living up to its title it wishes to shear off all superfluous letters from Dutch, even adapting loan words (as far as possible) to Dutch spelling, claiming "Wat gaet de afkomste van die vreemde woorden de Vlamingen aan?" (p.139). A few years later support was to be found from Zeydelaar who wrote in 1763 that "Men schrijvt ondertusschen zeer wel 'Exodus, ëster; fix, Saxen, 'Fënix' of 'Fënika' is onverschillig, ... 'Xénofon, Xántos, Xenocrates, Xerxes, Xantippe', etc. kan méér gevoeglijk schrijven 'Zénofon, Zéncrátés, Zérzès, Sántippe'", though he felt that "Artaçsérêšs" was a little too radical. This was in contrast to the many, such as De Haes, who followed Moonen's ruling that the original Greek or Latin letter should be kept here - Zeydelaar uses almost exactly the same examples as Moonen (p.14), though this may be coincidence. The grammar of "Kunst wordt door arbeid,...", much influenced by Zeydelaar, rejected this 'Z-' spelling however.

For loan words, as opposed to foreign names, it was slightly more common to find 'ks' creeping in, especially in those words which were in relatively common use and had nothing overtly "foreign" about their sound or appearance. This applies to "hexx", and the exclamation "fix" (see above), and also progressively more common is the spelling "tekst" - see Halma and Winkelman above.

In Siegenbeek's system all foreign names had to keep their native spelling, as did most loan words - "daar zij anderzins een waanstalig aanzien verkrijgen". Thus "Xerxes, Alexander, exempel" etc. were the only approved forms, though "feniks" was allowed. This view was also accepted in the South; for example Ter Bruggen felt that "het onbehoorlyk (zou) zyn, latynsche of fransche woorden met letters te spellen, welke in die taalen niet gebraukt worden; b.v. als men
Both Thijm and Van Vloten rejected the use of anything but 'x' in loan words, preferring "text" etc. to the more progressive forms to be found to a limited extent in the De Vries/Te Winkel system - here "tekst" was allowed but not "tekstueel" which could only have 'x-'.

Land, on the other hand, can be counted amongst the radicals: he appropriates 'x' for a new use altogether, saying that "voor spiritus lenis komen wij een teeken te kort; doch de 'x' zou vacant worden en in die leente kunnen voorzien". Although he does not discuss loan word spellings he must have envisaged the use of 'ks' in all words.

Some followers of Kollewijn favoured a far-reaching adaptation of loan words to the Dutch spelling system, and were later condemned by Van Ginneken for their "vulgaire... Hollandsche phonetische spelling" in the words "eksersitie, ekskaus, ekskusuren", even though such a move never figured in the official "Voorstellen" of the Kollewijn movement. One of the most radical suggestions for the spelling of loan words appears at this time in the anonymous "Proeve éener nieuwe spelling" (1934) written by "Dixi". Far from wishing to banish 'x', he wishes to extend it, finding it a very useful letter because of its brevity. He did wish to change the spelling of loan words but not along the normal orthodox radical lines: "De 'x' wordt in ons stáleel geschréven in ál de woorden waar zíj in de beschaafde uitspraak wordt gehoord, dus ook in die waarin ze in de bestaande spéllingen door 'ks' wordt aangeduid". This even covered such words as "anxI, axijas, auxI, reaxI, sanxl, saxI" (cf. chap.14): In view of these it is probably safer to put Dixi's suggestions for 'x' not amongst the radical but among the idiosyncratic (though not necessarily in a pejorative sense).

The Woordenlijst of 1954 allowed a few of the more common words to have 'ks'-"tekstueel" could now join "tekst". Such words were mostly of French origin, whereas the directly Latin prefixes 'ex' and 'extra' ("exotisch, extract, extraordinair"), even where they came to Dutch via French, were felt to be too obviously foreign. A number of words, however foreign their appearance, had alternative spellings (falanks, falanx; sfinks, sfinx), and the motivation was really the preservation of the status quo: "In woorden waarin 'ks' reeds algemeen is, wordt alleen deze spelling erkend ('tekst' en derg.). In sommige gevallen
The first of the post-Woordenlijst radicals to attack loan words, Rombouts, was in favour of the complete elimination of 'x' in loan words, using such forms as 'taksi, fleksi, filkseren, eksellent, ekperkt, ekskurs, ekksursie; silofoon, santippe' (pp.32,113). This was supported by Verschueren with a similar plea in his dictionary (1961): "x. gesp. ks, = KS: EKSALEI, EKSKHUS, KIAXEN, TEKXT".

In response to such pressures from the V.W.S. the government "Rapport" of 1967 conceded almost all points, a proving the 'ks' spelling in all words: "De commissie stelt voor 'ks' te spelen; dus: eksamen, falanks, kontekst, ksenofobie, ksilofoon, maksimum, paradoks, sfinks, sintaksis, tekstiel,... eksellentie, ekses, eksklamatie, ekskuzeren". The only exception was for the prefix 'ex-' in the sense "former", 'ex-' in the sense "out" became 'eks-' as in the examples above.

This judgement was not affected by the "Eindvoorstellen" and it seems that, except by some conservatives (and such as Mulisch who finds that "voor het oog maakt ('sphinx') duidelijker wat ik er mee te zeggen had ... dan de spelling 'sfinks', laat staan 'sfinks!'" p.23), here too the radical adaptation to the Dutch spelling system will become accepted.

**Summaries**

**Chronology:** 'x' in the inflected forms of Dutch words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Forms with 'x'</th>
<th>'x' predominates.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middle Dutch</td>
<td>forms with 'x' used almost exclusively, simple 'x' predominates.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1600</td>
<td>'-cx' becoming more common</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600 - 1650</td>
<td>'-ckx' also found, also '-ckx', depending mostly on the choice of final '-c, -ck, -k'. 'x' still common</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650 - 1700</td>
<td>North: '-x' still used, otherwise 'ks' South: '-cx, -ckx' widely used; '-x, ks' uncommon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 - 1720</td>
<td>North: '-x' revived a little South: '-cx, -ckx' still widely used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720 - 1750</td>
<td>North: only 'ks' in normal use South: '-cx, -ckx' dying out mid century; yields to 'ks'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1750ff</td>
<td>only 'ks' in common use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bliksem, ekster: '-x, -ks, -cks-' all in common use until end of 16th century, then 'ks' predominates, finally becoming normal usage fluctuates unsystematically after ca.1750; usually '-x' before this date.
Apart from those noted above, the following uses have been noted either in literary works or as very minor usages in grammars (printers' forms?):

- **-x**: Van Heule, Starter, De Witt, Bontekoe, Brune, Vondel, De Decker, Dullaert, Van Alkemade, Zeusi, Poot, Boomkamp, Moonen (in his questions to Vondel only)
- **-agx**: Roemer Visscher ("wangckens"), Bogaard
- **-xt**: in superlatives: Stevin, Van Heule (1623)
- **-xst**: Van der Schuere ("hcxstu"), very common in superlatives
- **-cx**: Boecius, Coornhert, Stevin, Roemer Visscher, Van Borsselen, Smert, Dafforne, Cats, Frederic, Coster, Hooft, Bontekoe, De Decker, Bolswert
- **-txt**: in superlatives: Middle Dutch, Voorreden
- **-ext**: very common in superlatives
- **-ckx**: Coornhert, Van Engelen, Huygens, De Ruyter, Bolswert, "Aerschot"
- **-kx**: Van der Schelling, Steven.
- **-cks**: Stevin ("sulckx"), and many others.
- **-ckxs**: De Ruyter (opposed by Van den Ende, Bilius)

**Loan words** (excluding "heks"): 'x' normal until mid 18th century, then progressively more words gained 'ks':

radically in favour of rejecting 'x': Snoeijmes, Zeydelaar, Land, some followers of Kollenzijn, Rombouts, Verschueren, V.W.S., Aekslegheer, Rapport, Eindvoorstellen.

in favour of restricting 'x': Woordenlijst (some De Vries/Te Winkel words)

'ks' also found in unlettered writers such as De Ruyter, at an early date.

in favour of extending 'x': Dixi.
Chapter 17: Double Consonants

medial double consonants: gemination
abnormal double consonants
superfluous '-ck-, -kk-
double 'ff' and double 'ss'

double consonants in verbs: '-dde, -tte' in imperfect tense
'-tt, (-tet)' in past participles and present tense
(' -tt' for enclitics)
'-dde' in past participles

equilateral double consonants: 
double '-ff'
double '-ff, -ll, -tt'
all final consonants doubled where appropriate
differentiation by means of final double consonants

avoidance of double consonants.

This section deals not so much with the spelling of a particular consonant, but rather with the phenomenon of double consonants. The use of double consonants in modern Dutch is purely an orthographic expedient. This is not so for all languages, and even where it is the case usage differs: in German a double consonant indicates that the preceding vowel is short (cf. "den, denn"), and in English it is basically the same (cf. "ape, happen"). In some languages a doubly written consonant is used because the consonant in question is pronounced double - the so-called "geminates" - for example in Finnish and Italian (cf. English "book-case"). In primitive Germanic the same situation obtained - for various reasons not relevant here (e.g. assimilation) double consonants were pronounced double.

But this is not so with Modern Dutch (or for that matter English and German): "is (na gedekte klinker) met de consonant het woord uit (als in b.v. 'kap'), dan valt het gehele foneera in dezelfde zyllabe; maar als een vocaal volgt, verdeelt het zich over twee klankgroepen; als b.v. 'kappen' tegenover b.v. 'kapen', in welk laatste woord de 'p' alleen tot de tweede klankgroep behoort... De verdeling van de consonant over twee syllaben rechtvaardigt de spelling met twee letters" (Schönfeld). There is no difference in the /p/ of the examples given, and a doubly spelt consonant is not pronounced double, except as "een middel om intensiteit uit te drukken, b.v. 't is schrikkelijk, ongelooflijk'", where it does not even have to be spelt double.

The singleness of the sound was realised by most grammarians from relatively early times, though some later writers failed to distinguish it from the sharing
of the spelled geminate by split syllables, e.g. "heb-ben". Van Heule did recognize this distinction: "Als in eenich woort, een dobbel Consonant komt, so en behoeft men meer een uyt te spreken, als 'Bedden, Zetten, Willen, Zeggen', behoort aldus gelezen te worden: 'Bed-en, Zet-en, Wil-en, Zeg-en'. De dobbel letters behouden allenlief dat de consonant by de voorste silbe behoort, so dat de dobbel letters de Wtspraak niet en bewaren. Deze verswijging der letteren kan ooc geschieden, als gelijke letters in verscheyde woorden volgen, als 'Ik kan niet', nach gezeyt worden met een K en H uyt te laten, aldus 'Ik an'iet', als ooc voor 'Tot dat het' wort om de lichticheyt gezeyt 'Tot at'iet" (1633,p.149).

He does not even recognize geminates between adjacent words, as is true of for example German "mi_y:eilen" and English "book-case" (cf."cupboard" with only one /b/, no longer recognised as a compound word).

Another to realise the sing' darity of the sound in a vjritten geminate, and one of the very few to suggest dropping one of the two (see below) was Plemp. In this respect both Plemp and Van Heule showed a considerably better ear for Dutch than some later grammarians, notably those written by foreigners. The "Grammaire Hollandois" by Van der Pyl in 1316 teaches for double consonants that "les Hollandois ... les prononcent toujours, comme dans les mots 'Krabben, zwabben' and in 1353 Gambs in his "Holländische Grammatik"("Ollendorff's method") wrote "bb horbar unterscheiden, b.v. ribben - r(g)b-ben
'pp hörbar unterscheiden, b.v. klapperen - klap-peren
'ff hörbar unterscheiden, b.v. effen - af-fen
gg hörbar unterscheiden, b.v. zegen - seg-gen
kk hörbar unterscheiden, b.v. zakken - sak-ken
gch hörbar unterscheiden, b.v. lagchen - lachchen
dd hörbar unterscheiden, b.v. ridder - r(i)d-der".

The representation at the end of each example is the imitated pronunciation in German terms, (i) indicates "das 'i' das nach 'e' hin lautet". Even though Gambs and Van der Pyl may have had a wider readership, one is inclined to ascribe a greater linguistic knowledge to Schönsfeld (and Van Heule & Plemp). One case where a truly double consonant probably did occur, at least for certain speakers, was the imperfect tense of weak verbs ending in '-d' or '-t', e.g. "achtede, antwoordede", which simplified to '-dde, -tte' (see below).

The normal accepted use in Dutch is to preserve the closed syllable and keep the preceding vowel short in polysyllabic words, and was already standard practice in Middle Dutch though a few exceptions are known, e.g. "wille" for
"wijle". Conversely some Middle Dutch writers used a double consonant where unnecessary in this function, sometimes probably influenced by German spelling, e.g. "gestillt, scriptt". But such anomalous usages are uncommon; the 1494 (Deventer) edition of the Exercitium Puerorum yields "cortten - brevio", and "capellaen, capitels" where the 1436 edition (Antwerp) has "capelaen, capitels". These may indicate differing local usages, or they may indicate, in the last two examples, a difference of stress. The Ghent Boecius often uses the spelling "de oude" (e.g. fol.2, col.2).

In the journals of De Ruyter in the 17th century similar spellings still occur: e.g. "gehallt, styve, bootter, keerren" (cf. conversely "begonen"). The occasional hypercorrect use of '-tte, -dde' in verbs may be connected with this lack of sureness in handling double consonants (see below), and De Ruyter shows many examples of this tendency. Coornhert's Voorreden of the previous century uses "fauffen, kortten", and it seems that the letter 't' is particularly prone to superfluous doubling (see below), for Huygens often uses such forms as "huyten, varkortten, hertten, worttel" (Worp 1,157-8). Internal doubles in Bredero's work, such as "ydelle, wandellen", are attributed by Caron (Reductievocaal, p.13) to a stress on the preceding vowel, though this is not a necessary implication, and does not explain his spelling "muyllen" (Weijnen p.12). Examples such as these are not widespread and never applied with any semblance of system.

They do however occur over a considerable period of time. In the earlier years of the 17th century Dafforne has "ghevoellens", in mid century De Witt uses "officieren" and Zoet has the occasional forms "ruimme, bedroopen, verloopen, schuitteboeven, roeppen" both in his works (p.33-6) and in Klios Kraam (II,271, 233); the 1714 edition of his works has a normalised spelling, though see '-kk-' below. Bogaard, also included in Klios Kraam (I) has the hapax spelling "Engellantts". Zoet's "Zabynaja" includes the spellings "geheuggen, klaaggelikke".

Around the turn of the century Van Rusting uses similar superfluous double consonants in his Volgeestige Werken, e.g. "Troopfttten" (p.11). Although they are not very common in this work of his, they almost de rigueur in his "Schouwtoneel des Doods" (1707), where the following and many others can easily be found:

"verdrietten, genietten, cierren, ophoopping, vrugtten, hiellen, smartten, nagtten".
The motivation seems to be an extension of the rule which causes doubling in such as "bed – bedden", though even this hyperapplication does not explain some of his forms, such as "geennerhande, trompetteent"

One relatively common anomalous usage, but with a fairly logical footing, is the use of '-kk-' after a long vowel. A large number of instances of this have been located, and they are far more common than the '-pp-, -tt-' etc. just described. The basis of this spelling is the older use of '-ck-' in such words as "maec" which, in inflexion, had 'k' inserted ("maecken") to prevent wrong pronunciation of the 'c' (see chap.2). Spellings of the sort "maecken, speecken" are exceedingly common up to the mid 17th century. With the general replacement of 'ck' by 'kk' a number of users did not always simplify to the single '-k-', but changed directly from "maecken" to "maakken", although the latter does not have the same justification as the former. An identical situation arose for '-nek-, -rck-, -lck-', giving '-nkk-, -rkk-, -lkk-' (see chap.2).

The main period of use of these '-kk-' spellings after a long vowel is from the 1650's (i.e. when 'kk' began to take over from 'ck') to the early years of the next century. One of the very earliest references comes from Dafforne in 1627: when discussing double letters in general he comments that "De Oude Schryvers (yns ghevoellens) hebben de dobbel Letteren met groote opmerkking gehestellt! als zynde een wyze van stellinge die vol-kommelyk met een vol-luydigh uyt-spraak stonde. Doch Ik zal moede een na-bootser zyn in 't spellen van 'Den-ken, Dan-ghen, En-kal, El-ken, Men-ghen, Spre-nkel, Wen-ken, Zin-ghen, Zul-ken', (het en ware hier, en'd'daer)". These occasional uses he refers to in the last phrase, apart from the unusually high number in the sentence itself (Dafforne often uses a spelling he discusses in the immediate vicinity of that section as if to impress it upon the reader – cf chap.3), include "enkel, enkela, winkel, elkken, maakken" (p.21-25). The hyphens are used in his examples because he is also discussing the syllable division of these words, though the '-kk-' spellings, on the rare occasions when they occur, are not restricted to such positions.

A very good example of the generation of this spelling is furnished by Hooft's "Gedichten". The 1644 edition regularly uses the then contemporary
'ck-' spelling in such as "vaekken, daekken" (p.301), which in the 1693 edition become "vaekken, daekken". The contemporary anthology Klioos Kraam (1656-7) has several examples of the same spelling; Zoet regularly uses them (vaekken, maakken, wiekken, adelriikke etc) as he also did in his "Digtwerkken" of 1675, though the 1716 edition, apart from the first few pages, changes them all to 'k-. His "Zabynaja" of 1643 also uses "telfkenen"; 'ck-' is much more commonly found in his works than the anomalous 'rr-' etc described above. Franciscus Martinus (Klioos Kraam t.6) has a single example of "rijkken", and the Index to the 2nd volume has "onverlijkkelijkken" for a poem of J.Lescailje's which in the text has "onvergelijkkelijkken", though whose spelling it is is unclear since the editor (Rintjus) always spells '-like' himself.

The only grammar to recommend these forms (apart from Dafforne's comment) is Millenius in 1664: "If the last syllable of any Noun haue but one vowel, & end in 'e', or 'k', the last letter doth double it selfe in the Plurall: as 'Chelak, Chelukken,...Minnelik, minnelikken, plank; plankken'" (p.19). He also gives the comparative adjectives "Rijk, rijkker" (p.29), and the inflected forms "welkke, welkker, mijn bouk, mijne boukken" (p.33). In all later editions the spelling was amended, though since the rule and the examples were left unaltered this did not contribute greatly to the logicality of the statement (cf. the similar phenomenon with 'gt' described in chapter 3).

In the next century Van Rusting's "Schouwtoneel" of 1707 still regularly uses "boekken, zaakken, verzoekk'ik, blijkken", though he also uses other less easily justified doubles (see above). The solitary example "wijkken" occurs in the quotation given below from E.C.P., when discussing forms such as "antwoorde". De Vin has such forms as "soekken, eerlijkke, kloekke" in his "Gesalvede Christen" though apparently not in his grammar.

An interesting anomaly with 'ck-' from a much earlier time is in the usage of Lambricht. He always uses 'k-' after long vowels, 'ck-' after short stressed vowels, but 'ck-' after 'ou' ("boucken" etc.). Most of his contemporaries treat 'ou' as a long vowel.
"-ck-' spelling in such as "vaeken, daecken" (p.301), which in the 1658 edition become "vaekken, daekken". The contemporary anthology Klioos Kraam (1656-7) has several examples of the same spelling: Zoet regularly uses them (smeekken, maakken, wiekken, adelriikke etc) as he also did in his "Digtwerkken" of 1675, though the 1714 edition, apart from the first few pages, changes them all to '-k-'.

His "Zabynaja" of 1643 also uses "talckkenen"; '-kk-' is much more commonly found in his works than the anomalous '-rr-' etc described above. Franciscus Martinus (Klioos Kraam 1,6) has a single example of "rijkken", and the Index to the 2nd volume has "onverlijkkelijkken" for a poem of J.Lescailje's which in the text has "onvergelijkelijken", though whose spelling it is is unclear since the editor (Rintjus) always spells '-likke' himself.

The only grammar to recommend these forms (apart from Dafforne's comment) is Hillenius in 1664: "If the last syllable of any Noun have but one vowel, & end in 'c', or 'k', the last letter doth double it selfe in the Fluart: as 'Gheluk, Ghelukken,...Himelik, Himelikken, plank, plankken'" (p.19). He also gives the comparative adjectives "Rijk, rijkker" (p.29), and the inflected forms "welkke, welkker, mijn bouk, mijne boukken" (p.33). In all later editions the spelling was amended, though since the rule and the examples were left unaltered this did not contribute greatly to the logicality of the statement (cf. the similar phenomenon with '-gt' described in chapter 3).

In the next century Van Rusting's "Schouwtonen" of 1707 still regularly uses "boekken, zaakken, versoek'ik, blijkstra", though he also uses other less easily justified doubles (see above). The solitary example "wijkken" occurs in the quotation given below from E.C.P., when discussing forms such as "antwoorde".

De Vin has such forms as "zoekken, eerlijkke, kloekke" in his "Gezalvde Christen" though apparently not in his grammar.

An interesting anomaly with '-ck-' from a much earlier time is in the usage of Lambrecht. He always uses '-k-' after long vowels, '-ck-' after short stressed vowels, but '-ck-' after 'ou' ("houcken" etc.). Most of his contemporaries treat 'ou' as a long vowel.
Double 'ff' and double 'ss'

A spelling which arose quite early, and unconnected with the usages described above, was the use of 'ff' and 'ss' to specify the unvoiced sounds /f/ and /s/.

In the case of the latter the usage is found primarily before the definitive separation of 's' and 'z' (see chap.11), and the former is usually found where /f/ is not normally heard in Dutch, mostly after a long vowel (Dutch fricatives are usually voiced after long vowels, unvoiced after stressed short vowels). De Heuiter alluded to this fact when he wrote that "lange vocalen en Diphthongen ... alle consonanten hun volgende, schienen te verkraincken ... korte vocalen die selve schienen te versteraken" (p.47).

But there were still frequent uses of such spellings long after the functional difference between 's' and 'z' were well established. Words which are commonly found thus include "twijffelen" (Van der Schuere, Sijters, Stevin, Hooft, Witschooten, Hoenen, Van Hoogstraten), "oeffenen" (Coornhert's Voorreden, Dukkerius, Van Haren, Van Borsselen, Chalmot), "cijffer" (Niervaert), "triumffe" (Killan, Killiana Augusta), less commonly "begraffenenis" (Hoener's questions to Vondel), "sterffelijk" (Valecoog, Dukkerius), "vouffrew" (Aerschot), "Hieffelijk" (Van Borsselen, Luyken), "laeffenis" (Van Borsselen); the many 'ss' spellings include "keersse, kanssen, persse, herse, oreszie, saussen, Prinssen, bruyselicke" from the same writers and many others.

Sometimes 'ss' is used with a similar function in the suffix normally spelt 'sch' (see chap.13), e.g. "Engelsse, Grieksse", and similarly "vreeselijk" (De Heuiter). "Wys" in Coornhert's Voorreden may be influenced by German, though the doubling is inappropriate here (="wijs, wijze"). Such spellings died out largely early in the 13th century, though a few, notably "oeffenen, twijffelen" persisted much longer.

Opposition to these forms is found already in the resolutions of the Bible translators: "Lieflick, loflick", per unicum 'f'. non 'lieffelick, loffelick'", though their main objection would appear to be the number of syllables - "placuit esse disyllaba". More freedom was allowed in other words: "Tuyschen, eyschen" scribi posaunt sine duplici 'sa' et cum eo". The doubling in 'ssch-' is not quite the same phenomenon, since the 'ch' is often used to indicate that /s/ is
heard, noting a doubling of the 'ss' with this function unnecessary (cf. "visch, vischen" chap.13).

Several grammars attacked the 'ss-' and 'ff-' spellings, mostly in the later years of the 13th century when, as mentioned, they were becoming less accepted. De Haezs for example argues that "perssen" cannot be correct since the stem is "pers" not "perss" (a weak argument, since the same can be said of "vis, heb, bad" etc.), and the Nederlandse Letterschik (ca.1775) says that "De 'ff' en de 'ss' worden vruchteloos verdubbeld in de volgende woorden: 'trijffel, erffenis', ons. 'yerselyk, assesen, eysschen, perssen, kennisse (I)' enz., maar niet in 'meesteresse, abdisse', enz." (p.35). G.W.Holtrop and Bolhuis criticised "danssen" and "twaifelen" etc., and the Rut grasmier (1814) comments that "eisschen, asessen, braassen, oeffenen, twijffelen" are as "ongerijmd" as "lagch, pogch, huigchelen, juigchen", with which De Simpel agrees in common with most contemporaries. Behaegel (1.377) connects this usage with the still current Southern use of 's' for /s/, commenting that a correct use of 's' and 'f' would render the spellings "danssen" etc. unnecessary.

Even in 1324 Emets still thinks it worth repeating that "een 's' is onnut in 'eisschen, ruijschen, grenszen, bloessem'. Een 'ff' is overtollig in 'schuijffelen, twijffel, oeffening'. Maar de 's' is grondletter in 'droes', dus ook in 'droes-seen'". Siegenbeek does not discuss this spelling, but with the recommendation of De Vries and De Winkel that one 's' or 'f' was adequate this usage became the norm. An extension of this use of 'as' for /s/ is put forward by Van Daele, with "asiered", and Van Daele and De Necker both also used 'as' in the suffix '-assel' for the same reason (see chap.11).

Double consonants in verbs

The doubling of the 'd' or 't' in the imperfect tense of weak verbs is quite regular, and is included in the "productief proces" of verb formation described by Van den Berg in chapter 6. The doubling arises through the stem of the verb ending in '-d' or '-t' receiving the regular imperfect ending '-de, -te', as in "antwoord + de, groet + te", giving "antwoordde, groette". Once this process is recognised these forms can be seen to be regularly formed, though phonetically
one of the consonants is superfluous. This superfluity has caused a
simplification of such spellings both on the part of writers who may have been
unaware that consistency demanded a doubling, and on the part of those who were
consciously attempting to simplify the spelling either in their own usage or in
a plan for general spelling reform.

In Middle Dutch the usual forms were neither of those just mentioned, but
rather such forms as "antwoordede, grootede", all adding the suffix '-de' to the
stem + 'e'. Such forms continue for a long time into the modern Dutch period,
and are still given by some 13th century grammars. Many of the latter were
especially concerned about verbs such as "redden, zetten" where if the then normal
'-ide, -tte' forms were used the present tense could not be distinguished from
the imperfect, the more so since the longer forms of the present tense, e,g.
"ik schuddde" were still current. This ambiguity led Hooft for one to advise
against the use of these longer forms in the present tense (Waerneingen, No.19).

For those who use the '-dede, -tede' forms there was no problem. They
used the regular forms "reddede, zette" in accordance with their general rule.
This is true for example of Van Haule, and later in Beyer (p.141) who used the
former's grammar as his basis. Several grammars in the 13th century still
recommend this form, e.g. the Sewel revision of La Grue, even though Sewel himself
only used '-tta, -dde' in his own works, as did the original La Grue grammar of
1641. On page 211 Sewel gives "ik antwoordde ou antwoordede, achtte ou achtede,
...reddde ou reddede". Even where '-dde, -tte' was used Sewel still considered
that the consonant was pronounced double - he heard /dede/, /tede/ where he spelt
'dde, tte'. It is arguable whether this is autosuggestion caused by the '-dede'
and '-tede' forms, or a spoken relic of a period when these forms were indeed
pronounced in full. A contemporary user of such forms is Boomkamp, with
"lustede" in his book on Alkmaer (1742).

Van Belle uses the '-dede' form only as an alternative for the second person
plural: "Gy-lieden haatte, 6f, haattede" both in the indicative and in the
subjunctive (1743 p.54-55). Kramer gives alternative spellings (e.g. "ik
bloedde (bloedede), ik boette (boette)") for all such verbs, whereas the
"Grammaire pour apprendre" of 1757 and Janson (e.g. in his English work p.209)
give only the long forms "heetede, geschiedede, maide, soheidede" etc.
Hasendonck, as late as 1314, still gives "vluchtte, vluchtede;... achtte, achtede; groette, groetede". It may be significant that Janson, Hasendonck and the anonymous "Grammaire..." all come from the South.

If the words of one grammarian are to be believed then some of these puristic longer forms underwent a renaissance towards the end of the 13th century. Schwiers wrote in 1799 that the normal form was "doode, bloedde" etc., except for verbs whose stem ended in '-d', which were "schuddede, gy schuddedet" etc. (these forms are almost unpronounceable). He adds that "The above is an observation which should be attended to, since the best writers have of late made it their practice" (p.76). He is however probably only copying from Zeydelaar (see below) who was a great influence on him (see chaps.7 & 11). The vast majority of grammars from the mid 17th century (e.g. the Bible translators, D.10) onwards give only the '-dde, -tte' form and its justification, and this too is the most common form outside grammars.

Some works do not conform to any contemporary pattern but use a system of their own. That Hooft should feel tempted (Waernermingen No.119) to write "kostde... want het staat voor 'kosteden'" is understandable. Similar lines of reasoning were followed by others though not always with equally acceptable results. Van der Linden regularly uses "agtde, gelustde, latde, agldtde, onderstutde", but will not accept the form "brandde" as used by Rabus: "Waar toe Heemt by hier 'dd'/? - it is, he claims, unnecessary, and also inconsistent since it would demand the spelling "verbroddde" for "verbroddede". He does not seem to realize that his own '-tde' forms demand just the same forms. The form "belooftde" used by De Ruyter is really on a par with the spelling "noortder" rather than being an example of the '-tde' imperfect tense spelling (cf. chap.5).

The only other grammar to recommend '-tde' is E.C.P., who begins by voicing the standard argument which he then takes to its logical conclusion: "On de Werkwoorden 'Achten, antwoorden, leyden, zuchten, vluchten' enz van hun lamachtig Imperfectum, 'Achtde, antwoordde, leydeder, zuchtede, vluchtede' te ontslaen, heeft men Gerard gevonden 'achtte, antwoordde, leydeder, zuchtte, vluchtte' enz te schrijven; maar wat raedt is 'er voor 'besetten, beletten, omwatten' enz?"
Want indien men 'besette, belatte, omvatte' schrijft, zoo en wikkelen die.

EmpeFecta van 't Praesens niet genoeg af. My vult in dat men 'besetde, beletde, omvatde' zou nagen schrijven. Doch wat nu gedaen met 'redden'? Ik zou het met 'reeditde' inschikken! 

Zeydelaar, later in the century, had the same problem with "redden, zetten, spotten". He recommends the '-dde, -tte' spelling for normal verbs ("antwoordde" etc.), but "schuudde, reddedde, spottede" (cf. Schuier above) to distinguish the past tense from the present, since a past tense form "ik schuudde" zou gantsch niet goed zijn". Unfortunately (from an aesthetic point of view) he went one step further and declared that if these forms contained a syllable too many for use in poetry then a shortened form could be employed. This was not to be the ambiguous "zette" etc., but "zett'te, vatt'te, spatt'te", which are compromise forms since the apostrophe suggests that they are short for "zette" etc., yet the 't' of "zette, schitte" is used. 

A similar form to this occurs in Suits (p.103): "ik trachte, trachte-de, trachtte,... ik spitte, spittede, spittte". This may well be a misprint, since the verb "kladden" on the previous page has "kladdede, kladde". A form such as "spittte" would not however have been far removed from Zeydelaar's "spatt'te", nor from forms such as "hij vatt't" suggested at a later date (see below).

Bilderdijs's use of the spelling "ontaartde" is inspired by a desire to differentiate "aart/aard" from "aard/aarde" (cf. chap.5 & chap.11). 

In the middle of the 20th century a movement got under way to simplify all the spellings with '-dde, -tte' on the grounds that they caused confusion through containing a superfluous letter. How much evidence is there of such confusion in the past? Forms with a single 't-' or 'd-' can be found very frequently in the 16th and 17th century, e.g. "antwoorde" in Coornhert and Duikerius, "lichte" (from "lichten") in Jan de Witt's letters, "bekleede, plante" in Vondel, and a regular use of such forms in the first edition of Hooff's "Hendrik de Grote", which in later editions were "regularised" to '-dde, -tte'. He does not seem to have used his '-dde' forms in practice. These writers therefore, or their printers, evidently felt no need to double the consonant here to avoid confusion of tenses. 

Forms with single 't' or 'd' are in fact given by Van Meurs: Als men in de
derde Vervouginge der werk-woorden, van het woort der onbepaelde wijze, de laatste 'n' afneemt, ofte in de plaats van de 'n' stelt 'De', zo heeft men twee verscheidene woorden, die den onvolkomen tijt uyt-drucken, als 'Achten', heeft in den onvolkomen tijt, 'Achte' en 'Actede'" (1633, p.35-6). This comment is also kept in Hexham and Beyer, who used Van Heule's grammar. Van Heule also recommends the parallel noun spelling: "(sommige woorden) hebben 'Te' als 'de sterkte, de grote'" (p.21). For this Hexham gives "de grote" but Beyer (p.120) uses the more orthodox form "de grootte". The note of the Bible translators mentioned above strongly suggests that they knew of such spellings with a single 'd' or 't': "'Geschiedde, wendde, antwoordde, brandde, doodde', et similia imperfecta, in his 'd' alterum addatur, pro nota imperfecti" (D.IO).

Reverse trends also occur, - i.e. the use of a doubled consonant where it was not necessary and not demanded by rules of consistency. De Castelein's works include the line "Den soon, dien dese harpe vier haer officie vuudtte, was Iesus Christus...". De Ruyter frequently writes such forms as "roeydde, seydden, oordynerdde, smacktten, maectten, stoptte, aardde". Even in the 13th century these same hypercorrect spellings occur. For example in the dedicatory poem "Op de Uytgave van de Kronyk van Egmond" in the work of that name by Eikelenberg: "...En in de uytspraak triomfeerdde, /Waarom men hem roemdde en eerdde,..." etc., especially in rhyme words such as "erkendde/aanwendde, behoordde/bekoordde, hersteldde/kneldde" etc. The book appeared in 1732, and as this spelling appears nowhere in the text itself it would seem to belong only to the writer of the poem, who signs himself "AntiquitatisStudio".

Such forms do not occur frequently after this date, though "lachtte" is given as the imperfect of "lachen" by De Neckere (p.59). It is not unknown for a related hypercorrect doubling to be found in such words as "haattede" (Van Belle see above), "leiddede" (-Bilderdijk uses "aflieiddede" in his "Merkwaardige Luchtreis" p.9). More modern examples are quoted by Gerlach Royen (Romantiek, pp.15,190,203): "(ze) overleidden het opzienbarende nieuws", "waarrond andere mannen de ronde stroeschelven al hooger en hooger optassten", "of je je ver-gstatte"(Scharten), and "braidde, zich vermeiddee"(Coolen). The last two may be due to a hypercorrect restoration of an intervocalic '-d-' in the infinitives 'breien,
There seems therefore to be ample evidence that confusion did occur in the use of these spellings. This confusion, along with the fact that both forms sound the same, has been the main argument of those who plead for the simplification of this spelling.

This is not a purely modern movement. Its precursor is to be found in the 13th century with Jan des Roches in 1761 (Van Heule, the century before, was not trying to reform the spelling when he gave "achte", since this was still in use). He felt such doubling to be totally unnecessary: "Daer is geschil over de Verba die uytgaen in 'den' en 'ten'. Zoor geleerde Schryvers maaken aldus die Imperfecta: 'blinden, ik blindede; agten, ik agtede; zugen, ik zutete'. Andere verdubbelen alleen de consonans, 'ik blindde, ik agtte, ik zutte'. De meeste (1), Vondel met de beste Schryvers naen hun hoofd, spellen aldus: 'ik agte, ik blinde, ik zutte'" (p.57).

In support of this he mentions the comparable dual-purpose forms in Latin: "legit" (he reads, has read), and French: "je punis" (I punish, punished). The same could be said for such English verbs as "I cut, shut, let" etc., where the same form is used for present, imperfect and past participle, as also in the modern spelling of the Dutch verbs "zetten, reddien" where the same form is used for present and imperfect, as mentioned earlier. Des Roches usually abided by contemporary usage in this respect, his dictionary for example giving "agtte".

De Simpel's reaction to this argument was that what happened in other languages proved nothing about Dutch; this is a valid criticism if Des Roches's argument is taken to extremes, but the latter's point is also valid in showing that claims that the differentiation of the tense forms was "essential" were exaggerations.

No more was heard of this reform suggestion until Van den Heuvel resurrected it in 1933, along with his "hij vind" suggestion (see chap.6):"Bij de vervoeging van het werkwoord vervallen de dubbele 'd' en 't' als vorm van de verleden tijd". As mentioned in other chapters, Wille made certain predictions about future radical trends, and included amongst these are the '-dde, -tte' forms: "is zoo de regel der gelijkvormigheid - die veel te moeilijk is voor het volksonderwijs (he is being sarcastic) - eenmaal opgeheven, dan volgen noodzakelijkerwijze
tacht' voor 'gt' ... en 'd' in plaats van 'dd'... etc. The proposals of Van den Neve1 had no real chance to be heard as they were immediately drowned by the Marchant reforms of 1934. The rule given in the Woordenlijst of 1956 specifically reject any such spelling: 'niet '(hij) prate' (verl. tijd), maar '(hij) praste', wegen 'lachte'...'(hij) baatde', wegen 'hoorde'!

Van der Velde, Rombouts (p.36), and the V.W.S. all plead for such a simplification, and for a similar modification in the abstract nouns "grootte/grote, breedte/breede", as proposed by Van Heule 300 years earlier. (Earlier texts also yield assimilated forms such as "wijtte", e.g. in Van Yk.) Rombouts points out that the absorption of the 't' of the ending '-te' into the '-t' of the stem is no more strange than the forms "dwaast, wijst, viest, boost" for "dwaas + st" etc. (p.39). This simplification/assimilation would mean that "bij de 'd-' en 't'-verwoorden de meerouwsvraven van de verleden tijd samenvallen met die van de tegenwoordige tijd: 'wij melden U bij deze, wij melden U de vorige week...'! Mocht iemand hiertegen bezwaar hebben, dan zeggen we: al lang hebben we hetzelfde geval gehad met werkwoorden als 'weeden, redden, kladden, zetten, wetten, vatten, ditten!'".

These arguments were accepted by the committee of the "Eindvoorstellen" and included in their proposals. This did not meet with universal approval: Van den Berg wrote that "Het spellingverschil tussen 'prate' en 'praatte' en dat tussen 'antwoorde' en 'antwoordde' beantwoordde aan een verschil in functie en het verstrekte dus een zinvolle informatie aan het lezende oog dat zichtbare tekens interpreteert. Opheffing van dit spellingverschil is een irrationele daad". This is fundamentally the same argument as frequently put forward in earlier times for the retention of '-sch' in adjectives e.g. by Scharten (see chap.13), and also for the use of 'oo/o' and 'ee/e' (e.g. "kolen/koolen") by De Vries and Te Winkel; the defence of the '-tte, -dde' forms does have more validity than these latter however.

Paardekoper's view, as expressed at the annual meeting of the V.W.S. in 1965, is that "Wij willen één woordbeeld omdat er maar één klankbeeld is". Mulisch (p.49) opposed this change, as did Kruyskamp: "Hoe wil je kinderen het volgende laten begrijpen: we kennen de vervoegingen 'maken - hij maakte' on 'praten -
hij praatte'. Volgens de nieuwe spelling zou dit laatste werkwoordsvorm worden 'hij prate'. Zo'n woord geeft toch een heel scheef beeld tegenover die vervoeging van 'maken'" (Algemeen Dagblad 15.1.72). Conversely the examples of children's spelling given by Van der Velde and by Rombouts show that young children especially care little for such regularity, and prefer to write the phonetic forms with a single 't' or 'd'.

A phenomenon in many ways similar to the development from '-dede' to '-dde' is seen in the present tense and in the past participle of some verbs. In both of these - the present tense being in the third person singular - a verbal ending '-et' is added to a stem ending in '-d' or '-t'. Thus for example Revius uses "opgerechtet". When such forms were simplified - the '-et' merging with the final 't' or 'd' of the stem, the spelling was normally also simplified to 't' (later '-dt' for '-d' stem verbs, see chap.6). Some writers however, possibly drawing on the analogy with the '-dde, -tte' forms mentioned above, merely dropped the vowel, leaving a double final '-tt'. Oohraan and Van Loey record such forms as "heett, leett, ett, doratt" in Middle Dutch, De Castelein uses the participle "ghedichtt", Lambrecht uses "laatt, moett, Chaprrentt te Ghend (title page), geprentte boeken (cf. below)" etc.; the Ghent Boecius has a similar spelling "gheprentt" with a hypercorrect '-d' in its colophon. Lucas d'Heere has such lines as: "End' ic en can niet ghechuern God weett./ Ghy hebt noch eenen vryer die hem vermeett". Van Beaumont rhymes "onbelett/ ick sett" (see below: final doubles). In the 17th century De Hubert uses such past participles consistently within his system: "gielett"; and Huygens too uses such as "gesett, gepraett". Revius usually has the '-et' forms, but occasionally has past tense forms such as "hiett". These spellings also form a direct parallel with the treatment of enclitic pronouns and articles: De Castelein often uses such forms as "datt (dat + (h)et), almoot (alzoo dat), dart (dat + dat?)", and Lambrecht also has "datt, diett (= die dat?)".

These spellings are rarely seen after the early years of the 17th century, and by the mid 18th century Van Belle was able to use "gy bett" as a purely hypothetical form to illustrate the ridiculousness of the "gy redt" spelling (see chap.6).

Amongst later reform movements and suggestions it has sometimes occurred
to the logical instincts of the reformer that such forms are demanded by the
productive processes of verb formation in Dutch. Land (1870) argued that since
"raadt" was consistent with the rules (stem + t) the past tense of hebben might
be argued to be "hij laat" instead of "hij hat". In 1912 one of the more
radical suggestions surrounding the Kollowijn movement came from Schumann, who
described a strong analogy-based verbal spelling: just as "singen, ik sing, hij
zingt; ik leer, hij leert" etc. are formed, so too should one use "vallen, ik
vall, hij valt; vatten, ik vatt, hij vatt" (sic). Even in 1954 the
Woordenlijst felt obliged to make the position clear: "In een zelfde lettergroep
wordt een medeklinker niet verdubbeld: 'hij praat; verwoord (verl.deelw.),
gedood; gezet'; enz. (onders: 'hij zingt; gehoord, gedaan');". Several years
later Paardekoper (Syntaxis 3.5 20.4.2.3) was still to ask: "Hoe komt het
immers dat niemand voorstelt om ...'hij laat' (te gaan spellen) omdat we toch
ook 'hij laat' spellen? Kennelijk omdat we van zulke analogy-gevoelens niet
de minste last hebben". Like Van Belle he uses these forms to show that "hij
laat, vindt" have a superfluous letter.

Although the use of final doubles in such as "gehaatt" died out quite early,
the use of double consonants in the inflected forms "gehaatte, gehaatte"
continued in use for much longer, presumably under the influence of the very
similar imperfect tense forms of the same verbs. Indeed the rule which
prescribes the use of double 'dd' and 'tt' in the imperfect should, if
consistency is required, also demand this doubling in the participle, at least
in the inflected forms. These have however usually been rejected by grammars
since they imply a non-inflected form ending in '-tt' which would break a
fundamental spelling rule. This argument is totally invalid, since "gehaatt" is
no more implied by "gehaatte" than "hobb" is by "hebben".

Examples are hard to come by as the usage was not very common, but even
eminent writers such as Koonen have forms such as "nieuwsmeedde" (p.33). Though
uncommon this system must have been in continued use; the Huit grammar of 1814
still feels it necessary to reject them: "eindelijk verdienen ook zij geenen
neveling, die in deelwoorden, op 'd' en 't' eindigende, die letter bij
verbuiging verdubbelen, en dus 'gehaatte' van 'haten', 'gesmolde' van 'melden'
in plaats van 'gehaate, gevalde' schrijven; welke laatste schrijfwijze aan de
uitbreiding volkomen voldoet, en door het algemeen gebruik van vroegeren en
latereen tijd gewettigd is". Two points emerge from this: firstly the forms
"verdienen ... geenen navolging"—they were therefore common enough to merit
mention, secondly the forms "aan de uiterstaak volkomen voldoe(n)" with a single
't, d'—the same could be said of "haate, melde" etc. as imperfect tense forms
instead of "haatte, meldde" defended by the same grammar. Behaegel has a
similar comment, condemning such forms as "gekenDDe, gekochTTe, gekochtTTe"(1,451).

Even the Woordenlijst of 1954 felt a need to note that "'d' en 't' worden
niet verdubbeld in verborgen vormen van verliden deelwoorden bij werkwoordstammen
op 'd' en 't', wits geen gedekte klinker voorafgaat: 'het versooide kind, de
gehate vijand'" (p.xliii, om.7). And it would seem that such a warning was
still necessary, for instances of these spellings with doubled 'dd' and 'tt'
can be found even in recent times. Gortach Royen (Romantiek, pp.15,190,203,216)
records the following examples: "green-gewande, ontmoette, vergoodde" (Scharten),
"bruinbesprootte" (Coolen), and especially Van Deyssel who "verdubbelt ... bij
deelwoorden geregeld de slot '-d' en '-t'. Hij zal schrijven: 'toegewijde
leerling, het uitgebrade stadsdeel, de uitgevaste wolven, het genootse
stoom, ... doorvoedde schouderenbulting'. In these the influence of the
imperfect tense "ontmoette, vergoodde, doorvoedde" is clearly seen.

Double consonants at the end of a syllable/ word

Almost as widespread as the use of double 'ff' within a word, as described
above for "oeffenen" etc., is the use of double 'ff' at the e nd. The two
phenomena are probably unrelated, since the latter is possibly due to influence
from German. Final '-ff' is not common after the mid 17th century, whereas
medial '-ff-' was still very common in the 13th century (see above).

The use of '-ff' begins already in Middle Dutch, and becomes quite common
in the 16th and early 17th century. A 16th century "refrein" contains the
illustrative line "U lieffde, lieff, heeft my wt lieffden genesen" (quoted by
Van Vriesland in "Spiegel van de nederlandse poëzie", I 105). Very few works
apply this spelling consistently, though a great many contain occasional
examples (probably type-setters' forms). For example Sexagius has the single
"geoff" (Gr.), Plantijn "ten derrf my nief sanden", Spiegel "off, loff, nosef" in his "Hertspiegel", and in the Twe-spraack "uyff, gaff, off, schreoff", Van Beaumont "off", Van Santen a more regular "off, dieff, k'llooff" (first editions only), Camphuyzen "loff, aff", Van der Venne's motto "Menigh frey is lief"/ Allied not brant in general?". De Ruyter, Croon, Barlaeus, Van Griethuisen, Van Maestricht (the letter two in Ellear's Aan II), Lodensteyn, and Hilarides all use double final -ff to a greater or lesser extent (for Hilarides cf. chap.7). Miervaert gives "fa, aff" as syllables containing 'f' in 1676, where the 1743 edition has "fa, af". As late as 1775 Staring spells "verblijff, braaff" in one of his letters. Ellett felt that this spelling arose "ten bewijze der meerder hardheid van de stuitletter... schryvende 'wijff, aff, hoff'": this is an unsatisfactory explanation unless he knew of a tendency to confuse the letters 'f' and 'v', and even this use would be unnecessary in final position where /v/ is never heard.

Whereas many writers used this double final '-ff' spelling a subset exists which is comparatively minor: these used not only final '-ff' but also final '-ll' and '-tt'. This usage is possibly related to such examples as "gestillt" mentioned above and likewise probably stems from German tradition. Yet these users are distinct from the "'-ff only" group mentioned above, if only because so many writers restricted themselves to doubling the '-ff' and left final '-ll', '-tt', single.

Just how widespread this practice was is hard to ascertain, but certainly in 1531 it was common enough for De Heuiter to warn: "Wacht u int laste der woorden, eindelijk in consonant die zelve te verdubbelen, alzo som zonder reden douw,schriverende: 'will, still, geschill, prill; miff, platt, vatt, datt, aff, gaff, laff' en meer derzelge daer nohtens een 'l', 'f', en 'v, genouh zijn" (p.36).

N.B. he only gives examples with '-ll, -tt, -ff' (of below). One writer who used this spelling before De Heuiter was Coornhert in his "Voorreden" of 1563, e.g. "(de blinden) en helpt keerse noch brill. Ende all ist dat de blinde..." (p.10), "of#(p.9), "sall" (p.13) and many others (mostly around p.10). Of doubtful motivation is the single spelling "ick sett" in Van Beaumont, - is it just a '-tt' spelling as mentioned by De Heuiter, or is it by analogy with "setten" (see below), or is it for visual rhyme with the participle "onbeletten"?
The pirated edition of Boeuer Visscher's "Lof vande Mut se" in 1612 (published "sonder (o)en encomiss ende useit") has many of these spellings: the title page reads "T'LOFF VADE V'TE", and in the text such examples as "off, dooff, aff, lieff, wijff, lijff, sall, vill" abound (e.g. p.23); 'ff' is more common than '-ll' however. The authorised version of 1614 has '-f, -l'.

The Bible translators reject "bevell" (see below), but put forward "glatt", quod multi in 'd' mutant in "glaadcyt!", and "satt" - "videtur tamen etiam 'satt' scribi possa (...for "'sat' a 'sat zijn'") discriminis causa, at quod 'versadigen' habeat 'd'. 'Satt' commode imperfектur est a 'sitten'". This does not seem to apply generally to the spelling system, just to these words. They further reject the internal doubling in "ellende" and "komen", but here presumably for pronunciation reasons. What is sometimes referred to as a rejection by the translators of the spelling "lasm" (Misc.13) may in fact be merely a comment that the plural occurs "per duplicationem litterae" - viz "lasmereen".

Outside the field of literature, but still amongst educated writers, the doubled final '-ll, -ff, -tt' are consistently used by De Witt in his letters (and in his name): "elff, off, aff, halff, looff; toevall, rootvall; opbott, besett, gatt" and even "tott" (!). Literary users include Anna van Schurman - "Godes Wett", and Hilarides. An interesting feature of this system present in both De Witt and Hilarides is the dropping of one of the double letters when in combination with another word, e.g. De Witt's "tott, totdat" and Hilarides's "off, orse"; De Witt also spells "affeylunge, lieffhebben" and the distinction seems arbitrary. A very similar situation obtained with final '-ck' (chap.2).

The final contemporary comment from grammars on this subject comes from Van der Weyden, who claims that "'druck, ick, kruck, luck' &c immers alzo qualik geschreven wordt als 'hoff, schooff, staff, wall, well, will, satt, ditt, lott, sott'"; note that he, like De Heuiter, only mentions examples with '-ff,-ll,-tt'.

The spelling with final '-ff, -ll, -tt' died out in common use earlier than the "'-ff' only" system (ca.1650), but for both the origin seems equally obscure. Usually attributed to German influence, this does not explain why it is restricted to '-tt, -ll, -ff' (see below for other final doubles where German influence is certainly present). Nor can the usage be explained by recourse to
gelijkvormigheid, - this would explain "sett, sall, will" from "setten, sullen, willen" etc., but cannot explain "looff - loven, gaff - gaven" or "tott", and certainly not the most common words with final '-ff' "aff, off". It may be true in a few cases that a certain writer originally used the gelijkvormigheid double consonant system described below, and then, forgetting its motivation, extended the usage to all final doubles, but again this does not explain why it is restricted for so many writers to the letters '-ff, -ll, -tt'.

One possible influence, not usually mooted, is that of the handwriting style and the written forms of these words: it is particularly striking that 'f, l, t' are all letters whose main feature is a single vertical stroke without major embellishments (cf. 'b, d, h'). The other similar letter, the long 's' (see chap.12) did not occur at the end of a word and so could not be doubled there. It is possible therefore that a single vertical stroke at the end of a written word was aesthetically displeasing to a large number of writers, and was consequently doubled in order to give more "body" to the visual image of the word. Some support for this comes from modern English orthography where the only consonants to be frequently doubled in final position are 'f, l, s' (not 't'); doubling in such as "ebb, egg, add, inn, putt, jazz" is unusual. The deviation here of English using '-ss' but not '-tt' is possibly due to different calligraphic habits (in earlier times it was spelt in English '-ff', which can not be counted as a final doubling - cf. final '-ck'), or may be due to the forms being felt contractions from '-esse'. Such a recourse to aesthetics would not only explain why the majority of vertical letters were doubled by these Dutch writers, but also why the non-vertical letters such as 'g, n, m' were not doubled by them. This is comparable to the frequency of anomalous internal doublings of 'll, tt' as compared to other letters (e.g. in Huygens, Bredero, - see above).

One spelling system which is certainly inspired by German usage is that used by a handful of grammars, and a few writers, who doubled all final consonants where gelijkvormigheid demanded it. Although a few examples are known in Middle Dutch ("gestillt, scifft" etc, see above), the usage was not apparently known to Van der Schuere in 1612 when he wrote that "Het en ware
De Hubert's system seems doubtful. Hermsens (p. 20) feels that "De invloed van De Hubert is vrij groot geweest: hij maakte deel uit van de letterkundige vergaderingen, die ook door Vondel en Hooft bezocht werd. Zijn systeem had een goede kans omdat het weldegacht was".

Whether in reaction to its common use, or out of fear of its becoming used, Ampzing is very critical of De Hubert's system four years later, although he does not mention him by name: "De verdobbellinge der me-klinkeren op het eynde
525.

Het moedig gevoel, na het eerst bij te zien, moet bewondering van den druk, in vreemde gestalte, en zoude ik tegenwoordig niet komen prijzen; also we die letter gemaakt en konnen niet spreken, onde onnuttige regelen in 't gevolg wel kon versien worden. Toen de boek van den vreemdelingen dar maa te komen dienen, dat zag ik zeer grauwe lieden, ende kon men sulkx heel wel ten goeden houden. Maar de enkele gevonden letter des eenvouds, op 't synde des erewouds, achte ik geheel noodzakelijk, ende en kan niet zien, boven ander kan cordelen, als we reden plaatse geven". The phrase "om het meervoud aan te wijzen" does not mean that he knew of a use of final doubles in the plural, but that these doubles in the singular indicate that the consonant is doubled in the plural form.

In 1635 the supremely analytical mind of Montanus felt very strongly drawn by the logical argument behind the double consonant spelling, though he is inclined to respect "gebruik" more than De Hubert does: "Ik (het) in't stafraken (= "spellen") van dit boek nee de eigenheit getracht: en daer ic, om te schouwen al te grooten ongewoonheit, en andere insichten, oneigenheit geschr: heb ic sunk cover al op een enpaerigen voet gedaen, al ist diwils ongewooneliic. By Voorbeelt, oneigenlijk schrijf ic 'ver, val, san, stau, roch, vor, mor, plat, tap!'; voor 'vorr, vall, man, stam, roch, voss, moff, platt, tap'. Later on (p.97) he gives the same rule as De Hubert: "den aert van onze verlenging is, dat het verlengde van het verlengsel geen letter en ontvingt, maar wel een needeelt" - i.e. the suffix cannot add any letter other than its own to the basic word; the suffix '-en' cannot add an 'f' to "hef" to give "heffen", so the two 'ff's must be part of the stem. He too draws a parallel with contemporary English and German. This theory is slightly unusual for Montanus since on the whole he avoids gelijkvormigheid spellings, of which this rule is one (cf. his use of 't' chap.5).

One of the few contemporary literary figures to adopt this spelling was Huygens, though he also tends to use it mixed up with the anomalous doublings described above, which are not covered by this gelijkvormigheid rule. Thus he spells "cob, glad, som, will, voll, sop, Witt, boes, gewerr, natt, Ik schatt" etc.; and even "gelach" in a poem to Tosselschade Visscher; all of these are justifiable by De Hubert's rule. Not so are his other spellings mentioned.

---

des eenvoude, naer de hooglytsche wandez, om het meervoud aan te wijzen, met bewaringhe van den druk, in vreemde gestalte, en zoude ik tegenwoordig niet komen prijzen; also we die letter gemaakt en konnen niet spreken, onde onnuttige regelen in 't gevolg wel kon versien worden. Toen de boek van den vreemdelingen dar maa te komen dienen, dat zag ik zeer grauwe lieden, ende kon men sulkx heel wel ten goeden houden. Maar de enkele gevonden letter des eenvouds, op 't synde des erewouds, achte ik geheel noodzakelijk, ende en kan niet zien, boven ander kan cordelen, als we reden plaatse geven". The phrase "om het meervoud aan te wijzen" does not mean that he knew of a use of final doubles in the plural, but that these doubles in the singular indicate that the consonant is doubled in the plural form.

In 1635 the supremely analytical mind of Montanus felt very strongly drawn by the logical argument behind the double consonant spelling, though he is inclined to respect "gebruik" more than De Hubert does: "Ik (het) in't stafraken (= "spellen") van dit boek nee de eigenheit getracht: en daer ic, om te schouwen al te grooten ongewoonheit, en andere insichten, oneigenheit geschr: heb ic sunk cover al op een enpaerigen voet gedaen, al ist diwils ongewooneliic. By Voorbeelt, oneigenlijk schrijf ic 'ver, val, san, stau, roch, vor, mor, plat, tap!'; voor 'vorr, vall, man, stam, roch, voss, moff, platt, tap'. Later on (p.97) he gives the same rule as De Hubert: "den aert van onze verlenging is, dat het verlengde van het verlengsel geen letter en ontvingt, maar wel een needeelt" - i.e. the suffix cannot add any letter other than its own to the basic word; the suffix '-en' cannot add an 'f' to "hef" to give "heffen", so the two 'ff's must be part of the stem. He too draws a parallel with contemporary English and German. This theory is slightly unusual for Montanus since on the whole he avoids gelijkvormigheid spellings, of which this rule is one (cf. his use of 't' chap.5).

One of the few contemporary literary figures to adopt this spelling was Huygens, though he also tends to use it mixed up with the anomalous doublings described above, which are not covered by this gelijkvormigheid rule. Thus he spells "cob, glad, som, will, voll, sop, Witt, boes, gewerr, natt, Ik schatt" etc.; and even "gelach" in a poem to Tosselschade Visscher; all of these are justifiable by De Hubert's rule. Not so are his other spellings mentioned.
earlier ("ooff, leooft, werff", "schreoff, tuytt, verwijt"; wytt, worttel; restortton" and his almost standard spelling "hertte", etc.). Up to ca. 1621 Huygens only doubled final '-ff, -ll' and (rarely) '-tt'; from about 1622 he also doubled other letters, e.g. "lipp" in "Aan de Soffromen Anna ende Tessell chade Vichers", and "muun" in Psalm 119. Since these date from before the publication of De Hubert they are unlikely to be directly influenced by him, though they may certainly have been encouraged by the support he gave them. De Ruyter occasionally uses "gehallt, heb" (= "ebbe"), though his irregularity is such that they cannot be taken to imply any great acquaintance with the system of De Hubert and Huygens.

In 1653 came an even more rigorous defence of this system than that put forward by De Hubert. Leupenius had already used doubled consonants in a previous work, e.g. "snutt, off" in "De Geessel der Sonaten" of 1651, but now he put his thoughts down in his "Aenmerkingen", in a manner more far-reaching than his predecessor. Whereas De Hubert usually spells a single consonant when not in final position e.g. "gestel", "gepeel" (though not always as Caron (p.xiii) claims, cf. "spelt" in lines 171, 173), Leupenius consistently keeps the double in all derivatives: "Om wel te spellen of de bevattselen (="syllables") recht te maken, moet men voor eerst aangoediglijk acht nemen op de wortelletteren en de selve in de veranderingen van het woord, soo veel mogelijk is, te behouden. Dat moet ook plaats hebben in die woorden waar twee medeklinkers in den wortel te samen komen, die moet men in de buiginge ook behouden, alhoewel een van de selve kracht genoeg hadde, soo moet men schryven "gesellschapp", en niet "gesel schapp"; om dat syn wortel is 'gesellen' niet 'geselen'. 'Hy stelt', niet 'hy stelt', om dat men in den wortel zegt, niet 'ik stela', maar 'ik stelle'; similarly "gestelld, bevattsel, gedrukkt" etc. The only time he will accept the dropping of a consonant is in compound words: "'altyd' voor 'alle tyd', 'sontyd' voor 'somiger tyd'"; though this does not apply to derivatives (cf. "gesellschapp" above).

Whereas Leupenius did have some influence with his double vowel spelling (as seen in his arguments with Vondel), he had very little indeed with his double consonant system. The only contemporary user located is Hendrik Rintjus the editor of the poetry anthology "Klioos Kraam" (1656-57). In his
introductions to the two volumes he consistently spells "gedrukt, strokkt, getolkschapp, ik drukkoe, vall, topp, traurepell, stellde, oogwitt, goproppt, vorr, godlinn, bott, eigendoms, gegannd, hunn, sullt, logg" etc., and even "minnste". He uses exactly the same system in his own poems in the first volume, and in his later work "De Morgenstond". There are occasional other examples in Klioo Kraan: one poem by Zoet is entitled "Aan d'jne Hoeverostlik Doorluchtigheid..." (II,27); Zweerda's poems include "bannt, port" (II,90, 126 - his "Gedichten" 1697 have "port"), Brune has "hebb, hadd, will" (II,207-222), and Jonctijs has "sijn, Portugall, vatt, vlam, hadd, getall, al, barr-aardig" (I,193-4). Of these only Jonctijs has this as a consistent spelling.

A contemporary and compatriot of Rintjus (both were Frisians) was the occasional poet Sibranda, who uses such forms as "trill, schikk, hebbt, besitt, pitt", which raises the question of whether the adherence to this system was a Frisian phenomenon at this time. In what way Van der Nijlden's claim that a doubled letter is used as a sign of the plural in the nouns "kann, Jann, tiin mann" (p.33) may be influenced by this almost contemporary usage is not clear, but the comment may be caused by a misunderstanding of Ampzing's statement given above, taken together with the use of the singular noun in the phrases he mentions.

However, such far-reaching application of the gelijkvormigheid theory was not seen in later times, although Smits (1824) still felt it necessary to say that "men ójndigt gane lettergroep met twee deselvde neven één staande medeklinkers: diensvolgens schrijve men bij afkapping der doffe 'e': 'ik klod, tref, trof, spot, visch' maar niet: 'ik kladd, troff' ens.\" (p.31).

It is possible that more such spellings did occur from time to time in the period between Leupenius and Smits, under German influence, since Sewel's revision of La Grue comments that "il y en a qui veulent retenir les deux Consonnes, & qui prétendent qu'on doit écrire, 'ik beminn, ik krabb, ik ontsnap (sic.= \'-pp\'), ik bekem, ik verdikk'" (1728 p.138, 1762 p.192). It is not necessarily significant that the new editor in the 1762 edition chose not to leave the comment out, and it does not imply a contemporary usage.

It was noted in chapter 2 that this work by Sewel/La Grue was the source of Cuno's grammar written in German in 1741. But in his translating of this
paragraph a very serious error occurred. What possibly happened is that the type setter thought that Cuno had inadvertently used German spellings for Dutch words, and proceeded to "correct" them. The result is a remarkable and startling non sequitur: "Nichts desto weniger wollen einige die beyde consonantes bey behalten, und halten es vor keinen Fehler, dass man schreibe, 'ik begin, ik krab, ik ontsnap, ik beken, ik verdik!'" (p.224). This is not the only occasion on which Cuno makes a serious error by translating over-literally. Probably the worst example is on the pronunciation of the Dutch 'j'. Sewel rightly points out to his French audience that "l'j consonne ne se prononce pas comme l'j Francois, mais plutôt approchant de l'i voyelle". Cuno translates this into an extremely confusing statement for his German readers: "Das j consonans wird nicht wie das Tautsche j consonans ausgesprochen, sonder es niemandth den Thon als das i vocal!"

To just a few grammarians it occurred that stress might be connected with these final double consonants. Montanus for example (p.97) gives as additional justification for this spelling the pairs "ic err/Brouwer, ic bell/ brobbel, ic kenn/reeken", and decides that the first of each pair has a stronger consonant (he does not mention stress or vowel accentuation). Such pairs are a natural consequence of the De Hubert system, since an unstressed final syllable '-el, en, -er' will not double the consonant in inflexion; this cannot however be used as a justification of the system.

A recurrence of this notion appears in Beyer: "Alle de woorden die op het einde long moeten uitgebragt worden, behoorden wel door d'eeen of d'andere by-gevoegde letter van de korte onderscheiden te worden: Ick zoude dan 'borsel' schrijven, om dat de laatste letter-greep kort is; maer 'bostell', om dat deze lang is" (p.102). Unlike most of Beyer's comments this does not seem to be taken from Van Heule. There may also be a connexion here with the example "bevell" mooted by the Bible translators: "'Bevell' an 'bevel', quod usitat. a 'Bevelen', et sic plur." - the decision was in favour of "bevel" (Privatim Observata, 291, Ed.Zwaan).

One unusual use for double consonants is that recommended by Van Heule in 1633. He appears troubled by the fact that the dative singular and plural and the accusative singular of the masculine definite article are all "den", and is
interested by the way that "De Hoogduytsen zeggen 'Denn' in het derde geval".

His solution is to suggest that "Wy stellen in het Meervoud 'Denn' met een
dobbelte 'N', om 'Don' in het Eenvoud, van 'Denn' des Meervouds te onderscheiden,
Hier in de Grieken naervolgende, welke tot onderscheidinge der gevallen een
ICTA SUBSCRIPTA gebruiken... tot meerder onderscheyt der buygingen". "Denn" is
also used as the dative plural of feminine and neuter articles.

He introduces a similar distinction for the ambiguous article "der": "De
woorden des Vrouwelicken geslachts, en worden in het buygen by na niet verandert,
ende de meeste veranderinge geschiet in de Ledekens, als volcht: 'De Wet,
Der wet, Derr of De wet'... Hiert stellen wy 'Derr' of 'De' in het derde Geval,
volgens het 10f-weirich gebroy: der onde tijden, is ende by de Hoogduytschgen
gebruukt, ende woort in desa Taal-spreuken gebroykt: als 'Wy is derr sake
toegestaen. Op dat ik derr waarheyt getuygenisse gave, Johan 13, ende Rom.6. Wy
zijn derr wet gestorven"; in the last example he has mistakenly taken "derr
wet" from his paradigma instead of "derr zonde" of the original. His reference
to former usage is probably to the Middle Dutch form "derre", but the extension
to "Denn" is his own invention, since there is no comparable form "denne" for
him to model on. The most likely course of events was that in his search for a
means of distinguishing the various functions, inspired by German, he came
across Middle Dutch "derre" in the given examples, and by analogy invented "denn".
On p.49 he still uses the orthodox forms: "Het ledeken 'De' des Vrouwelicken
geslachts, wordt alduas gebogen: 'De, Der, Der of De, De'". This means of
differentiation so attracted him that he made analogical changes to the inflexion
of pronouns: "Heurr, Onzerr, onzerr, Dierr, Dienn, Allenn" (p.73-77).

Two of the grammars which copied their ideas from Van Heule reflect these
spellings. The grammar included at the end of Hexham's dictionary has the same
forms, and the work is for the most part a word for word translation of sections
of Van Heule's 1633 edition. Hexham even took over Van Heule's errors (cf. chap.
5): "Wy zijn derr wet gestorven, we are dead to the Lawe. Rom.6". In the
revised edition by Daniel Hanly (1672), all such spellings are normalised to
"der, den" etc. The other grammar, that of Beyer, though not a translation, is
comprehensively based on Van Heule, likewise gives the same examples: "derr,
dienn, heurr, onzerr, onzerr, allenn" (p.126-135).
Influence from Van Heule is also probably the cause of Richardson's comment in 1677: "Haur ... Note... that the 'r' is doubled at the end of 'heur' in the plural number to distinguish it from 'heur' in the singular"; he does not mention any of the other Van Heule spellings. (Hillenius's work, also heavily influenced by Van Heule, does not mention them.) This plan of Van Heule's for differentiation of the cases, like Hooft's for differentiating "hun/hem" in the same way as "huy/hey", the Bible translators "sedt/sett" (see above), and possibly Suida's "dog" (see chap. 13 for these and other differentiation forms), found no permanent place in the Dutch system.

Avoidance of double consonants

In connection with the theories governing doubled consonants, it is relevant to mention a few grammarians who raised the suggestion of avoiding them altogether. This is not to be thought of in the same context as the occasional misspellings of Middle Dutch ("wijle" for "wille" mentioned above), or De Ruyter's "begonen".

The first grammar to suggest this as a consistent system was Plemp. He takes De Hubert's argument that since the plural ending is 'en' the stem of "hebben" must be "hebb", and argues the converse; since the stem is "heb" and the plural ending 'en', the inflected form must be "haben". This gives such forms as "hob-en, wed-en, zef-en, leg-en, bak-en, wil-en, ten-en, min-en, klap-en", which he considers the best form, with the hyphen helping to avoid the potential mispronunciation with a long vowel. Because of this possibility however, and the weight of normal usage, he does not depart from the orthodox spelling: "In 'hebben, wedden,...setten', en andere deestelijke woorden, werd bij mij een consonant, dat is, bijletter verdubbeld; na de wijse dor gezenen (die voorwaar te veel zijn) de welken onbekend is, dat dien bijletter niet en behoort verdubbeld te worden" (p.4). In this connection it may be of interest to note that the red-ink additions to Van Heule (1633) in the copy on the Royal Library in The Hague (see Van Heule 1625 ed. Caron p.xxii), which use the same spelling system as Plemp (e.g. 's' for /z/), note "Wand-en, Rat-en, Bloot en, Voot en" (sic) on p.3, and "dag-en, levendig-en, hand-en" on p.6. It is distinctly possible that these red-ink notes (not the black-ink, which have
different spelling system) are by Plemp, who is known to have annotated a copy of the 1625/6 edition (see Cron loc.cit.).

In fact this theory of Plemp's may have influenced Van Heule, for in a marginal comment in the 1633 edition (p.149-150) he suggests that "Wy zouden ooc konnen verwijden dobbele Consonanten te schrijven, stellende twee Vocalen als de Consonant niet verdubbelt en wort alda, 'Beeden, Wijlen, zeegen', maar in plaats van dobbelde Letteren zouden konnen stellen 'Beeden, Zegen, wilen', etc. Door dusdanige verandering en verswynginge der Letteren is de Franse en Italiaense sprake tot eene uytneemende lichticheyt en zoethayt gebrocht, welke andersins zeer swaersilbich wazen zouden". The idea that this may be due to influence from Plemp's work of 1632 is strengthened by the fact that Van Heule's comment is only in the margin, as if it were too late to incorporate it in the main text at that stage of printing.

A single repetition of this same idea appears 350 years later in 1972, when Garmt Stuiveling moots the "strakke eenvoud van een raam, twee ramen, en: een raz, twee ramen" as contrasted to the orthodox "'raam-ramen' met een fonologisch zinloze 'a', en 'raam-ramen' met een fonologisch zinloze 'mm'" (De Gids 1972, 170). This suggestion, radical at first sight, deserves serious consideration, as it is admirably suited to the Dutch language (see conclusion).

Summary:

Medial: abnormal: De Ruyter, Huygens, Dafforne, De Witt, Zoet, Bogaard, V.Rusting
'kk' after long vowel: Dafforne, Hooft (1653), Zoet, Miltenius, Van Ruyzing, De Vries (E.C.P.),
'te' in imperfect: Hooft, Van der Linden, E.C.P., (De Ruyter)
't-te' in imperfect: E.K.
'tt-te' in imperfect: Zeydelaar ('tt-te' Suits?)
't-te' in imperfect: Van Ruyter, Bilderdijk
hypercorrect 't-de, -tte de Castelein, De Ruyter, Antiquitatis Studio, De Neckere, Scharten, Coolen.
'tt' in present, past participle: Revins, De Castelein, Lambrecht, De Heere, Huygens (Land, Schumann).
'te' in participles: Moonen, Scharten, Coolen, Van Beysael

Final: '
'iff' Middle Dutch, Van Santen, Vo, Van Heule, De Ruyter etc. etc.
'iff', 'if', 'if't' Coornhert, Vischer, De Witt, S.Chrumman, Bilaridaes.
" opposed by: De Haufert, Van der Heyden.
all final letters: De Hubert, Looupuus, (Constantus), Huygens, Rintjus, Zoet, Zweeds, Brune, Jonckitt, Sbranka.
" opposed by: Ampzing, Sewel, La Grie, Cuno, Suits.

differentiation forms: Van Heule, Hoxha, Beyer; Richardson.

Avoidance of all doubles: Plemp, Van Heule (1633), Stuiveling.
Chapter 13: Differentiation Spellings

The existence of homonyms has induced many West European languages to introduce differences in spelling whereby the two (or more) homophonous words could be distinguished. In most cases this has been done with recourse to etymology, e.g. English "write, Wright, rite, right; hour, our", or French "saint, cont, sans, sense", Italian "bo, hai ha, hanno, o, ai, a, amm", in such cases the historically different forms have been preserved (not always with unanimity) after the sound of the words had become identical, because of their usefulness in differentiating these homonyms. In a smaller number of cases an artificial difference of spelling is actually introduced in order to differentiate words where etymological spellings were either impossible or inconvenient. Into such a category fall English "putt, put; flower, flour", French "a, à, ou, ou", and German "statt, Stadt".

Dutch has had, at various times, quite a large number of words of both kinds. Into the former category fall the etymologically distinct meanings of "wasen, lessen, pans", and many words in which differing etymological spellings were deliberately retained, e.g. "ko(o)len" in the De Vries/Te Winkel system, and the current "lijden, lij, hij, lijt, rlij, wij, zij; leiden, el, hai, lel, mel, r(e)l, wel, zoi". To the second category belong such current pairs as "nog/noch, dog/doch, kruit/kruul", though in the past a great many more have been used (gene/gene, na/na(r), bot/böt, zo/zoo, etc.).

Allied to the first category are a very large number of words sounding alike but which have different spellings as a direct consequence of the particular spelling in use at a given time. In these pairs potential homonyms are automatically differentiated, such as "wijd/wijdt/wijt, slab/slæp, rad/rât, houd/hout/houdt/hount, wind/wint/wînt" etc. In the sense that these are produced by the normal rules, and not introduced specifically for the purposes of differentiation, they are referred to below as "quasi-differentiation" spellings. They are however of the greatest relevance since they have often figured in the defence of various rules. The most illuminating treatment of differentiation pairs is gained by a division according to the key-letters (i.e. the letter which differs in each word pair). Only words differing by their consonants are treated below, though vowel differentiation is also common (cf. above).
All the words in this category are quasi-differentiational spellings. There are about nine words which are homophones in their uninflected forms, but differ in having /b/ or /p/ in inflexion (where such occurs). They include "slab/slap, tob/tob, krap/krap, slob/slip, slob/slop, lcb/lep, schrab/schrap, krib/krip, roth/rop". Here gelijkvormigheid automatically demands '-b' in the first of each pair, and '-p' in the second; where no inflected form exists (e.g. "krip") the phonetic spelling ensures the different form.

However if the gelijkvormigheid system is not used and a purely phonetic or phonemic system adopted, using 'p' for /p/, each word pair becomes homonymous. This has often been pointed out as part of the argument for the use of the gelijkvormigheid rules, in that they ensure the avoidance of a great number of such homonyms.

Due to the general reluctance to adopt the '-p' spelling for these words, even by many phonetic spellers until recent date, the problem has never arisen. Such word pairs are quoted by most grammars since the times of Koonen, though most restrict themselves to the common words "slab, tob, krap". Before that time the question rarely arose since the normal forms were "slabbe, tobbe" etc.

Very few homonyms have ever been differentiated through variation of these letters. The most frequent one is "sier" (in "goede cier maken") and "sier" (as in "sierad"). Allied to this is "vercieren/versieren" (in the sense of "to adorn") and "verzieren" (to think up); the latter was later superseded by "verzinnen" making the differentiation unnecessary. As there was usually a difference in pronunciation between "vercieren" and "verzieren" these should really be included in the quasi-differentiational forms, though many writers evidently felt them to be pronounced similarly enough to constitute genuine homonym pairs.

One of the first to mention this distinction is De Hubert, spelling "sierliek" met ζ. For him (and similarly for Ampzing, Leupenius and other users of 'z' for /ts/ described in chapter 2) this was the only possible spelling. Hooft distinguishes "versieren" from "verzieren" (seebelow), though others,
such as Cats and Bontekoe, make a distinction for the first mentioned pair by spelling "goede chier" with 'ch', reserving 'c' for "cier(aad)". Some of the spellers who avoided the letter 'c' altogether used "cier" in both senses, for example Winschoten includes "goede cier maken" in his dictionary.

The usage of Hooff may have been of importance in later times, for Van Hooft mentions his use of "verzieren (ornare), verzieren (fingere)" in support of his own "sierraed, sieren" spellings. However he too recognises the difference in sound. Zeydelaar is one of the few who claim this difference to be more orthographic than phonetic: "'verzieren' spół' ik nêt 'c', nêt nêt 's', on dat't betekent apachikken. Maar nät 's' schrijt ik 'verzieren". He presumably means that he uses 'c' in the first because he also uses 'c' in "clerock", though his phrasology is obscure.

It is not unknown to find this rule reversed: the Snoeijmes writes that no "grieksche 'ph" is needed "(om) de moedertale te verzieren". The difference between "sier/cier" or "sier/chier" in all periods has been purely orthographic, whereas that between "verzieren/verzieren", "verzieren/verchieren" or "vercieren/verchieren" had a difference of pronunciation behind it. When Siegenbeek proposed using 's' in both meanings of "sier", De Stapel (p.35) asked indignantly "wat gemeen heeft 'cier' (goede cier maken) met 'sieren' (sieraad bijzetten)?"; the usual answer to this question would be the sound.

A more modern example raised by some during the latest reform moves is that between "cytologie" (the study of cell formation) and "sitologie" (the study of food). Given the radical change from 'cy' to 'si' (cf. "cycloon, sikloon") the two words would become homonymous. Since most scientific jargon is international and often bears little relationship to the spelling system of individual languages, the retention of these two forms is not a valid argument against the reform of 'cy' to 'si' in general.

CH:G(H), CHT:G(H)T

This spelling yielded for a long time the commonest true differentiational spellings. Often etymology was called upon, though not infrequently with little justification, and equally often the forms are put forward as purely differentiational. It must be admitted that many grammars fail to make any
Distinction between the two sorts of difference. Very few differentiational forms in this section can be produced by the gelijkvormigheid rules, probably only "lach/lag" (laugh, lay), "echt/hij ekt" and "licht/hij ligt". All the others can be considered true differentiational forms, though, as just mentioned, etymology has sometimes been cited in support. The motive remains avoidance of homonymy however, not an etymological spelling per se. The actual number of word pairs recommended by grammar has varied quite considerably, there being up to twenty possible pairs, though no single work has ever specifically recommended them all.

Although both the Twe-spraack (p.44) and Van der Schuere (p.21) mention "lach/lag" they only do so to show the difference in sound between 'g' and 'ch' in the related forms "lachen/lagen" (the latter actually states that such a differentiational spelling was not common, - see chap.3). The first mention of purely differentiational spellings with 'ch/g' cases in the brief comments in Seylers's "Schryf-konst-bod" of 1613: "On te onderckerden het evenwicht uyt het eene, het ander uyt, willen (sommige) dat men de 'c' verandere in 'g' als in 'dag' ende niet 'doch'; 'dog, doch'; 'weg' ende niet 'wech' en de esmae in twijfels stellen voet aan dag 'louw', ofte een poock verstaet, oft een eene beuk van wech, of te gaan meyn". Although it is possible that there was a qualitative difference in the final consonants of "dag (dagen); dag (daggen)" and similarly "doch; dog (doggen)" and "weg (wagen); weg (weggen)"; his prime motive is the differentiatio; and it is pure not quasi-differentiatio since gelijkvormigheid would give 'g' in all these words except the particle "doch". He is rejecting the 'g' spelling in the first of each pair simply because such a rule would cause homonymy. Most dictionaries of this time spelt "weg(h)e" for the second word of that pair (e.g. in Plantijn, Kilian, Mellema), thus feeling no problem.

None of these writers so far have mentioned what was to become the most common differentiational form of all; in fact one of the very few to survive De Vries and Te Winkel. Indeed this pair -"mog/noch"- is not at all commonly seen at this time, most writers using "noch" in both cases (e.g. Lambrecht, Plantijn, Kilian, Valcoogh, De Hubert, the young Vondel, Bredero, Binnart, etc.); or using "nochte" if ambiguity was possible. The latter is put forward by Ampzing (p.42), and since it involves different words it cannot be counted as a
Differentiation spelling. Even where different possible spellings were recognized (e.g. Kilian lists both "dagh" and "dach" as variants) they were not always put forward as candidates for differentiation.

Plemp is the next to discuss differentiation forms, condemning those who confuse 'g', 'gh' and 'ch', "als of zij ... tussen 'dag' en 'dach', 'weg' en 'wech', 'rog' en 'roch', 'plag' en 'plach' geen onderscheid en sagen, of en hoorden, of ons, à la mode de France, anders willen doen lusen, dan schryven"; autosuggestion may be at play here as respects the difference in sound (though cf. Sayters above and chap.3).

Common usage continued to make little call on differentiation spellings in these words. Even the widespread change from 'ch' to 'g(h)' did not affect the use of "noch". Sometimes "nog" was adopted for both meanings (e.g. by Winkelhoven), sometimes "nogh", but most often "noch" was preserved. In fact the latter form was used by almost all except those who advocated a radical avoidance of 'ch' in all positions (see chap.3). If it was felt that ambiguity might arise for such words, writers could still call on the longer forms of the nouns in question - "dogge, wegge, dagge".

Until the mid 17th century therefore, the only differentiation forms put forward have been "weg/wech, dag/dach, dog/doch, plag/plach". But the beginning of the future wave of such pairs is seen in 1636 when Gargon states that he writes "'regt' voor 't geen niet krom is, en 'recht' voor 't gerichte, of iets, dat iemant toebehoort". Almost exactly the same situation is defended by Noonen twenty years later: ",(gh) is nodigh, en brengt den woorden in de uitspraak hulp toe, zal men den weggh, dien men reist, van een weg (wittebroed) den dagh, dien wy beleeven, van een dag, dat een wapentuig en een tou te scheep betekent, en plaggh, solebam, van eene plag, eene afgemakte veltsoede behoorlyk onderscheiden" (p.3). Again he claims to hear a difference in sound, though this should not be presumed to be real, due to the power of autosuggestion, especially as he also claims a difference in sound "tusschen 'lach' en 'lag', 'echt', matrimonium, on 'egt', occat, 'juichte' en 'ruigte" (p.3). Noonen set great store by differentiation spellings in general, and apart from these specific examples, wished to add 'h' to all adjectives ending in 'g' "onderscheits halve" - to distinguish them from nouns (see chap.3). His claims did not go unchallenged.
The first reply came from Sewel in his grammar of 1703 (p. 32), and also in his dictionary of the same year: "een vint'or die schryven 'dagh' (dies) tot onderschoying van 'dag' (een dolk). Doch belangende het laatste, het is evrylyk 'dagge', ... 't zelfde kan rede gesegd worden van 'wegh'". He also contests the variant spelling "wech" for command, which Noonen included in "wegh", dien een relat: "Soome schryven 'wegh' of 'wech', als men or 'weggegaan' of 'wegydaen' door beteken wil; saer 't schymt dat sy niet overweegen dat dit 'weg' afgeleyd wordt van den 'weg'". It may be that those others felt the differentiation more important than the etymology, or were arguing along the same lines as for "kruid/kruit" (see below).

Sewel's overriding concern was derivation, having precedence over differentiation. Where derivation did not prevent, however, he was most certainly in favour of such word pairs: in the same edition of his dictionary he inserted a list of differentiaional forms, including "Licht (der Zonne), ligt (om te doen)" and "nog/noch, Geslacht/geslagt (noun/participle), slagh/slagh". Some of these he had already defended in 1691: "ook kan (ch) dienstig zyn om een onderschoyd tusschen soome woorden te maken, als Noch (neque) en nog (etiamnum) als ook Licht (lux) en ligt (faciles of levia)". In the 1703 edition he added further "dog (molossus) en doch (veruntemen)". It can be seen then that although both Noonen and Sewel favour differentiaional forms, their choices are quite different, the latter suggesting "licht/ligt, noch/nog, geslaachte/geslagt, slagh/slagh, doch/dog", and the former "wegh/weg, dagh/dag, plagh/plagh" rejected by the other.

In the light of later developments it would seem that Sewel was the more influential in this respect. For a great number of the pairs which he put forward are found very frequently, and more frequently than before he had suggested them (few of them are invented by him). Other pairs also became more common, possibly encouraged by this new support for differentiation forms in general on the part of Sewel and Noonen. Van Hoogstraten uses "nog/noch", E.C.P. lists inter alia "nog(or noch)/nocht, slagh/slag, wech/weg, doch/dog". Steven resists the general change from '-cht' to '-gt' because of the need of both in differentiation forms, and Kramer recognises "Licht/ligt" (noun/adj.) on p. 33, though making no distinction between the two meanings of "doch/dog" or
"noch/nog", giving them as more spelling variants (p.95, 109) possibly under the influence of German usage. Sewel's revision of La Grue states that "on écrit 'nog' encore, 'ligt' léger, 'dog' un dogue, chien", as exceptions to his rule on '-ch'; the concept is Sewel's rather than La Grue's, and is taken over by Cuno in 1741. It is possible that Prinde is attempting to use a differentialional form in the closing poem to his Schatkamer: "Doch hou o stil, gelyk de doge, die sich laft quellen...", though such a form has not been seen elsewhere, and it may be a missprint for "dogg".

Strong criticism came from Huydecoper on those who deviated from the differentiaional pairs he supported. In book II (p.237) he mentions some irregular spellings caused by the crampping of words by the printers: "gebruige HENRIK DLOSI 1LA.ERT, getr. Herder, acliter de aangewezen drukfouten, daar hy zegt: dat ook somtijds 'nog' en 'dog' in plaets van 'noch' en 'doch' staat, is d'oorzaek, dat de regels geen Letter meer bevatton konen" (see also chap.13 above).

Not all contemporaries accepted this criticism however: Post (1732) uses "noch" for "nor" but both "noch" and "nogh" for "still", and Schorner (1725) also uses "noch" in both senses. Most spellers of the "g'-everywhere" system described in chapter 3 used "nog" for both meanings, for example the 1743 edition of Niervaert uses both "nog" and "dog", whereas the 1676 edition has '-ch'.

The use of "licht" for the noun and "ligt" for the adjective, mentioned above, is purely orthographical. One of the forms, however, now clearly merges with the verb form "hij ligt". A further complication is the verb "lichten" (verlichten, toelichten), and a possible (though unlikely) ambiguity is mentioned by Verpoorten: "Als ik nu schryf 'de keers ligt niet wel', hoe wéet ik dan dat ik wil naggen of sy wel licht gëeft, of dat sy nederligt op een Tafel!". He is in favour of the "g'-everywhere system, provided that such ambiguities are avoided by means of differentiaional spellings. Wagenaar makes such the same distinction: on the whole he avoids purely differentiaional forms, with the exceptions of "døch, noch" and "licht (noun)/ligt (adj.)" and "ligt (liggen)/ licht ("licht...ons toe")". This usage of Wagenaar's is later put forward as an ideal model by "De eenigste Middel" of 1762.

Van Belle (1748) reviewed the various arguments of Sewel and Noone, and
decided in favour of the former, against "weg/wegh, dag/dagh", in that:

"Yoortn dient (ch) neest, (oudat men niet sou' dwaalen,) In't Bindwnord 'Doch', (Van Doggen) 'Roach', ('t ontkennend woord,) en 'Döp'
(Hervord'vande) 'Licht', (det schynct,) en 'Ligt', (In 't waeren;)
(p.l.). A similar comment is included in the 1755 edition (p.6), though his printer does not always agree, and "Döp" can be found on p.10. He possibly also allows "recht/recht", since he specifies in the 1755 edition that "(g) geenzins voegh(); in ... 'recht; (dat niet kom in)"; - this way exclude the prohibition from "recht" in the other sense (cf. Gargor above).

He did not, however, favour too many differentational spellings, arguing that "hot is ool: v-r van onze Taal te vertragten, als men, on noodloos onderhoud door spellinge te verloren, de rede voedelig in de hetspraake verhard, dat ze het hardst der Hoffentaale geen strooide behoort te wiken". It is not entirely clear what he means by this, unless some people were pronouncing differentiation spellings differently (cf. E.C.P.'s comment in C;Z below).

The difference between "lach/lag" is still being put forward by some, in support of the general retention of the digraph 'ch': Schütz deflects "lagch" from "lagchen" on these grounds, and Ten Kate realised that the difference between the two words was merely orthographic (I.122).

The forms mentioned above (dog, ligt etc.) are, by the mid 18th century, almost generally accepted, both in the North and in the South. They are given for example by Binsken, the Grammaire pour apprendre..., and Des Roches, the latter both in his grammar ("De woordekens 'zich, ach, slach' in den zin van soorte, 'wech', als wechgaen, 'tocht, och', worden beter met een 'ch' als met een 'g' geschriven") and in his dictionary (noch/noch, doch/dog). Halma wrote in the introduction to the later editions of his dictionary that "Wij hebben bij voorbeeld 'doch' gespeld voor 'dog', om de eerste als een koppelwoord, te onderscheiden van het tweede als een zelfstandig woord; ongelijke 'noch' voor 'noch', als het eene ontkennend in e.a.v."

Moonen, whose 5th edition dates from around this time, was still receiving criticism for his suggested forms, for example from Sinkel (p.vi): "om den weg en 't wittebrood te onderkennen, zoude ik den Lezer anraden als hy geen ander middel of wytkomt tegen de verbysteringe en 't gebruik wist, om de 'h' te
He is here (as elsewhere, cf. chap.3) being sarcastic, insofar as he (not without some reason) sees no context capable of causing confusion between these two words. De Haes similarly opposes the use of "dach/dag..."dan dit bestaat voet 'dagge' zijn". He does distinguish "geslacht(noun)/geslagt(participle)" probably under the influence of Sewel.

Amongst the supporters of Sewel's differentiational forms the feeling that the word pairs produced were a very useful feature of the language caused the extension to a few other cases of homonymy. Thus, for example, Buys, in his comprehensive revision of Sewel's dictionary in 1766, puts in some extra pairs: "ik (gebruik) do 'g' in het ene (woord) en 'ch' in het andere..." on het onderwijsfond cun meen dat chryf ik 'acht' onduidelijk, en 'act' het geval. 'Krachtig' verwijzijl, en 'krachtig' sterke; 'achtig', groot, zonderlijk en 'achtig', bestaande; 'licht' niet donker, en 'ligt', niet zwaar enz." Three of these - "acht, krachtig, machtig" - have not been mentioned before as differentiational forms, though this does not imply that Buys invented them himself. However "krachtig/krachtig, machtig/machtig" are not taken up by any other grammars, and no examples have been located of their use in this way.

"Acht/acht" on the other hand was to become very common in the later decades of the 18th century. The "Nieuw Nederduitsch Speldeboek" of 1772 lists: "acht (= 3), agter, acht (= oostena)" "nog/noch" etc.; it does not discuss this usage, as the work merely comprises spelling lists, - the spelling book of "N.A.C.P." later is very similar. Zeydelaar presents yet a further example in "digt" (close, closed) and "licht" (of poetry), amongst other more standard examples, though he also uses "nog" in the sense of "nor" (printer's spelling?).

Some voices were raised in opposition however. Van Belle had already pointed out that it was very inconsistent of Moonen to separate "weg/veg, dach/dag"... "daer hy geenen nood maakt om 'nood' (zwaarheid) by hem 'noot' gospell, te onderscheiden van 'noot' (sene boosbruggt (sic)) of (sene muzyekteeken), en soe anderer van die naturen". The same could be said, and was, of all differentiational forms - as long as there remained any cases of homonymy then it could not be claimed without inconsistency that artificial separation in only a few cases was "essential". Janssens for one (1775) felt that all such forms, including "dicht/digt, deg/doch", were totally unnecessary. Even the
quasi-differentiation pair “lag/lach” disappears in his system (see chap. 4).

But others remained convinced differentiation spellers, in spite of any such opposition. Pictorson, in his Rapscaphe, mentions his word pairs “lach/lag, doch/dog, clash/slash, week/wag, digit/dicht, ligt/licht, nog/noch, slogan/slashen”, and comments that “Daese zynnelykheit in ’t spellen acht ik zindylyk on naarloopen waardig. Ik voet wel, dat zowelgen die verwerven, en dat het verband van eene onderscheiding genoeg te kennen mest, wat een door die woordjes verstaan nosta, en gelyklyk dat die onderscheiding onnoodig is. Maar ik zie echter geen reden waarom een zulk een netheid nit zou waarnemen: want een doet der tale niet te kort”. It must be borne in mind that at this time both ‘-gt’ and ‘-cht’ are almost equally common spellings in nearly all words, and it was not totally unreasonable to wish to restrict a particular spelling to a particular word/meaning; it did not involve the creation of new forms. It often did involve a departure from the accepted derivation rules however, although most of Sewel’s original variants did not. The standard differentiation forms also live on in Stijl’s grammar: “nog/noch, lag/lach, ligt/licht, slap/slash, Geslacht/geslacht, wek/weg”, though he is slightly confused in classing all these together with the quasi-differentiation forms “slab/slap” etc.

On the other side stood Kluit. He criticised many aspects of Moonen’s system, including his differentiation pairs, and further concludes “dat het een onzekere, onzeker, de Regelmatigheid krankende, en den Ouden onbekende, Regel is, die ons voorschrijft, om ’licht’ van ’ligt’, ’dicht’ van ’digit’, ’acht’ van ’agt’, ’acht’ van ’legt’, ’nocht’ van ’nog’, ’tocht’ van ’tong’, ’wicht’ van ’wigt’ door de spelling te onderscheiden”. He even opposed (rightly) one of the reasons behind the “lag/lach” pair: “die gewande scherp- en zachttheid van klank in de woorden ‘lach’ en ‘lag’ op ’t einde des woords, (rust) meer op de verbeelding..., dan op de onzekerheid”. Some of the forms he mentions, such as “wigt/wicht, togt/tocht” were never in very widespread use compared to the others. For Krom, the only useful differentiation form was “’agt octo’ geschreven met een ’g’, (en) ’ik achte, hy acht’ met een ’ch’ onderscheidelhalven, waartoe ik in andere woorden wederom geen moedzaake vindt”.

Against these radical opinions opposing what was now very widespread use of often unnecessary and arbitrary differentiation spellings, most grammars persist
in giving them. C.W. Holtrop (1733) gives "acht/agt" and many others (p.52), Winkelmann in his Schota the following year does likewise, and so too does "E.C.J.ö" in his "Lessen" included in Brandt à Brandis's "Kabinet" vols. IV & V (1734-5). The Inlayding of 1735 sides with Kluit and Janssens, finding all such spellings superfluous, especially as he points out that there is no difference in sound between "'ligt' van liggen, 'ligt' dat niet waer is, 'ligt', helder Licht, cnz."

The more traditional view prevails in most grammars, such as Bolhuis, who gives "lag lach, acht (bij acht van eggen) echtt, ligt licht, lenen lochen, pogen pochen, dog doch", and the various Nut works which contain between them "dog/doch, digt/dicht, egal/echel, gelag/gelach, lach/lach, nog/noch, uagt/wacht". Wester has "nog/noch" etc., and Schwiers has the following comment: "At the end of words, the 'ch' sounds like a 'g', and many writers use the one instead of the other; This is apt to occasion a confusion in synonima; a few words will suffice to prove this; as 'Dicht' poem; 'digt' close, 'licht' candle; 'ligt' light, easy", plus also "acht/acht, geslacht/geslagt" in which "the pronunciation ... is exactly alike" (p.21). Verick gives a similar list: "acht/acht, dog/doch, digt/dicht, uagt/wacht".

By the end of the century therefore, some 22 or more different word pairs had been mentioned in connection with the 'g/ch' differentiation spellings. The time was ripe for Siegenbeek to call a halt to further expansion, and also to cast out the vast majority of these needless forms. Certainly he felt it useful "dat een gelijkluidende, doch in beteekenisse verschillende, woordt door de spelling, zoo veel mogelijck, moet onderscheiden", though he realised that for a great many other homonyms this was impossible - he mentions for example "arm, boot, deken". His viewpoint is echoed in the official school-grammar of the Nut (p.116), where the writer (possibly Bolhuis) declares himself against differentiation spellings in principle, as being "louter willekeurig, als noch in de uitspraak, noch in de afleiding gebrongen". In some cases however "heeft het gebruik een grootendeels willekeurige onderscheid der spelling reeds zoo zeer gewettigt, dat het dwaasheid zijn zou, zich daartegen te verzetten". In the latter class he includes "ligt/licht, nog/noch, dog/doch" only, and rejects "jag(hunt)/jacht(yacht), acht/acht, regt/recht" etc.
The post-Siegenbeek editions of Bastiaan Cramer's "Trap der Jonge" (published at least until 1897) were correspondingly amended: "De 'a' of 'ich' dient ook om de betekenis van sommige woorden te onderscheiden, bij voorbeeld 'licht' of 'ligt', 'doch' en 'dog', 'noch' en 'nog' enz., to which is now added the footnote "Sommigen houden zich ook nog aan de spelling 'acht' in acht noem, en 'acht' het gebal; de Boolelaar SIEGENBEEK, echter, spelt in beide gevallen 'acht'."

In the South a certain amount of variation persisted. De Neckere opposed "noch/nog", thinking both should be "nog", but was in favour of "agt/acht" (p.57), as also was Terbruggen (p.3)'). Zuide was unsure about the differentiation forms: "een hecht geen verschil tussen ... 'acht' en 'echt' (p.7) ... de uitspraak doet geen onderschoed horen tussen: 'dog' en 'doch', 'agt' en 'echt', 'noch' en 'nog"', but recognised that "het algemeen gebruik (heert) in deze twee 'nog' (adhuc) en 'ligt' (niet waar) de 'g' gewijzigd, om de beteekenis te onderschoeven" (p.32) - i.e. the Siegenbeek system.

Willems was in principle opposed to such word pairs, but he too felt the weight of usage: "wy (zouden) de gelykluisende doch in beteekenis verschillende woorden, zoo weinig mogelyk, door de spelling willen doen onderscheiden. Immers de geschrevene taal is slechts het afdruksel der zuiver gesprokene, en moet ook niet voer zyn ... Sommige onderscheidingen nogtans, als 'nog' van 'noch'; 'dog' van 'doch', en andere, die door een langdurig en ingeworteld gebruik gevestigd zijn, kan men blijven behouden".

The Siegenbeek ruling was later modified yet further by Te Winkel: "De onderscheidende spelling van 'nog' en 'noch' is onmisbaar voor de duidelijkheid. (he quotes "de man heeft noch geld, noch vrienden") ... De onderscheiding van andere gelykluisende woorden als 'digt' en 'dicht', 'ligt' en 'licht' is nutteloos". The pair "dog/doch" he evidently considers to constitute a quasi-differentiasiational spelling because of the inflected form "dogge" for the first.

The same rule is contained in the 1954 Woordenlijst, mentioning only "'nog' ... naast 'noch'" (p.xxxviii), though a proposal for simplifying both to "nog" was contained in the first version of Kollewijn's "Voorstellen" in 1893, being dropped from the 1895 version. Buitentrust Hettema was one who pressed for
Even at this late date some wished to see more differentiation forms: Van Eeden claimed that "het schijnt ze even onttig ('even' en 'even') te onderscheiden, als de woorden 'noog' en 'noch';... Ik onderscheid dus ook 'wigt' en 'wicht', 'ligt' en 'licht', 'ligt' en 'licht' met alle daarvan afgeleide woorden" (p.136-7). These long obsolete forms found little support.

In the modern Dutch spelling system, with gelijkvormigheid and analogy governing verbal spellings, every '-d' stem verb has an automatic differentialional spelling for the singular forms "(ik) vind, (jij, hij) vindt". This has often been put forward as a point in favour of this system (e.g. by Sewel), though few have explained why no need is felt to differentiate the 2nd and 3rd person forms. Many have questioned whether this difference is necessary at all (see chap.6), since those who consistently spell "ik, jij, hij vind" or "vind" evidently encounter no problems of ambiguity. The most common counter-argument (e.g. by Van Belle) has been that since '-t' stem verbs (laten, zetten etc.) have no such means of differentiation, and yet manage to convey the meaning unambiguously, the difference is not vital.

Certainly there are cases where misunderstanding is possible, e.g. "het geldt/geld zijn vermaak" (devised by D'Hulster in his "Verslag" p.34 in an answer to Behaegel who had claimed there were no such cases), or "De verteller verteld/vertelt" (Rudolf Geel in De Gids 1972, 212, concerning the title of a work by Mulisch). But there are also equally plausible cases where homonymy is unavoidable, e.g. "De berichter bericht, de ontmoeter ontmoet", which once more belie the claim that the '-dt/-d' differentiation is essential.

A parallel case is seen in the latter examples, where the past participle is marked off from the 3rd person singular of the present tense. But the participle also figures in another differentiation spelling, common in the
16th century, and consisting in spelling attributively used weak participles with \'-d\' in line with other objectives, but predicatively used with \'-t\'. Since in this position they are undeclinable. Such a distinction is put forward by Leupenius: "van ik heb bâld geleeert, knot gelooft", van ik heb bâld benimt, benimt. Dit onderscheid is noodzaaklijk om het gevolg" — he regards \'-t\' as the primary form. Others who supported this were Verwer (p.45) and Ten Kate (I.127), together with several Southern writers (see chap.5).

Of the spellings mentioned so far, the difference between the forms of the \'-d\' stem verbs, and the difference between past participles and 3rd person forms of weak verbs, are quasi-differentiational, whereas that between the attributive and predicative participle is truly differentiational.

There are a large number of other quasi-differentiational forms for words ending in \'-d\' or \'-t\' on the same lines as "slab/slap, lag/lach" mentioned above. Even early grammars such as the Twe-spraack and Van der Schuereknew of word pairs such as "God/got", and Van Heule rightly points out that the difference between "wand/want, rad/rat, voed/voet, blood/bloot" is a direct consequence of his rules. Many different words have been used by the various grammars who used these pairs in support of gelijkvormigheid, e.g. "lood, goedje, wed, mijd, moed, moeyd, schild, bad, laad, rad, wand, hard, blood, voed, bond, grond, god, ox, houl, mood, wind, zad" etc. Most of these come from Van der Schuerek, Sowel and Bolhuis, the others from Hil Volentibus, E.G.P., Van Heule, Tuilman, Zeydeleyaer, Leupenius, Terbruggen, Koonen, Haydecoper etc.

It is interesting to note the way that the attitude to these quasi-differentiational forms changed in the course of several hundred years. Most of the early defenders of gelijkvormigheid point out the different forms for what would otherwise have been homonyms as a useful by-product of the system. Ampzing for example writes that "dese gevolg letter maekt dicMvils een heel ander woord ende van eenen gansch vorscheydend sin: als 'wand', een muer, ende 'want', een handschoen; 'rat', een dier, ende 'rad' een wiel eenen wagen; 'bloot', naakt, ende 'blood' ofte 'blode', beschoomd: so onderscheyde ook de naam-woorden 'voet voeten, hout houden', van de werkwoorden 'voed voeden, houd houden', ende diergelijke" (p.35). This is taken over by Van Heule (1693) in a similar vein.
As time went by the situation was reversed: the useful by-product became the raison d'être. Sewel, in his Spraakkunst and 1703 dictionary (not earlier editions) is already of this opinion: "sooige vereyschen...dat se...behoort te schryuen 'Lent, bent, bent, voet' ens. Naaer zo dit als een vaste regel doorgaet, dan verwalt een diikrika in eene verwarring, die zelfs landigen zou kunnen onlayden, en de gelijktydensheid van soeme woorden die veel in de beteekenis verschoven".

At leest Sewel does not fall into the trap of several later writers who, going one step furhter, gave the different gelijkvormigheid forms as axiomatic and deduced a different pronunciation of the final consonant. Huydecoper was one of these: "men schryft niet 'brood' en 'nood', omdat men zegt 'brooden' en 'nooten'; maar integendeel, men zegt 'brooden' en 'nooten', omdat men in 't eenwoudige zegt 'brood' en 'noot'" (I, p.32). In a standard Dutch pronunciation this is little more than autosuggestion (cf. chap.5). The grammar of Bolhuis (1803) exemplifies later comments on the same lines: "(ieder) klank moet...onderscheiden worden van ander, die nabij komen: zo moet 'lijden' onderscheiden worden van 'leiden',... zo ook 'blood' en 'bloot'" (p.33).

Most grammarians were not as extreme as this however, realizing the true nature of the phenomenon. Stijl for example writes that "dese spelling maakt ook dikwils een nuttig onderscheid in de beteekenis" (p.52) - for him the difference is incidental, not imposed upon the system, nor causing it. The difference between "God" (or "Godt") and "got", argued by several grammars, is in most cases quasi-differentiational (¬ "geden, goten"). This is true for example of Huydecoper. For Hoonen however it is a true differentiational form: "'Godt'...schryve ik met eene D voor de T, om hem van eenen Got (eenen inboorling uit Gotlant) te onderscheiden" (p.33). "Godt" here constitutes an artificial exception to his rule of final 't' ("woort, lant" etc.).

Apart from the many quasi-differentiational forms mentioned above there are a few true differentiational forms, one still current, most obsolete. Gargon makes a three-fold distinction for one word as early as 1686: "On onderscheid te maken schryv ik 'hart, hard', en 'hardt', 'hart' is een deel van ons lichaam, 'hard', iets dat niet week is, 'hardt' een dier" - the first two are quasi-differentiational, but the latter is a true form.
A similar use of 'dt' where it is otherwise irregular is contained in Sewell's revision of La Grue: "Padt (weg) chevin H. / Pad, origenaal K & F; ... Vaardt (spool), diligence H & F / Vaart, passage F". These are in the section (p.73) of words of different meaning but spelt the same (sic!). The first of these two pairs may have been quite common: Tuinman, in 1722, after discussing the quasi-differentiation forms "rat/rad" etc., sections that "daar blijven echter gelijkvormige namen over, b.v. 'pad', een padde, en 'pad', een weg. Wil men 'dt' schrijven, ik beg 't lyden". He does not specify for which of the pair he will tolerate "pdt", but it may well be the same as Sewell's choice, which Tuinman could have known. This usage is an example of the way different contemporary spellings are adapted to function as differentiation forms (cf. 'gt, dtt' above), since the gelijkvormigheid rules are incapable of separating these words.

Another such pair arose when the word "aarde" began to lose its final '-e' and thus to acquire the same sound as "aard" (sort, species). Sewell/La Grue (p.70) spells the latter "aardt" and the former "aard" (like his other forms, also copied by Cuno, p.94). Some of the Hut works perpetuate this distinction, e.g. Verick's Rudiments, and it is also used by Schwiers and Zeydelaar. This spelling was taken to an extreme degree by Bilderdijk, who not only wrote "'aart' (indolet), 'landaart'", but even "ontaartte, lwaastaartte, boaartaartte", with 'd' added to the differentiation '-t' for the sake of the pronunciation (see "Kenschets onzer voorvaderen" p.106, and "Verlustiging" p.23,29). Zeydelaar also made a three-fold distinction between "waa(r)"("maw"), "waart" ("touwerk"), and "Went" the particle, comprising both true and quasi-differentiation forms.

The only word pair in the present system is "kruid/kruijt". Since the latter, in the sense "gunpowder", is not found in the plural, it became accepted to spell it with 't'; though it is doubtful if real ambiguity could arise ("stop dat kanon vol kruid"?). The original Kollewijn "Voorstellen" proposed 'd' for both meanings, though this was later dropped. It is still given in the 1954 Woordenlijst (p.xxviii) as one of the only two true differentiation forms in the present system (with "mog/noch"). It is however on the verge of being quasi-differentiation, on a par with "kruij/
and especially with "dog/doch", where the uninflectable word has a phonetic spelling; it is a true differentiational form though, since the two forms are the same word, having acquired divergent meanings (exactly analogous to the English doublet "flour, flower").

For these letters there are very few pairs of homonyms. The pairs "fel/vol, tan/van" mentioned by Bolhuis, the Hut, Koonen, and the Twe-spraak are kept distinct, in most normal pronunciations, by their different sounds. Because of the phonemic distribution of /f/ and /v/ in Dutch there can be no quasi-differentiational pairs, even if the consistent gelijkvormigheid "v" spelling were in use. Although there are words which are identical in the inflected forms but different in the basic form (graf, graven; graaf, graven) there are none identical in the uninflected form but with different inflected forms, to which a differentiational spelling on a par with "rad/rat" could be applied. The 17th and 18th century spellings "graven, graven" may be considered quasi-differentiational, but do not affect the use of consonants.

Only one differentiational form has ever been proposed. Gargon spells "'stof'... voor materie, of iets waar uit iets bestaat, of dat ons doet bedryven, en 'stov'... voor de geringe deeltjes van d'aard, die opstuiven". This has the backing of gelijkvormigheid (stof stoffen; stov stuiven) and etymology. The latter, however, has no inflected form, and also has related forms with 'c', such as "stoffen, stoffig".

In the now obsolete pronunciation of final 'ng' as /nk/, common up to the 18th century (cf. chap.2), it was relevant for van der Schuere and others to point out that the gelijkvormigheid rules neatly separate potential homonyms such as "bank - bange, bank - banken" (p.24). But by their nature all such pairs are quasi-differentiational.

Only once has it been suggested to put this varying pronunciation, with its corresponding spelling, to use for homonyms differentiation. This was in 1769 when Zeydenlaar declared that for him "'gang' met 'g', is de gang van een huis, 'gank', met 'k', in de gank van een mensch". If he pronounced the two words
Differently then they are not really differentiational at all; if he pronounced them the same - either both /gai/ or both /gai]/ - then they constitute a case very similar to that described above for "bruil/bruit".

3.0

No differentiational forms have been suggested using these letters.

3.2

This, together with 'ch/p', is the only letter pair ever extensively used for true differentiational spellings, though the number is here substantially smaller. There are a few quasi-differentiational forms which have been put forward at various times, usually to show that the rules which create them are worth adopting (cf. D:T above). In this latter category fall "sullen/zullen, saal/zaai", and often "sagen/zagen, zijde/zijde", used in defence of the separation of 's' and 'z', and "bos/borcz, dea/loech, vas/varch, wassen/waaschen, gans/garach", used to defend the 'sch' spelling.

The first to use potential homonymy as an argument for given fixed values to 's' and 'z' was the Twe-spraak, which gives "'ssay" van Hornskoven onde 'ich say', 'een sant' of hayligh onde 'zand' vanle Duinen ... de 'sop' ende het 'sop', om 'sook' an de vost ende het 'sök' inde horsten, 'sonder sy' ende 'sy'" (p.45). In each of these the sound of the first letter is different. It is also possible that there was a similar difference between "zijde" (= silk, from vulgar Latin "seta" with /s/) and "zijde", which the Bible translators kept distinct (Privatim Observata, ed. Swann line 297). "Zyde" (silk) is also one of the few words given an initial 's-' by Plantijn, including the cross-reference "Zijde oft zijde, de la sayo, sericus, vide Zijde". Nellena has "zijde" for both, and Killian has "sijde" for both (for the reasons given in chap.11), so that Plantijn may have had a reason for keeping them distinct.

The consistent separation of "sullen/zullen" is given by Sewel, Kyloë, Cramer, Bolhuis and the Nut works, as evidence of the usefulness of the separation of 's' and 'z'. The separation of "zijde/zijde" however became less common as the latter adopted the Dutch /z/ pronunciation. The pair "sant/zard" mentioned by the Twe-spraak reappears in the introduction to the later edition of Pomcy's dictionary in 1753 (see chap.11).
For the pairs involving the presence or omission of 'ch' after the 's', most "normal" spellers up to and including To Winkel found little problem in separating "bos/bosch, tas/tasch, las/lasch" and other examples mentioned above, since they could call on the inflected form in support. The more so is this true for those times when the /ch/ was actually pronounced in the inflected form (see chap. 12).

However, as soon as any progressive speller discarded the 'ch' he created homonyms. For most of the words this does not seem to have mattered, and only for "gans" have differentialional forms as such been proposed. De Hubert wrote that he spelt "'gans' met een' a, on dat een uitzt 'den ganzen dag', 'gans' met een' S, on dat een in 't meervoud eilt, 'de gansen' - a quasi-differentialional form. Van der Linden, who made a similar distinction in 1696, was criticised by Rubus "'ganscha' gemaakt te hebben tot 'Ganse'... Ja! ... De 'gansche bos' een 'gansche bos'... als een anders melle Franck (et een Sondaagens naam 'Sant Franciscus')" (Jochsaal July 1697, p. 32).

Huydecoper was very critical of those who ignored the difference between "wassen" and "wasschen", although he admits there to be no difference in the (albeit "bedorven") pronunciation. Even Verver used "ontwasschen" for "grow": "Dat Vondel alle toets cn navrage niet ontwasschen is...", in his letter to Roland of 1709. At a later date Still includes "bosch/bos/bus" in the section on "Enige nuttige onderscheidingen in de spelling", along with such as "liggen/leggen, vinnen/vien" etc., and Seydelaar gives "lasch/les, wasch/was, lease/les" alongside "dicht/dig" etc. Allied to such words in their form was the long contested distinction between adjectives and adverbs (e.g. in "dagelijksch/ dagelijks") described in chap. 13.

What were really also quasi-differentialional forms were the spellings proposed to distinguish the pronoun "ons" from the possessive "ons". One of the first to suggest this separation was Van Heule (2nd edition). On page 75 he notes in the margin that "'Ons' is Nostrum, en 'Ons' is Nobis en Nos". The apostrophe after the first is to show that the particular word is the shorter (i.e. uninflected) form of "once". Beyer in 1661 takes over this same spelling, but other works based on Van Heule, such as Hexham, Hillenius and Richardson, do not do so.
In 1653 Lawrenius suggested another form for this homonym. On the same
grounds as Van Malle he proposes a parallel distinction "selfstandig 'ones', on het 'yon', en het 'gevolg'" (p. 47; cf. chap.12).
A third variation is found in some, but not all, users of the 's' spelling in
gelijkvormigheid described in chapter 11. Here too the form "ons" was quite
correctly deduced from "one", alongside the undelineable "one"; these forms
are used by Gargon (1686) and Joists (1621), though Gargon normally uses 's'.

There are only two true differentiation forms involving 's/z', namely the
separations of "sijn" (possessive pronoun) from "zijn" (verb), and "sy" (pronoun)
from "zy" (present subjunctive verb). Long before it was mentioned by any
grammatical work the verb "zijn" and the possessive "sijn" had been kept apart;
in fact there is already a tendency to this in Middle Dutch, showing a marked
preference for 'z' in the verbal forms (see chap.11), though many works show
"sijn" in both senses.

The prologue to the Ghent Boecius has 's' only in "zijn" (verb), but uses
"suy" (they) in the text alongside "sijn" (his). Other regular users of these
separate forms include Van der Harve, Plantijn (not Nederian), Valcoch,Goornhert,
Van der Huin, Van Beaumont, Roomer Flascher, Van Borsselen, Boetius à Bolwirt,
and many others, though few achieve total consistency.

This usage is not recommended by any grammar until the Bible
translators resolutions in 1623. Here, briefly, they prescribe "'zyn' esse: 'zy' suus,
ipsius" (2.1). Undoubtedly this had great influence on the writing
public and the use of this differentiation form continued unabated. The
translators do not specifically mention the use of "zij/zij" (verb/pronoun),
though this may be included in the Revisers comment (1633): "monet 'z' in verbo
substantivo. 3 in pronominibus". Users of this same system in the next few
decades include Gat, Bontekoe, and Van der Venne.

There is some evidence that a few made the same distinction the other way
round (a not infrequent occurrence also in other differentiation spellings,
notably "digt/dicht, agt/acht"). Jan de Witt is a prime example of this:
alongside "sijnde, zyn, sy" (verb forms) and the possessive "zijn", is to be
found contrasted "zy" for "they/she". This is an uncommon usage, and may be
connected with the reversal of the roles of 's' and 'z' in some writers about
this time (see chap. 11). De Witt uses 's' in all other words, including the unstressed pronoun 'ze' where no ambiguity could occur.

The next to recommend the alternation forms is Binnart. Already in 1635 he lists "Zijn, zijnde" with "Zee" as the only words under the letter 'z', but in the revised editions after 1659 enters only "zijn, zijnde", and explains in the introduction that "De woorden 'zijn, esse', en 'zijn, suus', moeten verscheelyck gespelt worden, om de differentie te kennen". This may be influenced by the Bible translators' usage, or possibly ultimately by Plantijn. Certainly influenced by the former is Laconis... in 1666, using 's' only in "zijn" (to be). Other users at this time include Van Attevelt (1649 edition only) and Niervaert (1676).

For those who recommended the total avoidance of 'z', such as Winschooten, no such differentiation forms are acceptable (just as in rejecting 'ch' he rejects "noch, doch" etc.). Yet one thing is common to all those mentioned above as using this particular word pair: they all use initial 's' for /z/, making "zijn" the exception to their rule. But this was not to continue in this way. Gargon in 1636, using the then normal way (= the modern usage), makes an exception for "t woorden 'syn, suus', om het t'onderscheiden van 'zyn', den onbepaalden tyd, infinitivo van 'ik ben'". In fact the same differentiation forms were preserved by many users of 'z-', so that now the whole situation is reversed, and it is the possessive "zijn" which constitutes the exception.

Users of 's-' continued to use the same forms as earlier writers, for example Leydekker, Kuiper, M.S., and Verwer. The latter is quite explicit as to his usage: the 's', he claims, should always be used in Dutch, with this one exception based on tradition, since "aliqui, inter quos Hugo Grotius, item Metaphraste Dordraceni, pinxerunt 'sijn' pronomen, & 'zijn' verbi substantivi infinitivum: ad rei, non soni, distinctionem". This last phrase is vital, as he is explicitly recommending it as a true differentiation.

Amongst 'z-' spellers however, this usage is now far less common, above all in the North, although De Vin, Van Haren, and a few others used it. The Sewel revision of La Grue contains a "Remarque touchant la pronomen 'se' ou 'ze'") (p. 150), but is not concerned with differentiation, and Overschie lists his personal pronouns (as examples for the use of 'y') as "hy, sy, zy, syn, syn ens."
though he makes no consistent distinction between the two, nor between "syn" and "sijn".

It is in the South that this differentiation was to receive its greatest support. E.C.P. is one of the first to encourage it: "ik wenschte ook val dat men verschil maakte tussen de woorden 'sijn (suus)' en 'zijn (esse:)'

want dit duikt my veer duidelijk in onze Taal dat men schryve en spelle: Godt is onsen Heer, en wy ZY ZY volk: Dat hy zig daar stelle, en ZY ZY daer (Ille stet illie: iilla sit ibi) Zy Zy Zy Zy razen moede. Ik wenschte zelfs daor-by, dat men dit verschil niet alleen in 't spellen, maar ook in 't spreken maakte; en dat men de S, in 'zijn, zijne, zijnen (suus vel ejus) sy (inca vel ipsi)' ook op zijn Friesch wat meer door de tenen de sissen; en aldus (alhins ten deele) de ware uitspraak van de E. de aensamen" (p.27). His statement is possibly unique in wishing to make the pronunciation of spoken Dutch conform to a purely differentiational spelling.

Steven and Verpoorten, like E.C.P., regular 'z-' spellers, make the same differentiation, as do Pomey and the Snoeijmes. The latter comments that "van dit gevoelen zijn alle geleerde schoolmeesters en alle taalvondigen, en zoo word dit van alle geleerde drukkers in alle boeken onderhouden, gelijk men in Brabant en Holland opentlijk ziet" - a clear statement on the popularity of this usage, even if a little sweepingly exaggerated. Bineken also considered it "zeer goed, dat men de voor-naamen 'syn, syna, synen, gy' met eene 's' schryve, om die te onderscheiden van de woorden 'sijn, zynen, gy, zy'".

But even in the South now this usage was beginning to be contested. Des Roches, though mentioning it, does not use it. (Zeydelaar in the North uses 's' in both as quasi-differentiational forms distinct from "sijn" = "téken") Some, such as Van Belleghem, still use the "sijn" pronominal form, but Janassens rejects it, as did all later grammars, both the normal 's/s' spellers and the radical 'e'-everywhere school of Van Daele and his followers.

This, one of the most persistent differentiational forms, began almost certainly in Middle Dutch, and faded out in the early 18th century in the North, and about 50 years later in the South.
Apart from those discussed above, there are a handful of miscellaneous differentiational forms suggested at various times, falling in no particular category.

Sewel put forward "Wadto" with the 'te' suffix added to the stem 'wad-'. There is nothing at all exceptional about this spelling (cf. "breedte"), except that the 1574 edition of his Guide remarked that it furnished a useful distinction from "watte" (cottonwool, though Sewel himself had not mentioned this. This instance is an excellent example of the way in which those who were preoccupied with finding differentiational spellings were often blind to the almost impossibility of confusion (between "shallows" and "cottonwool") ever occurring.

Winschooten rejects all 'vr-' spellings except in the word "vrede" where he would seem to be avoiding potential homonymy with "vrede" (chap.15). Many later grammars suggested that 'vr-' and 'vr-' be kept apart because of the emotional difference which separated the words beginning with each combination.

Kuykens (Levende Talen 1969) rejected the reform of '-isch' to '-ies' because it would cause homonymy, or homography, in "staties/staties" (from "statisch/ statie+s") and "logies/logies" (from "logisch/ logies met ontbijt'"). But this should have been an argument for changing 'tie' and 's' not for rejecting 'ies' (see chap.13).

Zeydelaar decided to keep the letter 'x' in the Germanic loan "Hex"... ter onderscheiding van 'hêks' of van 't hèk" (see chap.16).

David felt that the long 's' (see chap.12) would be useful "om alle dubbelzinnighed voor te komen ... in 'ryk-staf (ryks-taf), koning-staf (konings-taf), dorp-slooper (dorps-loopcr)" ess., the first of each pair, when written without the hyphen presumably, having the long 's'. This differentiational spelling is in fact a logical consequence of the rules governing the positioning of the long and curly 's', and was instinctively used by many (but not all) early writers. David is trying, however, to re-introduce the system.

Both Sewel and Hooft make a distinction between some verb forms. The former in "ik galoef, ik galoove", reserving the latter rigorously for the
subjective at a time when no such distinction was normal (see chap.1), and the letter in forms such as "ik schui,acht,achut, spat", so that "schuif, 
spat" etc. could be clearly recognized as imperfect tense forms (Haernominingen No.19) - see chap.17.

Semel includes in his list of differentiation forms (1701) "Weiter" (mother) and "wieder" (again), the former with a capital letter. Kremer makes a similar point in his grammar, though with a much wider application: "die Holländer (gebräuchen) grosse Schriftaben... zur Unterscheidung einiger Wörter, als 'Licht'... und 'light', 'Hovart'... und 'heven' (noun/adj. and noun/verb). It does not seem that this was a very common usage, although capitalization practices varied often greatly (cf. Rabus and Van der Linden, chap.13).

Quite a number of suggestions have been made using double consonants. The Bible translators mooted "satt"...discriminis cause, et quod 'versadigen' habeat "di'. 'satt' commodo imperfectum est a 'sitten" (T.1). Beyer used a double final consonant to show that the preceding vowel of a bisyllabic word was stressed, as in "borstel/mostell" (p.107) - cf. Montanus's similar comment given in chap.17. Said's spelling "dogg" mentioned above may constitute another case. Van Heule introduced many double consonants in pronouns and articles, in order to distinguish various cases in the manner he had seen in German. Thus "Denn" was separated from "den", "derr" from "der", with corresponding forms for "heurr, onsen, onser, dienn" etc. (1633 p.44, 52, 73 -6). Some of the grammars based on Van Heule, such as Hexham, Beyer and Richardson, preserve at least some of these forms, and sometimes add further examples (see chap.17).

Van Heule also proposed differentiational forms for subjunctive verbs, such as "habbeën, wezen, vezen, gaen, doen, staen" (p.91-5), and for the personal pronouns "hen/him" (acc/dat, p.72) similar to Hooft's suggested "hen/him" on a par with "hen/him" (Haernominingen No.31). These latter however would involve changes not only in spelling but also in the actual construction and form of the words, even in the spoken language, and cannot be described purely in terms of differentiational spelling.

In the history of Dutch spelling then a very great number of spellings have been put forward with a view to avoiding homonymy, especially in the early 18th
century, but out of all those mentioned only "nog/noch, dog/doch, kruid/kruit" are still in use, and of these the last two both have one form caused by gelijkmelijkheid (dog-on, kruiden) and one uninflected word, so that they are not as purely differentiational as "nog/noch", without being quasi-differentiational either.

Whether the existence of any of those is vital is arguable, and a great many spellers have successfully managed without them. "Nog/noch" is a comparatively recent arrival (mid-late 17th century), arising when "nochte" began to die out; it would appear that for this pair most writers have felt the need for some difference, be it "noch/nochte" or "noch/noch". It is nonetheless difficult to imagine uncontrived and natural sentences in which ambiguity of context could present absolutely no guide to the meaning, and there will always remain a large number of unavoidable homonyms which apparently never cause problems of interpretation.

An example of a sentence in which the difference between "nog" and "noch" is useful can be found in Busken Huet's article "Een avond aan het Hof" in De Gids, January 1365: "Beneden ons...strooide de Neckar; de hier nog onbevaarbare, nog wispelturige, nog bandeloze, maar die...een grootse toekomst voorspelt". The significance of this example is that it has not been invented specifically to show the difference between "nog" and "noch".
Chapter 12: the alphabetical names of the consonants

Appendix of letters:
Appendix of group of letters
Reform movements
Alphabetical order

The development of the names given to the various consonants, though of
peripheral importance, sheds some light onto certain aspects of the development
of consonantal spelling, and also onto the interrelationship of various works.
For the great majority of consonants the names have remained largely the same,
allowing for minor differences of spelling, and it is surely no coincidence
that the letters causing the most discussion, even controversy, are those which
either did not appear in the Latin alphabet or had a new application.

The types of name fall into several distinct groups, best treated separately:

E.C.E.

"Fe, Ce, De, Co, Je, Pe, Te" is the basic system for these consonants, and is
used by the vast majority throughout the whole development of written Dutch
grammar. The names (though some works do not discuss the subject, or only
in part) have been noted as used by De Keuiter, the Tweespraak, Leurier, Van
der Schore, Van Heule, Beffeene, Ampzing, Van Gherwen, Plemp, Hexham, the
Dutch Tutor, Nok, Larpenius, Van Atteveld, Van der Weyden, Beyer, Hierwaert,
Richardson, Wunschoten, Van Helderen, Kuyper, Van Geesdalle, the Grammaire
plus exacte, Nolde, Sevel (SprAakronst), Moenen, E.C.P., Steven, Kremer,
Hengalenburg, Guno, Eincken, Des Roches, Van der Pals, Van Belleghem &
Waterschoot, Jansens, Crane, Holtrop (C.W.), the Inleyding, Ballieu,
Siegenbeek, De Necker, Behaegel, Terbruggen, Guits, Bril, Senier, To Winkel
and all later works.

Of these works, "Je" is omitted by De Keuiter, and later by Hexham; the
Dutch Tutor, Van Atteveld, Van der Weyden, Richardson, Des Roches, and
Siegenbeek. "Go" is omitted by Siegenbeek/Walland, Behaegel, Guits, and has
a variant form in Van Gherwen mentioned below. "Go" also has a variant form.

Obviously little can be deduced from such a standard usage, but the
deviations are more significant: "Dee, Gee, Dee, Gee, Jee, Pee, Pee, Tee" are used
by Montanus, Daikerius, Halvoord, Van Belle, and are also given as contemporary
contemporary forms by Bomhoff in the mid 19th century. The motivation behind this spelling, as also behind those given next, was that the spelling "ie, Ge..." did not accurately represent the long vowel heard after the consonant. Van Nelle omits "Ge", and Buikermius and Solvoord (almost certainly influenced by the former) both have "Je" (sic).

"De, Ged, Gé, Jé, Pê, Té": here the vowel quantity is shown by an added accent rather than by doubling. These forms are used by Lambrecht, Sewel (Spraakkonst), Sewel/La Grue, Zeypelaar, Sijmsens, Stijl, Bilderdijk, Olinger, Tyi, and are given as contemporary by Van den Ende. La Grue (Sewel), Van den Ende, Olinger and Tyi are writing for a French audience. Sewel, mentioned in both of these lists, actually mixes the forms thus - "De, Ged, De, Je, Jé, Pê, Té". These may be printing errors, and his revision of La Grue suggests that he preferred the accented forms. Only Stijl, Zeypelaar and Sewel himself include "Jé".

"Dea, Gea, Dea, Gea, Jea, Penn, Tena": these forms are only to be found in Dutch grammars written in English, and must therefore be counted as pseudo-Dutch spellings, with '-ea' given so that the English reader would read /e:/, cf. the use of accents in French texts on Dutch mentioned above. These forms are to be found in Nuxian, the Dutch Tutor, Milleniad, Sewel's English works, and Scholers. The first two (the second is no more than a few pages of extracts from the other) mix two forms thus: "Dea, Gea, Dea, Gea, Penn, Tena" and Milleniad has a variant for 'j' (see below).

"Bija, Gijs, Bije, Gijs..." have not been encountered in any grammar, but are known to have been used in Groningen province up to the end of the 13th century. Hendrik Wester was responsible for bringing provincial usage into line with the standard system, though he does not mention the forms in his spelling book (see Van, p.41).

Individual variants of these letters

C: Opposition to the name /se:/ comes as early as 1531 from De Reuiter. The true sound of 'c', he claims, is /k/, and this should be reflected in the name. He also comments on the absence of 'k' in Latin, and the Roman pronunciation of the name as /sk:/ in support of his suggestion. This must have been known to Van der Schuere, who writes that "Ten zoude ook niet onwoegelijk zijn,
His argument is that since the Romans did not hesitate to change the Greek letter and name 'ke' to 'ce', the Dutch should have no qualms about reversing the change in favour of 'k' and /ke:/.

It is not clear from Ampzing's wording whether Mostart (whose book is now lost) wished to reform the name of the letter 'c', or to introduce one for the digraph 'ch' (see below); he writes that 'c' only occurs before 'h', "waerom David Mostart de 'c' 'chi' noemd, om dese haere uyttsprake uyt te drucken" (p.21).

It would appear to be a renaming of the letter 'c', for the other would be very radical at that time, and it is distinctly possible that the same idea is seen in Van Gherwen's alphabet names "A be che de ..., where 'ch' appears instead of rather than in addition to the expected 'c'. Van Gherwen usually follows the usage of the Twe-spraack, which, however, does not mention this suggestion. A parallel may be drawn with the contemporary spellings "chier, verchieren" with 'ch' representing /ts/ or prevocalic /s/ (see chap.2).

Montanus echoes De Heuiter's connection of 'c' and 'k', adding also 'q'. This sound /k/ bears the names "'kaa', of 'qû', of ooc zeer ongevoechelij 'cee' (de 'c' als een 'a' uitgesproken)" (p.82). He prefers the name 'kee' for this sound, be it spelt 'k' or 'c'. Although later writers, such as Moonen, knew of De Heuiter's argument, none went so far as he or Montanus in wishing to actually change the name. And the name 'chi' or 'che' died out, probably because of the moves concerning the digraph 'ch' discussed below.

G: Because of the influence of French, it was very common in earlier times to find the name of the letter 'g' pronounced /ʒe:/

Again Van der Schuere echoes this: "Eenige noemen ze 'sje', gelijk de Francoyzzen: Ende van ander wordze 'dje' genoemd. Zommige gevenze ook den eygentlijken naam van 'je'... Maar ander (van welker gevoelen wy ook zijn)
willing vel liever dat wyze ... zullen 'ge' heeten", - namely with the fricative. Montanus has a similar comment on "'dje" - welken naem by sommige ooc in gebruik is, om daer meede verkeerdelyc de 'g' te beteikenen".

Later opposition to such misnamings came from Winschooten ("...alsof wij seiden 'sje"), Steven (who used 'ghe' with a self-admitted superfluous 'h' to avoid the pronunciation which he gives as "dsé"), Janssens (against 'dje' mooted by Van Belleghem and Waterschoot), and Behaegel (against 'dje', p.189). This French name would seem to have been very stubborn, especially in the South, persisting at least until the early 19th century. Some grammars evaded the issue: Pyl gives no name for the letter at all, nor a description àf the sound, because "il n'est pas possible de l'exprimer par des lettres frangoises".

Several grammars, apart from Steven mentioned above, inserted 'h' after the 'g' in the name, possible for the same reasons. Richardson and Jaarsveldt have "ghe" and Hillenius, Sewel's English works, and Schwiers all have "ghea". Possibly along the same lines, Van Geesdalle uses 'gue', and Janssens has "Gué" in the "Letterrol" of his "Practical Dutch Grammar" (elsewhere "ge", even in the same book). The latter work also includes "gay" (for the benefit of English readers) as a simulated "Hollandsche Uitspraak" (p.17). Sexagius, much earlier, had mooted "ga" as an alternative to "ge", which he also uses, in the appendix - cf. "fa, va" below. 

The name of this letter, like 'g', was often given as /ze:/, and is equally often rejected by purists. In the earliest grammars is was simply referred to as the consonantal 'i', and was often not even granted a place in the alphabet, being regarded merely as a variant form of the same letter. The Twe-spraack is the first to suggest the possibility of "de 'j' een meklinker zynde ãck 'je' (te) noemen" (p.47). Van der Schuere also regards "je" as the "eygentlijken naam van (J)" (see above under 'G'). This name is also put forward by Ampsing (p.24), Leupenius, Van Helderem (rejecting "jod"), and C.W.Holtrop (rejecting "Ye" - cf. Hillenius and Richardson below).

The name "jod" or "jot" was often used on classical grounds, e.g. by Van Atteveld, Van der Weyden, Nyloë, Richardson, being rejected by Van Helderem. "Yota" is also used by Richardson, who in common with Hillenius yields the
third alternative "ye", presumably intended to represent the normal /je:/ for English Readers. At a much later date Des Roches suggests "ja" by analogy with other letters and German usage (see below). Bolognino, rejecting "jot", is alone in suggesting "ji", which is inspired by the origin of 'j' as a variant of 'i'—"om aldus kennelijcker te maken het onderscheyt tusschen dese twee letteren 'j' consonant ende 'i' vocal" (p.14, 21).

F.L.M.N.R.S

Two basic names have been given to these letters: "Effe, elle, emme, enne, erre, esse" and "Ef, el, en, er, es". The latter is the most common, being used by all those in the extensive list given for "Be, Ce..." with the exception of Sexagius, Meurier, Ampzing, Leupenius, Heugelenburg, Steven, and Van Belleghem & Waterschoot, and with the addition of Lambrecht, De Berd, Montanus, Hillenius, Duikerius, Sewel's English works and revision of La Grue, Zeydelaar, Stijl, Schwiers, Bolhuis, Bomhoff, and Olinger.

The origin of the bisyllabic names is obscure, though it must be connected with the fact that all these letters are liquids or fricatives. Theories have been put forward, though inconclusively. Certainly these names are very old, though they were long excluded from grammars. They were known to Dafforne, and earlier to De Berd, whose lost book of 1588 is quoted by Dafforne as condemning them: "De letteren (zyt hy) moeten de kinderen aldus uyt spreken 'ef...el, em, en,...er, es'. Maar niet 'effe,...elle, emme, enne,...erre, esse'. 'T ghebruyk dezer staarten is waerdigh mispreezen:/ Want 'thangt de Kinderen aen, als Zy willen leesen", — the last section is a rhymed couplet. A similar comment is given by Van der Weyden — that "men niet en mag zeggen 'bee, cee, dee, effe, gee, elle, emme, enne, erre, esse' &c' and later by Bincken"... en niet 'bee, dee, effe, elle, emme, enne' ens."

In 1654 the bisyllabic forms are given as contemporary by Van den Ende, who, like Van der Weyden, rejects them. Only one grammar up to that date had actually given them as acceptable alternatives, and this was Montanus — "ef, effe; en, enne; er, erre" (p.74). Sewel also gives them as alternatives in his Spraakkonst, but not in his works written in English.
Not until Steven's "Voorschriftboek" are the longer forms given without the alternatives "af, el" etc. (the vital letter, as it were, is often capitalised as "Af, el" etc. in most periods, e.g. Van Heule and Van der Palm). Later grammars to adopt this same usage were Van Belle, Van Belleghem & Waterschoot (criticised by Janssens), Cramer (earlier editions), the Groningen provincial usage condemned by Wester (see above), Bomhoff (as alternatives), and Smits (for "affe, esse" only).

Bilderdijk had his own theory on these name forms, based on the distribution of letters in Dutch spelling. In older spelling patterns 'b, c, d,' etc., only appear in initial position in a word or syllable and were consequently given the names "Be, Ce, De...", in contrast to "Affe, elle, emme..." which were not thus restricted, - "deze benaming wijst dus aan dat deze seven letters tevens sluitletters en aanvangletters zijn..." Met de tegenwoordige wyze van spellen waarin men de sylben of woorden op alle letters behalen 'v' en 'z' laat eindigen, zouden wy naar dit beginsel even zoo de 'b' 'ebbe', de 'd' 'edde', de 'g' 'egge', de 'k' 'ekke', de 'p' 'eppe', de 't' 'ette', ja de 'w' 'ewe' moeten noemen".

It would be better on the whole, he concludes, "die oude tweesylbige namen der letters te verbannen".

These names were still in current use at the time of Bilderdijk's writing: Behaegel (1817) considers it "éenen misslag de zamenklanken (=consonants) aan de kinders te leeren uyt spreken in twee lettergreepen: als 'affe... elle, emme, enne, erre, esse". Bomhoff (1854) still gives the forms in brackets as contemporary alternatives.

**Individual variants**

Fa is used by Sexagius (D4 v*) - "F' facilius ab 'f' distinguatur 'va' & 'fa' inter se conferendo" (for 'F' as opposed to 'f' see chap.7). Although the first-mentioned "va" was later adopted for 'v', the name "fa" is never seen again.

Ar is equally exclusive, found in De Heuiter alongside the normal "er".

Esses/Es Because there were two forms of the letter 's' (see chap.12), some attempted to give them different names. This move was started by the Twe-spraak - "De voorste 'f' noem ik 'esse', om die vande kleine in de naam te onderscheiden, also deze nimmermeer int leste vant woord, ende de kleine niewers elders mach staan" - a variation of Bilderdijk's theory, though with an important difference
of emphasis. Van Gherwen copies this usage (as he did other of the Twe-spraack's usages, cf. chap. 8): "...er esse es te...". Neither the Twe-spraack nor Van Gherwen use the other bisyllabic names. As late as 1816 De Neckere has the same sequence of letters, though all other grammars, even though listing both forms of the letter 's', only gave them one name between them.

Es/se, er/re On the same lines as "esse/es" a few distinguished the long 'ʃ' from the curly 's', and the round 'ç' from the straight 'r' in this way. This appear to affect only Sewel in his "Sprakkonst", and Cramer. The former, describing the usage of the variant forms of 's' and 'r', gives "re en er" as the names (p. 2), and Cramer, much later on, writes that "De 'ʃ' is eigenlijk 're', en de 'r' 'er' genoemd...(want) de 'ç' dient om een woord of lettergreep te beginnen, en de andere 'r', om dezelve te sluiten. ... ter zelfden einde... de lange 'ʃ' (eigenlijk 'se' genoemd) dient om een woord of lettergreep te beginnen, en de korte 's' ('es' geheeten) om dezelve te sluiten". This is contained in all editions of Cramer up to 1897, though it is doubtful if this practice was current as late as that.

The rest of the consonants do not allow grouping, and are treated individually.

H By far the most common, and normal, name-form for this is "Ha", being used since Lambrecht. The only exceptions in name and spelling have been:

Há given by Lambrecht, and later rejected by Van den Ende

Has given by Duikerius and Hakvoord on the same grounds as the double vowel spellings "Bee, Cee..." etc., though not as common since "Ha" was not capable of the same mispronunciation as "Be, Ce" etc.

Haâ given by Hillenius; the circumflex may be for the absent '-ts' (see below)

Haw in Sewel's English works, and in Schwiers, for the benefit of Englishmen

Haö given by Meurier ("H, ê detta haö") - in imitation of the "dark" /a/.

Hee is used by Montanus ("gemeenelijc 'haa' genoemt") by analogy with "Be, Ce..."

He is similarly used by the Southern works of Steven, Van Belleghen & Waterschoot, and Ter Bruggen.

The most argument surrounded the borrowed French name "hache", and its Dutch variants. This occurred in early times, Lambrecht using "hà of haats". He is the only grammar to give both as alternatives, and by 1584 De Heuiter...
was already rejecting it: "Leert die kinderen zeggen 'ha', niet 'haetse', op
dat zij van geen letter een Fransse bijl maken " (p.49 - "hache" is French for
"axe"). De Berd included "haetse" in his warning given above (his comments
on letter-names show much similarity with De Heuiter's). The name seems to
have been most common in the South, probably because of the greater proximity
of French speaking areas and influence. Steven writes that "De H noemen hier
zommige 'atse' ofte 'hache',...(men) behoord() die... te noemen 'Ha' ofte 'He'",
and Des Roches warns that "voor al Zy men bezorgt de 'h', geene 'atse', maer
'ha' te noemen".

The only instance noted of a grammar giving "hache" only is Janssens's
"Spel-konste" (1175). He has a good reason for this, in that in his system 'h'
is ideally used only "om eigen Naemen en onechte Woorden te spellen" (cf. the
Flemish habit of dropping initial 'h') - and as it occurred only in foreign
words it could be comfortably allowed to retain its foreign name. Consequently
it also appears at the end of the alphabet and not in its normal place (see below)

K The normal name "Ka" is used by almost all grammars, with the variants
Kaa in Duikerius and Bakvoord (only)
Kaw in the grammars in English by Sewel, Janssens (=Janson) and Schwiers
Keah in the similar work by Hillenius
Ca in Pyl (1816); Meurier gives "K pro cao" as a simulated pronunciation of /ka/
Kee is used by Montanus by analogy ("nae gelijkheid van de andere") for 'c'&'k'.
Ke is a minor variant used by Sexagius, De Heuiter (p.42) alongside "ka" (p.32,
50), Steven (alongside "ka"), and Janssens. This is clearly by analogy with
"be, ce, de," etc.

Q The basic name for this letter, pronounced /ky/, has had a remarkable
variation of spelling through the centuries. The earliest form is
Cu given by Lambrecht, later as an alternative by Haxham. The next form is
Qu presumably with a full vocalic value given to the 'u', rather than the semi-
vowel heard in such as "qualik". This form is used by De Heuiter, who rejects
the French pronunciation, which he represents by "Ku". The difference is
probably one of lip rounding i.e. /k^y:/ and /ky:/ respectively (see chap.10).
The same form "qu" is used, without comment, by Van der Schuure, Haxham (as a
variant), Van Atteveld, Van der Weyden, Kuyper, Van Geesdalle, the Grammaire
plus exacte, Steven, Bincken, Des Roches, Ballieu, Van Belleghem & Waterschoot,
the Inlayding, and Ter Bruggen - all but the first five are Southern works.

Que is the Northern counterpart of "Qu". It is first given by the Twe-spraack:
"de 'q', die ick 'que' noeme" (p.54), which is copied by Van Gherwen and Kok,
and is later used by Van Heule, from whom it is borrowed by Beyer, Hillenius
and the Dutch Tutor, though not by Hexham or Richardson. Later users include
NyloS, Moonen, and Van der Palm. It is possible that the Twe-spraack's comment
that he uses 'u' after 'q' in the name because of the normal use of 'qu-
"alsomense int spellen bezight", might be interpreted as indicating a name
pronounced /kwe:/ - i.e. similar to "bee, cee" etc. (possibly also /k'ye:/ or
/kya/) otherwise the '-e' would be superfluous. Support for this comes from
De Berd and Van den Ende, who reject contemporary forms "quwe" and "quyuwe"
respectively, which must have had one of the latter pronunciations. Van
Helderenc, in his "Kort-Schrift-Boek", also comments that "'qu' heb ik ... in een
letter, heet se 'kwe'", though this does not imply the same name for 'q'.

Minor variants are:

Quu used by Duikerius (not by Hakvoord), and the 1757 edition of Bincken
Quu used by Montanus (p.32)
Quw used by E.C.P.

With the change in spelling from 'qu-' to 'kw-' the name of 'q' also
underwent modernisation in its spelling. "Qu" yielded to
Ku as early as 1627 in Dafforne, and was later used by Richardson, Hakvoord,
Zeydelaar, Cramer, Holtrop, Bilderdijk and most subsequent works. Bomhoff gives
Kuu as a contemporary alternative to "ku".

Kuw is used by Sewel in his English and Dutch works, and later by Schwiers.
Kuuw is the form used by Stijl.

Possible at play in some of these names were the varying theories governing
use of final '-u' and '-uw' (chap.15). In some of the works written for Germans
imitated pronunciations are given, such as "küh" (Cuno), and "kI" (Jaarsveldt).
Because of its origins, this letter was often simply referred to as the consonantal 'u' in earlier times (e.g. Lambrecht), and consequently (like 'j') often omitted from the alphabet as a mere variant of the latter. It was also sometimes referred to as "enkel u" (rejected by De Neckere). The earliest name \( \text{Ve} \) is possibly influenced by the Hebrew name "vau", as used in German. For Sexagius, however, being the first to mention it, it may have simply been by analogy with "fa, ga", which he also suggests. The form is taken up by De Heuiter ("Die vocaal 'u' heeft 'va' voortsgebracht"), and later by Twe-spraack (p.46), Van der Schuere, Van Heule, Van Gherwen, Dafforne, Kok, Leupenius, Beyer. It then died out, but was resurrected in 1761 by Des Roches: "'J,v,w' worden van de Duitschers 'ja, va, wa', en van de Hollanders 'je, ve, we' genoemd; men kieze uyt deeze benaamingen, welke men wilt". Rather than have the same usage as the North a few Flemish grammars chose the German names, e.g. De Neckere. Janssens has "va" in his English works, but only in the simulated pronunciations for English readers, representing /ve/i. In the middle of the 17th century the earlier form "va" yielded to \( \text{Ve} \) for reasons which are obscure, though it was probably due to analogy with other consonants. Its first appearance is in Kok (1649) where it figures as a variant "ve oft va". Only in 1683 is it adopted as the only form in a grammar, as used by Winschooten ("...dat een Fries ... een F gebruikt, daar wij ons met de Ve vergenoegen"). Thereafter it is adopted by Van Helder (1686), Kuyper, Nyloë, Moonen, Hakvoord, E.C.P., Steven, Heugelenburg, Cuno, Eicken, Gelliers, Van der Palm, Ballieu, Van Belleghem & Waterschoot, Janssens, Cramer (early editions), Holtrop, the Inleyding, Weiland/Siegenbeek, Behaegel and all later works in both North and South. The variant spelling \( \text{Vee} \) is used by Montanus, 14 years before Kok's "Ve", and later by Duikerius, Van Bells, and Bomhoff.

\( \text{Ve} \) is used by Sewel in his Spraakkonst and revision of La Grue, Stijl, Zeydelaar (Verhandeling), Janssens, Cramer (later editions), Olinger, Jaarsveldt.

\( \text{Vee} \) is the simulated pronunciation used by Sewel and Schwiers.

\( \text{Vau} \) is the classical name, and is found mainly in the latter half of the 17th century. It is used, or mentioned, by Van Atteveld, Van der Weyden, Bolognino, Richardson, Van Geesdalle, Nyloë (as an alternative to "ve"), and the earlier
editions of Cramer. It is also rejected by Van Halderen.

Yu together with "ji, wu" is given by Bolognino as preferable to "jot, vau, dubbel u", all three forms being unique to him. "Yu" is modelled in the same way as "ji" (see above). However both Hillenius and Richardson have the similar Yuv the latter, like Bolognino, as an alternative to "vau".

Uwe is the other main variant, though it is not recommended by any grammar. It is condemned by several, however, including Van den Ende, Gelliers, Cramer, C.W.Holtrop, and Behaegel - covering a period of over 150 years!

Uv is a very minor form used only in Buys's revision of Sewel's dictionary in 1766, and as a third alternative (with "ve, vau") by Cramer's early editions.

W Like 'v' this letter originally had a name describing its origin. As this was as a separate doubled 'uu' (or more usually 'vv'), sometimes written as a ligature but often kept apart, the name was naturally the equivalent of English "double-u" or French "double-vé". A great many variants of this name have appeared during its currency from the 16th to the 18th century:

duplex w used by Sexagius
dubbel wv rejected by the Twe-spraack
dubbel-uu rejected by Van Atteveld
dubbel-u rejected by Steven
dubbela uwé rejected by Cramer
dubbela u rejected by Moonen and Behaegel
dubbela u uses by Montanus (p.74)
dubbeld' uu rejected by Gelliers
dubbeld' uve rejected by Gelliers
dubbeld vv rejected by Cramer
dubbelduw rejected by Cramer
dubbeldv rejected by Zeydelaar
dubbeldewe rejected by C.W.Holtrop
dobbela uwen used by Lambrecht
dobbela-u used by Bincken and Ballieu, rejected by Steven
dobbela u rejected by De Neckere
dobbeld u rejected by Van Halderen
dobbelduw used in Buys's revision of Sewel's dictionary 1766
dobbelduw rejected by Van den Ende

Hillenius and Richardson have the anglicised forms "double ou" and "double u", Cuno has "doppelt v", the Grammaire plus exacte uses "ue (vulg. double v)", and Sewel's revision of La Grue has "double v". Almost every grammar has a slightly different form for this name, influenced largely by differences in vocabulary (dubbel/dobbel, dubbeld/dobbel etc), rather than intended as different names.
With the development of the acceptance of 'w' as a letter in its own right, 
wa became the normal name until the mid 17th century. Thename of this letter 
develops almost exactly parallel to that of 'v', except that "wa" first appears 
in De Heuiter, who also pleads for the use of 'w' rather than 'uu'. This name 
is used by all those mentioned above as using "va" for 'v', plus Ampzing who 
refers to "de 'w' ofte 'wa', (alsze sommige noemen)" on p.17. 
We superceded "wa" and is used by those who used "ve" for 'v' with the 
exception of Bincken, Gelliers, and Ballieu (see above), and with the addition 
of Richardson and Van Geesdalle. 
We is used by the users of "ve" with the addition of Cramer 
Wea like "vea" is used by Sewel and Schwiers for English readers 
Wu is suggested by Bolognino: "dubbel u ... ick noemse 'wu', om te toonen 
datse ooc luydt met de 'u'!". 
Wee is used, like "vee", by Duikerius, Van Belle, Zeydelaar, and Bomhoff. 

In addition there is also the Hebrew name 
Waw "...gemeenlijc 'vau' gencent", which Montanus equates with 'w' rather than 
with 'v' as was normally done (see above). A similar name is used by Van der 
Weyden and Van Atteveld: "Men laat een ieder Klerc en Letter-zetter weten/ Dat 
'wau' misbruykelijs is dubbel-uu geheten" (Van Atteveld). 

X Here there is only one basic name, but with several slight variations 
Ix is the earliest, given only by Lambrecht. It was followed by 
Ix used by De Heuiter, the Twe-spraack, Dafforne, the Dutch Tutor, Sewel (all 
works), Duikerius, Van Geesdalle, the Grammaire plus exacte, E.C.P., Steven, 
Cuno, Bincken, Des Roches, Ballieu, Van Belleghem & Waterschoot, Stijl, Cramer 
(early editions), the Inleyding, Schwiers, and Ter Bruggen -mostly Southern. 
Ex enjoyed its greatest popularity in the North in the 17th century, being 
used by the Twe-spraack (p.A8, "ix" p.52), Van Heule, Van Gharwen, Hexham, Kok, 
Van Atteveld, Van der Weyden, Beyer, Hillenius, Richardson, Winschooten, Van 
Helder, Kuypier, Nyloë, Moonen, and Hakvoord. At a later date it was taken up 
by Van der Palm, Janssens (in "Practical Dutch Grammar" only), and De Neckere. 

With the adoption of the change from 'x' to 'ks' the name spelling changed; 
Iks is used by Van der Schuere and Dafforne (also "ix"), followed much later.
by Ten Kate, Zeydelaar, C.W.Holtrop, Cramer, Behaegel, and most subsequent works. A corresponding change form "ex" is found in the spelling Exs in Bomhoff (alongside "iks") and Van der Pyl

Iks is given as an alternative by Duikerius, and the bisyllabic Ixe (cf "effe") is rejected by Van den Ende.

Ikse is similarly rejected by Bilderdijk and Behaegel.

For this letter two basic names are found, with several variants, either by analogy with other consonants or subject to classical influence.

Ze is used by Sexagius, De Heuiter, Van der Schuere, Van Heule, Van Gherwen, Dafforne, Hexham, the Dutch Tutor, Kok, Kuyper, Van Geesdalle, Nyloë, Moonen, Steven, Zeydelaar, Van der Palk, Van Belleghem & Waterschoot, Janssens, Holtrop, the Inleyding, Siegenbeek/Weiland, Behaegel, Ter Bruggen, and Smits. This form is used in both North and South, and in most periods. Variants include Ze used by Stijl and Janssens (Practical Dutch grammar)

Zee used by Montanus and Van Belle.

The classical name, by analogy with Greek, is found until about 1700:
Zeeta is used by Ampzing, Smids, E.C.P., Bincken, Des Roches, and Ballieu, but was earlier rejected by Sexagius and De Heuiter. It was often used by those who did not regard 'z' as a Dutch letter, e.g. Ampzing, Smids and E.C.P. among those just mentioned (cf. also Van Rusting chap.11). Popular usage changed this to Zeeet used by Lambrecht, the Twe-spraak (p.52), Van Atteveld, and Van der Weyden. It was rejected by Van den Ende, and is sometimes also found spelt as Zeed e.g. by Hakvoord.

Zede is also rejected by Van den Ende, and a variant of this

Zade is given as an alternative by Nyloë.

For a great many grammarians the name changed more radically.

Zedde is used by the Twe-spraak (p.48), though it is rare at this early date. Later on it is used by the later editions of Cramer, by Schwiers, De Neckere, Bomhoff (as an alternative), and is rejected by Bilderdijk along with all other bisyllabic forms. De Neckere also mentions that the name word ook uytgesproken "zidde".

Occasionally the name received an extra sound, origin obscure, and became
Zeddet as used by Sewel in his Dutch and English works, and also in his revision of La Grue, from where it was borrowed by Cuno.

Zedet is also used by Zeydelaar in his Verhandeling. An abbreviated form Zadd* is found in the earlier editions of Cramer, and can be regarded as a transitional form between "Zedde" mentioned above, and the later Zed. This is used as early as in Dafforne (alongside "ze"), and later by Beyer, Hillenius, Richardson, Duikerius, Van Helderen, Heugelenburg, Zeydelaar (as a variant), Weiland (as a variant), Bomhoff, Olinger, Van der Pyl, Jaarsveldt, and most later works.

Zet is a minor variant of this used in the Grammaire plus exacte of 1701.

Extension of names to extra-alphabetical combinations

CH It has on several occasions been suggested that common combinations such as 'ch' and 'sch' should be regarded as one letter (cf. chap.3), and some took the further logical step of including them in their alphabet (see below), and giving them individual names. The digraph 'ch' has the most extensive history in this respect, undoubtedly because it could be identified with Greek 'χ'. This is done for example in the Twe-spraack, but not until Montanus did any suggestion come to invent a name for the Dutch 'ch' (though Mostart and Van Gherwen use "chi/che" for 'c', and Plemp speaks of "de ch" in the same way as "de c, de g, de v" etc.). This digraph, he claims, is "geen verschillende twee letteren... maar alleen een enkelde letter". The name moreover should ideally be "ech" - "omdatse als een Voorletter zelden, en als Naeletter dikwils in onze spraec gebeezicht wort". He specifically rejects "chee", which form may thus have been known to him.

A further century passed before any one else took up this argument, in the person of Ten Kate: "Indien men zig ontslaat van dien verbijsterenden owdien naam van 'Ceha', en dit lêttertürken 'CHI' of 'CHe' noemt..." (I, 123). Ten Kate certainly had more success than Montanus, and his suggestion is taken up by Van Belle (who often refers to Ten Kate - see chap.7): "De Grieksse 'CH', te dwaas 'Cee-Ha' geheeten / By plaatverts, ja by hen die beeter wesen,/ Verdient (als Duits) den Duitsen naam van 'Chee'" (1748 p.12, similar 1755 p.6).

Ten Kate's comment is also echoed in the Taal en Dichtkundige Bijdragen of
1760 (I.216): "Men heevt (ch) aentezien voor een ondeelbaar letterteeken, en Che of Chi te noemen". Stijl and Pieterson, both writing in 1776, are of the same opinion. The former says that "de naem en klank niet 'ce-ha', maar enkelvoudig 'che' is", and the latter (Rhapsodia II), referring to both Ten Kate and Van Belle, also chose "che". Even the Nut works adopted this, both in the Spel- en lees boekjen voor eerst beginnenden (1786, 1789, 1805), and in Varick's Rudimenta. These too chose "che" rather than "chi": "De 'ch' en 'sch' moeten niet 'c h' of 's,c,h' uitgesproken worden, maar als een enkele klank of letter 'che, sche' ".

This name had a very good chance of becoming accepted in the normal Dutch alphabet, and indeed "Che" was adopted by Weiland and Behaegel in this way. Bilderdijk, with the alternatives of Ten Kate, comments that "het ware niet onvoeglijk dat men by ons die 'ch' (gelijk thands de Duitschen doen) als één letterteeken aamerkte en 'che' of 'chi' noemde" (Spraakleer, 40). Smits too had adopted "che" in his reforms, and Bomhoff, probably influenced by Weiland, included "chee".

There have thus been two different names: "chi" on the Greek model, used by Ten Kate, the Bijdragen, and Bilderdijk; and "che" given by the same and also by Van Belle, Stijl, Pieterson, Nut, Varick, Weiland, Behaegel, Smits, and also Bomhoff with "chee", by analogy with his other letter names (see above). The reform was not taken up by Te Winkel, and has not recurred.

SCH Only three grammars extended this "che" spelling for 'ch' to cover 'sch' as well. Montanus includes in his very radical suggestion given below the name "schee", but the first notion of the name outside this sweeping idea is seen in Van Helder's "Kort-Schrift-Boek". As he felt it cumbersome in his shorthand system to have three letters for such a common sound, he scrapped them: "'sche' heb ik in een letter: noemt se 'sche' ". Whether this had any influence on contemporary usage is doubtful, and no more mention is made of it until the above-mentioned Nut work. Smits too added "see" (= /sche:/), since "men weet dat het spellen van es-ce-ha gansch ongerijmd is" (p.11).

NG Two grammarians have proposed a name for this digraph, regarding it as an indivisible sound; they are Montanus and Ten Kate. Montanus (p.77-9) gives the
name "eng", or, if analogy with "effe, elle..." is desired, "engage". Ten Kate does the same, giving "ING", and also includes 'nk': "De CH, NG en NK, die men 'CHE', 'ING', en 'eNK' mag noemen..." (I.122). Montanus similarly extends his form to cover "enj, enjje" for the sound in "Franje, Oranje, Spanje".

Montanus's reform

Montanus had a very ambitious reform proposal, covering all the consonants, not only singly but also in their various combinations. It has been seen above that he often differs from his contemporaries in using '-ee' name-forms instead of '-a' (hee, kee, vee), but he did not stop there: "Het getal van (tweedubbelle Voorletteren) is tamelijk groot, onder de welke in onze taal sonder menging gebruikelyc zijn de volgende 'wr, gr, gl, gn, vr, vl, dr, br, bl, sl, sm, sch, st, sp, fr, fl, kr, kl, kn, tr, pr, pl': Als te hooren is in 'wreeken, greep, gloet, gnor, vry, vlam' &c. Men mach elc noemen met naemen, die gemengt zijn uit de naemen haeder Enkelder Letteren: als de 'wr', noemende 'uw-er', de 'gr', 'geee-er' &c. Of anders met haer eige samengevoecht geluit, en 'ee' achter aen: Als met 'wr'; te heeten 'vree', en 'gr', 'gree' &c... Op gelijke wijze als de tweedubbelde Voorletteren, commen deene ooc elc noemen: als de 'schr' 1. 'es-ech-er', 2. 'schree'... l.'Erps' 2, 'Er-pee-es', 1. 'Elpt', 2. 'El-pee-tee'... l. 'tstree', 2. 'Tee-es-tee-er'... l. 'Elpst', 2. 'El-pee-es-tee" (pp.101, 107,108,109) - nb the combinations which only appear at the end of a word have a prefixed 'e-' rather than suffixed '-ee'. His suggestion of "ech, schee, eng, enj" can be seen to be part of this.

Van den Ende's reform, and its emulators

Van den Ende, writing in 1654, furnishes the second attempt to change the names of the letters of the alphabet, in a way radically different from that of Montanus. The latter wished to rationalise the names, iron out the inconsistencies (ha/be etc.), and extend the application to new letters and combinations. Van den Ende had no wish to change or augment the alphabet, but wished to give new, and more logically constructed names to the existing letters.

This suggestion consisted in adding '-e' (pronounced /a/, /e/ or /ə/). Because most consonants could appear both in initial and in final position in the contemporary gelijkvormigheid system, he wished to reflect this in a second
name to be given to such letters when appearing in final position. I.e. when the letter appeared initially, e.g. in "bed", it was called "Be", and when in final position, e.g. in "heb", it was to be called "Eb". Montanus had the germ of this theory in his name "ech" (see above).

Thus Van den Ende's full reformed alphabet reads:

"be ce de fe ge he je ke le me ne pe que re se te ve ye ze ob ed ef eg ek el em en ep er es et ex ez"

The blanks represent letters which cannot appear in the given position in his system (final 'c, h, w' etc.). The 1681 edition, revised by D'Arsi, varies slightly in including "ac", changing "que" to "qe", and oddly excluding "je,ke".

Although this system did not find support, it did receive attention from later works. Moojen (p.2) quotes him (inaccurately) as using "B', 'B" (i.e. with apostrophes), "en niet zonder gront" - drawing a parallel with Greek and Hebrew names in which the consonant precedes the vowel (Eykmans in NTg XVIII seems to use Moojen's quotation of Van den Ende, rather than the original, since he too mentions "B', 'B")

Ten Kate has a similar system involving "iNG, eNK" which only appear in final position, and also mentioning "éG, éCH, éY, éV" on a par with "éR, éL" etc. (I,122-6, see the quotation in chap.1).

The only other suggestion for this reform comes in "De Nederduitsche Taalkunde gemaklyk gemaakt" of 1783 (2nd edition = "Nieuwe en Volledige Spel- en spraakkonst", 1791, being almost identical throughout), by C.W.Holtrop: "ik zoude het eigener, en tot gemakkelijker spelling beter achten, zo men de medeklinkers tweevoudig en naar het begin, en naar het einde der lettergreepen, aldus noemde,

'Be de fe ge he je ke le me ne pe re se te ve ve ve en 've' En Eb ed ef eg ek el em en ep er ew'. (sic)

A parallel distinction was mentioned above for the two forms of 'r' and 's', given the names "er, re; es, se" respectively, in Cramer's Trap der Jeugd. But only Van den Ende, Ten Kate, and Holtrop suggest it for all letters.

One or other of these books current in his youth may have influenced Bilderdijk, who when putting forward the bisyllabic names mentioned above, adds that "het is toch zeer, dat 'a, bé', geen 'ab' kan maken, maar 'a, eb' wel" - cf. Cramer's comment on "'re', en 'er'... hetgeen de spelling, vergeleken met
Other reforms

It was seen above that Montanus wished to extend the '-ee' suffix to many names, and that Van den Ende actually used '-e' in all names, alongside 'e-'. Others, however, went half-way and suggested using '-e-', thereby giving most letters the same name-form, but without suggesting the 'e-' alternative. The first hint at this may be seen in Sexagius's "va, fa, ga" (using '-a' rather than '-e'), the latter two going against contemporary usage. A similar tendency is seen in Janssen's adoption of "ka" expressly by analogy with "pe, te", as further with the form "he" (e.g. proposed by Steven, see above).

No actual large scale reform along these lines appeared until the early 19th century, when Smits (1324) ridicules the haphazard way the consonants are named: "men begrijpt echter dat deze benaming met 'e' en 'a' zo als men hier ziet willekeurig in het gebruik ingevoerd is, want men zónde om derselve wezelijke kracht aan te dujden, zó wel kommen zeggen: 'ba, chi, ja, va, wa (=wa?)'; en zeker zó wel 'he, ke', als 'ha, ka', zó wel 'fe, le, me, ne, re, se' als 'effe, el, em, en, er esse'" (p.6). He would thus have great sympathy with any reform which rationalised the names.

All except one ("ba") of the forms mentioned by Smits have in fact existed, though he does not make it clear whether he is aware of this: "he, ke, chi, ja, va, wa" are all mentioned above. This leaves "fe, le, me, ne, re, se" introduced for the reasons stated above (analogy). That these forms did exist is shown by Weiland's criticism of them, several years before Smits's writing. He proposes the normal "ef, el" etc. - "schoon men de eersten, sedert eeniger tijd 'fe, le, me, ne, re, en 'se' genoemd heef't" - a name of which he does not approve. It is not clear whether he has only seen these forms in the "E6, be" system of Holtrop and Van den Ende, or as a simple series of analogy forms. The latter is possible, however, since Rehier (writing after Weiland) gives the alternative forms "be, ce, de, ef of fe...el of le, em of me..." (1831).

However widespread this usage was, it is probably not to be confused with a phenomenon described by Bomhoff in 1354: "Op de scholen noemt men ze thans
bij het lezen leren 'be de fe ge he je ke le me ne pe (q) re se te ve we (x) ze'. This may be simply referring to the very earliest lessons in giving sounds to letters, rather than naming them (cf. the similar system in English).

Most of these reform motions, as distinct from spontaneous changes such as "va/ve", have been excluded from the overall picture described earlier, in the interests of clarity.

**Alphabet reform**

It is relevant here to touch upon the vast subject of alphabet reform proposals, insofar as some new letters have been suggested in an attempt to overcome a particular difficulty in consonantal spelling. This in no modern phenomenon, even in Dutch:

Lambricht introduced a diacritic dot below 'i' and 'u' for the consonants 'j' and 'v'; Sexagius attempted to introduce the inverted digamma for /v/; both of these also suggested new vowel signs.

De Heuiter wished to use 'h' for /ch/.

Ampzing (p.36) and Leupenius (p.15) yearned for a new letter for /ch/.

Montanus (p.30) wished to use Greek gamma for /g/ (as in /hegbo:t/), or alternatively (p.19) a 'c' with a dot in the centre "indien er zulke gegoote vormen waren".

Ten Kate, in the next century, suggests a tie over all digraphs: CH, NG, AE, EU. In the 19th century Smits includes a new digraph 'œ' for 'oe', and the use of 'c' for 'ch', which he did not consider an innovation at all (see chap.3).

De Neckere (1816) longed for diacritics on 'g' and 's' to represent /z/ and /s/ (see chap.3 & chap.11).

Land used 'c' for 'ch', 'q' for /ng/, and 'x' for the glottal stop.

In the 20th century J. te Winkel proposed 'h' for /ng/, and 'x' for 'ch', Van Ginneken suggested a ligature of 'c' and 'h' for 'ch', Wellekens 'x' for 'ch', and Seeldraeyers 'c' for 'ch'. Each of these has been discussed in the relevant chapter.

Comprehensive reforms of the whole alphabet (excluding the analphabetic phonetic script of Ten Kate, and the quasi-mathematical phonetic script of Land) range from Joffroy's manuscript "Korte Aenwijzing tot sene prompte letter-
spelkonst med de welke men alle talen besceedlyk zal konnen schrijven ofte spellen", together with a "Dictionaire Flamand" using the said alphabet (written before ca.1740), to Klück's modified/streamlined alphabet characters proposed in 1956.

Alphabetical order

Many letters, at various times, have been omitted from the alphabets given in the Dutch grammars consulted. The most common is 'c', followed by 'q', 'x' (and 'y'). In very early times 'j', 'v', 'w' were also often omitted. 'u' and 'v' often change places: "...t, v, u, w,...", e.g. in Sexagius, Van Belleghem & Waterschoot, the Inleyding, and Hasendonck. The four "foreign" letters 'c', 'q', 'x', 'y' are omitted by Van Belle, Weiland, the later Nut works, Brill, Behaegel, and Smits; Janssens and Olinger omit 'q', 'x', 'y', but retain 'c'. Janssens would also like to omit 'h, j', which he also considers foreign (the latter for /ɪ/). These are the only normal omissions, and 'c', 'q', 'x', 'y' are usually mentioned as letters "also used", in footnotes.

Very few consonants have been added to the alphabets given, though some, such as Bolgnino and Smits, add a great many vowels, including many diacritics. The most common consonant addition is 'ch' (cf, above), which was inserted after 'g' by Van Belle, some of the Nut works, and Bomhoff; and after 'b' (instead of 'c') by Weiland, Behaegel, and Smits. 'Ph' is used by the spelling books of the Nut as if it came between 'f' and 'g' (e.g. "Philemon" comes straight after "Filosoof"), but is not included in the actual alphabet lists.

Several attempts at reordering of the letters have been put forward, starting with Sexagius's "a b c k d q f g h i F l m n o p q r s t v u x y z" (for 'F' and 'f' see chap.7), echoed much later by Van Daele's equating of 'c' and 'k', both put after 'j' (No.2), throwing out only the foreign 'g'. The augmented alphabets of Bolognino and Smits mentioned above leave the skeletal order intact, as did Van Vloten who inserted a few extra letters: "a b c d e f g h c h i y j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x i j z".

Aman, in his "Surdus loquens", wrote that "mihi ordo maxime dissplicet" and suggested "a e i j y o u w...m n g l r h g c h s t v k c q d t b p x z" (vowels + nasals + liquids + fricatives + stops + double letters). Aman may have had
in mind a German audience rather than purely Dutch (he is not always clear on
this, and refers to both), since he includes 'ë ë' etc. in the alphabet, in the
spaces indicated above by '...'. This certainly does not apply to the similar
revision put forward by Janssens (1775), who gave his preferred order as
"a e i o u el em en er es be ce de ge ke pe te ve we ze hache" (vowels + liquids
/nasals + stops + fricatives + foreign letters; or possibly vowels + 'e-' letters
+ 'e-' letters + foreign letters; p.26).

The whole development of the names given to consonants (the vowels are
relatively unchanging) throws an interesting, and often illuminating, light on
the development of the consonantal spellings themselves, most notably in the
rejection of 'c, q, x' and the insertion of 'ch'.
Conclusion

The intention of the foregoing chapters has been to present a picture of the evolution of the spelling-uses of each consonant, and thereby of the great variety of spelling systems as a whole. For the reasons stated earlier it is an inevitable feature of such a discussion that very uncommon spellings gain a perhaps disproportionate amount of emphasis as compared to widely accepted—and thereby little disputed—standard usages. The depth or length of argument should not therefore be assumed to be proportional to the frequency of use or the degree of acceptability. The more so is this the case where relatively minor spellings either exhibit an interesting facet of a certain system, or are in some way preferable to more common forms. Notable examples of this are the doubling of *ch* in "lachchen" and the use of final 'v' in "brief" and "laavde". Nor must the existence of a large number of variants be taken to imply confusion, for by far the majority of the various spellings have fitted into and conformed to systems used by or in some cases evolved by the writers in question. Very few writers have totally inconsistent usage.

The problems for each consonant are on the whole different, though there are large overlapping areas. Only the use of 'z' and 'v' in final position show an almost complete convergence, in that the justification for the use of each, and the arguments against each, are exactly the same; yet even here the use of medial '-s-' and '-z-' affected the choice of the writer, and very few use both '-v' and '-z' (see summary to chapter 11).

These two spellings form the major anomaly in what is normally considered the basic rule of modern Dutch spelling, that of "gelijkvormigheid". This rule, in fact, only applies to final '-b, -d, -g', and only for '-d' is there any real justification for its use in avoidance of homonyms, although this has often been put forward as a significant factor in favour of the gelijkvormigheid system. There are no homonyms for words ending in /f/ or /s/ in the inflected form on a par with the relatively large numbers ending in /t/, e.g "rat, rad". Final /ch/ has only one gelijkvormigheid-induced word pair, in "lag/lach" (nog/noch" is a different case—see chap.13), and does not justify the gelijkvormigheid rule per se.

It is no doubt these differences in the nature of the consonants that have
caused the unsystematic treatment of the consonants. The fact that
differentiation of homonyms ending in /t/ was a useful by-product (not the
raison d'être as some maintained) of the gelijkvormigheid system has encouraged
the continued adherence to those rules which caused them.

Gelijkvormigheid is not however applied consistently - for example it is
not applied to potential '-v' and '-z' words, nor would it appear to be the
basic rule underlying the spelling of final /ch/, where '-g' has often been
supported on the grounds of brevity ('-g' instead of '-ch'), even by the most
ardent of gelijkvormigheid spellers. Gelijkvormigheid spellings are restricted
in modern Dutch to the final consonants, largely as a result of the extremely
confused situation which arose in earlier times from its application, for
example, to '-gt, -cht' forms. Where ostensible gelijkvormigheid spellings
merged with derivation rules ("rijgen - regt") the systems became unwieldy and
impractical. Even in the current system there are cases where it is not clear
whether gelijkvormigheid rules should be applied or not, the most notorious
case being the word "bijdehand", where derivation demands '-d', but
gelijkvormigheid demands '-t' because of the inflected form "bijdehante".

One of the ways in which the development of spelling in general is affected
by the fact that different consonants have different problems attached to them,
is the tendency for different spelling questions to become prominent at
different times. Some problems can be placed in quite well-defined periods, for
example the question of final '-u, -uw, -w' is centeres on a few decades from
1680 - 1730, the choice between '-d, -dt, -t' between 1585 and 1650, and later
from 1890 to the present day, the division of 's' and 'z' in the later 17th
century in the North and early 18th century in the South, the choice between
'cht' and 'gt' in the mid-late 18th century. Furthermore it is unusual for
more than one spelling problem to acheive great prominence in any given period,
all attention being concentrated, as it were, on the controversy of that moment.
It is also noticeable that most problems have only one period of prominence.

The major exception of this is caused by the development of the various
phonetic systems in comparitively recent times. Here there has been a demand
for the (re-)adoption of '-ch, -t' forms, and in vowels for the merging of 'ij/
ei, an/ou'. One interesting feature of this is that the system which would
result from the adoption of these suggestions would in many ways closely resemble that of Middle Dutch! It would be ironic indeed if after all the controversies of the intervening years the end result was a reversion to the starting point.

In many ways the latter system, and its modern counterpart, are greatly superior to some of the intervening systems. Superior, that is, in terms of ease of application by all users, learned and uneducated, - for any self-consistent system has just as much merit in abstract terms as any other, there being no innately superior system. Each of the various schools of spelling used in the past four centuries (chronologically: phonetic, gelijkvormigheid, historical/derivational, phonetic, phonemic) has yielded a potentially viable self-consistent system. The fact that few of them have fulfilled their potential is not inherently caused by the systems per se, only by their imperfect application.

In terms of ease of use however they are not equal, as mentioned above. The drawback of the historical system is that it presupposes an intimate knowledge of the background of the language (sometimes also of foreign languages!), the drawback of the phonetic system (in the strictes sense) is that it tends to become unwieldy through representing the sounds more accurately than is needed for visual comprehension. The phonemic system, which takes account of the latter difficulty by only representing those differences in sound which are relevant (e.g. not spelling differently the vowels of "oor/oom, meen/meer"), avoids this unwieldiness, but shares with the phonetic system the tendency to become normative.

Both the phonetic and phonemic systems can become normative in that the only way in which they can be formulated is by drawing on the actual spoken language, - a fortiori the spoken language of a given group. In the first instance then the system is descriptive. However, as soon as it is known that the spelling and the spoken language have an exact correspondence, it is natural to take the spelled form as prescriptive of the spoken forms.

The classic example of this is the confusion caused by Siegenbeek's use of the motto "schrijft zo als gij spreekt" (he did not invent the motto, it was known and used long before), which brought about a number of spelling-
pronunciations such as /mensch/, /bench/. If an accurate phonemic (or phonetic) spelling were devised for modern Dutch, the tendency for most people would be to see it as representing the way Dutch should be spoken, and, a fortiori, that any divergence either diachronically (i.e. developing after the fixing of the spelling) or synchronically (i.e. in dialects) is incorrect.

The "ideal" Dutch spelling

Many writers, expert and otherwise, have claimed to have found the key to an ideal Dutch spelling. Yet Dutch, with its regular alternation of consonants (hant, handen; wijf, wijven, etc.), seems to be particularly susceptible to representation by a relatively large number of fundamentally different but equally valid systems.

Of these there are two notable extremes. The first is the consistent phonetic (or rather phonemic) spelling used in Middle Dutch, the early 17th century, and some of the modern reforms. This involves consistent use of unvoiced consonants where unvoiced sounds are heard ("voesch, voecht, voegde; hant, hep, reis, reizde"). The other is the consistent gelijkvormigheid system, involving the use as final letter, in uninflected forms, of the medial letter of the inflected form ("hand, heb, voeg, wijv, huiz"). Very few have used this latter system fully, the most notable examples being Staring and Saits. To these can be added the arguments as to whether the distinction between 'ch/g, s/z, f/v', being rarely phonemic (i.e. making different words when interchanged), is really necessary, so that the systems of Duikerius and Najer involving the radical avoidance of 'ch' even in 'sg-' (= 'sch'), and with little use of 'z', earn a high quotient of rationality.

The choice between these two extremes is not easy. Given that spelling is supposed to represent the spoken language, it would seem that only the phonetic or phonemic system has any validity. But the written language does not have the flexibility of the spoken language - in cases of homography, homonymy, or other ambiguity of the written form, the writer cannot be asked to redefine his sentence. Added to this is the normative tendency of phonetically based systems described above, and it can be seen that the choice is not as straightforward as many have claimed.
Not too much weight should be attached to the argument that the eye "needs" a fixed word-image such as "hand", in order to see the same meaning contained in "hannen", since from the foregoing chapters it should be abundantly clear that large numbers of Dutch spellers, and whole periods of written Dutch, have felt no such need without impairing either their interpretative faculties or their intelligibility.

There is one other feature of consonantal spelling which is the product of an irrationality affecting the rigourousness of the vowel spelling. In the present system 'a' can represent two sounds, and the same sound /a:/ can be represented in two different ways. The former is seen in "aan, manen" the latter in "maan, manen", where 'a' represents both /a/ and /a:/, and /a:/ is represented by both 'a' and 'aa'. If, as has been suggested, /a:/ is consistently spelt 'aa', this gives the word-pairs "man - mannen, maan - maanen". This system has in fact often been used, especially in the 17th and 18th century (e.g. Hooft, Wimschooten, Moonen).

However, a moments consideration will show that there is a superfluity here: if 'a' consistently represents /a/, and 'aa' consistently represents /a:/, then the double 'n' of "mannen" is unnecessary. It is strange that the extremely high degree of systematic rigour and ease of application in this system, using "man - manen; maan - maanen", has only been mooted by three writers - Plemp, Van Heule (1633) and Stuiveling (1972) - see chap.17.

The ease in this system is that only '-en' shows the plural, and the basic word remains unaltered (where gelijkvormigheid is applied at least), whereas in the "man - mannen, maan - manen" system the plurality is shown in the first case by '-nen' and in the second case by '-en' + the deletion of '-a-'. Many supporters of gelijkvormigheid have used the "maan - maanen" system, but none other than those mentioned have even suggested the "man - manen, heb - heben, zet - zeten" system.

It cannot be argued that this system is wasteful in using "maanen" instead of the shorter "manen", since a comparable saving of letters is made by shortening "mannen" to "manen". The net result is probably no increase or decrease in the number of letters used, but a considerable gain in logicality and ease of learning. The number of words which would be rendered shorter
by this is very large, due to the frequency of word structures such as "dubbel, letter, lessen, mannen, hebben" (short stressed vowel + unstressed vowel in a bisyllabic word), each of which loses one letter.

The often quoted examples such as "meeteeoorooloogie" which result from this vowel system are rare, though not without significance. However, the present system readily accepts such as "vooroordeel, oogaarts". The reason for such forms as "mmeeteeoorooloogie, tteooooloogie" etc. is that being loan words they do not conform to the normal Dutch vowel-length distribution pattern. The latter examples clearly show that the occurrence of two consecutive long vowels in Dutch (as also in English and German) is almost invariably a sign of a compound word ("na(n)deel, oordeel, aanvraag") or a derivative ("le(e)raar"). The cases of compounds and derivatives could probably be tolerated with several vowel letters in them, but the problem of the loan words would have to be resolved if this system were to be seriously considered for Dutch. It must be pointed out, however, that loan words have rarely adhered strictly to Dutch vowel spellings, notably in the rules for the spelling of /iː/ in the present system, which is always 'ie' in Dutch words and 'i' (usually) in loan words; there is therefore a good precedent for not expecting "meteorologie" to conform to the "maanen" system.

In conclusion then the course of the development of Dutch consonantal spelling systems can be summarised as a progression from the phonetic through the analogical/gelijkvormigheid, and the historical/etymological, back to the phonetic/phonemic. Many systems have been put forward, most of them - if viewed objectively - both logically based and functionally viable, but most also with difficulties of application, not least of which is overcoming the inertia of the writing public. Few systems have been thoroughly consistent, though inconsistency of application must not be interpreted as inferiority of the system. Because the various systems for each consonant have not developed in full synchronisation it has been necessary in the foregoing chapters to treat each letter separately. The various systems have been described in some detail, and it has been attempted to show how each of these systems usually has a logical basis.

It is possibly the ease with which Dutch structure lends itself equally
well to more than one equally self-consistent spelling systems, that has
caused, or encouraged, the Dutch national preoccupation with spelling since
at least the end of the 17th century. A few quotations from grammatical
commentators may show how much this has struck the theorists, both native and
foreign:

"I shall not speake much of the changing of their Letters, because the
Netherlands, in their wrytings differ among themselves much herein" (Hillenius
1664).

"Geen twee van onze Schrijvers zijn hierin 't eens, ja niemand bijna met
zijzelve" (Francius, 1699).

"Is 'er eene taal in welke verschilling der spellings plaats heeft, het is
dan de onze, de Nederduitsche" (Pieterson, ca. 1761).

"Er is in Holland geen regel waar na men zig voegen kan, 'er is geen
woordenboek van genoegzaam gezag om de landtaal als tot een zuil te dienen. De
geleerden zyn, in dit stuk, zeer oneens, 'er is misschien geen enkeld boek,
waarin de zelfde spelling, altoos, gevolgd word, en twee, die in deeszen opzigt
geleyk zyn, kan men nergens aantreffen. In deese omstandigheden, heeft yder
nieuwe schryver, en, in 't byzonder, yder die een nieuw Woordenboek vervaardigd,
de vryheid, een zooadaanige wyze van spelling uit te kiesen, als hem best mag
toeschynen" (Wilcocke, 1798).

"We therefore will not extend the list of (variant spellings of) words, and
hope that at some future period a Dutch Johnson or Sheridan will arise, and
give a proper standard of spelling " (Schwiers, 1799).
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Eijckman, Leonard Pieter Hendrik Geschiedkundig overzicht van de klankkleur in Nederland, in "Nieuwe Taalgids" xvii & xviii
Eikelenberg, Simon
Alkmaar en zyne geschiedenissen, Alkmaar 1739
Gedaante en gesteldheid van Westvriesland, Alkmaar 1714
Kronyk van Egmond, Alkmaar 1732
& see Boomkamp

Elger, Willem den
Zinnebeelden der liefde, Leyden 1703, Amsterdam 1732
Wag me voor dat Laantje, Amsterdam 1725
dedicator poem in Boon 1704 q.v.

Elzevier, Kornelis
Proef van een nieuwe Nederduitsche Spraekkonst,
in "Drie Dicht-proeven", Haarlem 1761
on spelling; 1654 only

Ende, Casparus van den
on alphabet; Schat-kamer der Nederduitsche en
Francoysche tale, Rotterdam 1654, ib.1669,
=Schat-kamer der Nederduitsche en Franse talen,
ed.J.L.d'Arsi,Rotterdam 1681,ib.1695-97

Engelen, Roeland van
Aan den onverdeelden Leser. De redenen di my bewegen
te-letten op mynder Mouder-taal de spellingh of
ORTHOGRAFIE, in "Pastor Fido verdryve" np.ca.1653

Erasmus, Desiderius
De recte...pronuntiatione dialogus, Paris 1528;
Leyden 1643

E.S.d.G.

Eversert, Cornelis
Spelen van..., ed.J.W.Muller & L.Scharpé, Leiden 1893-1920

Exercitium puerorum grammaticale, Antwerp 1488 in Kooiman q.v., Deventer 1439

Forrestier, P (pseud)
Verbandeling over de zedelijke opvoeding der kinderen,
in "Verv.Holl.Ny" 1766 q.v. (vol.91)

Francius, Petrus
Voorrede, in his translation of Gregorius Nazianze
1699, in "Bloeimeling uit de Nederländsche
prozaschrijvers der zeventiende eeuw" ed.
J.van Vloten, Arnhem 1669

Franck, Johannes
Mittelniederländische Grammatik, Leipzig 1833

Gambs, J
Anleitung zur erlernung der Holländische Sprache,
Frankfurt a.M. 1853

Gargon, Mattheus
Aan den Zanger en Leser, in "Wut Tyd-verdryve",
Amsterdam 1686 (not in later eds.-1696 ib.)
& see Poeraet
review of Sewel in Boekzaal, 1707b,535
review of Poeraet and Moonen, ib.1708a,357

Geel, Rudolf
Zalig zijn de vereenvoudigden van geest,
in "De Gids" 1972,210

Geesdalle, J F van
La parallèle de la grammaire des deuz langues
françoise et flamande. De vergelijkinge van de
spraak-konste der twee talen de fransche en de
vlaemsche, Gand 1700, ib.1712
see Boecius

Gelliers, Carel de
Trap der Jeugd, (1640) Amsterdam 1769, ib.1799

Gherten, Abraham van
Voorlooperen inhebbende een kort onderricht der
letterkunst, in "De ghulde Fonteynder",Gouda
1624 (not other editions)

Ghucht, Adriaan van der
Ciijferboek (1567), in "Adriaan van der Ghucht en
zijn 'Vlaemsche Orthographie'", by J.P.
- the "Vlaemsche Orthographie" is lost

Gids, De..., Amsterdam 1837-

Ginneken, Jacobus van
Grondbeginselen van de schrijfwijze der
Nederlandsche taal, Hilversum 1931

Giron, Moses
Het groot Nederduitsch en Italiaansch Woordenboek,
Amsterdam 1710
Een troost ende spiegel der sleeken, np 1531
= Tobias ende Lazarus, Emden 1557

Goemans, Leo
Goeree, Jan

Opdracht, in "Alcander, Koning van Cyprus en Cilicie" (1707) Amsterdam 1741 (translation of Paul Scarron's "Le prince corsaire")

Graaf, Jacobus Johannes

Onverdraagzaam en onberekenbaar, in "De Katholiek" Leiden 1908

Grammaire plus exacte et plus methodique de la langue flamande, Bruelles 1701
(first title page reads "Nouvelle grammaire flamande")

Greuve, Fredericus Christianus
Over de deelen der Rede, in "Archief..."IV,425

Grondregels der Nederduytse spelkonst, Lovem 1807

(1688 was published anonymously)

see Mellema
see p.180

see Index

(Nouvelle grammaire flamande, Amsterdam 1684,
Grammaire flamande, ed. W.Sewel (1719) Utrecht 1723,
Amsterdam 1744,
Grammaire Hollandoise, ed. W.Sewel Amsterdam 1762
1743, Amsterdam ca. 1760, Ruremonde 1791,
Utrecht 1798

De Nieuwe nederduitse spel-,lees en schrijfkonst,
(ca.1710? see p.291)Deventer 1746,Groningen 1800

see p.180

Nieuwe Fransche en Nederduytsche Spraek-konst,
Maastricht 1787

Het groot fransch en Nederduitsch woordenboek,
Amsterdam 1703, Leiden 1761, 's Hage 1781

Het groot frans en nederduitsch woordenboek,Utrecht 1798

Het groot fransch en Hollandsch woordenboek,
Amsterdam & Bruxelles (1757)

Woordenboek der Hollandsche en Fransche taalen,
Amsterdam & Bruxelles (1757)

Woordenboek der Nederduitsche en Fransche taalen,
(1708), Amsterdam 1729, Leiden 1729,'s Hage 1731

De vier uitmuntende Gedigten, benevens de Polybias,
Harderwijk 1742

Dutch grammar, London 1814

A grammar of the Dutch language, London 1823
Heemskerk, Johan van
Heere, Lucas d'  
'Hemmer, Klaus

'Heldere, Klaas
Heinsius, Daniel
Heinsius, Nicolaas

'Heiderscheidt, P

'Helderen, Johannes Gossens van

Inleydinghe tot het ontwerp van een Batavische Arcadia, (1637) ed. D.H. Smit Zwolle 1935

in "Den Hof ende Boogaert der Poesien", Haarlem 1614

Niet zoo maar zo; 'n populaire toelichting bij de nieuwe spelling, Baarn (1947)

Premiers éléments de la langue Flamande, Malines 1842

Nederduytse poeana, Amsterdam 1616, ib.1618

Den vermakelijken Avanturier, (1695) Amsterdam 1715

An English and Nether-Dutch dictionary, Amsterdam 1715

A new and easy English grammar. Een nieuwe en gemakkelijke Engelsche Spraak-konst, ib.1675

(both with name spelt "Heldoren")

Kort-schrift boek...insgelijks een Neerduytse spelkonst, Amsterdam 1683 (two books in one)

De Oppuw van de algemeen beschafte uitspraak van het Nederlands, ed. P. Tuyman, Arnhem 1968

in "Kroniek van Kunst en Kultuur", Amsterdam VIII, 5

Middenneerduytse spraakkunst, Groningen 1887

Vlaamsch spraakkunst geschikt voor de spelling der heeren Siegenbeek en Weiland, 1815

Beknopte Nederduytse spraakkleer, (1846) Gent 1855

Spellung en Interpunctie, 's Hertogenbosch 1969

see Buitenrust Hettema, F

Kort Bondige Rijmen...door A Severinus...volvoerd door M Heugelenburg, Leiden 1682

Klein woordenboek zijnde een kort en klaar onderwijs in de nederduytse spel- en leeskonst, (1714)

Amsterdam 1719, ib.1727, ib.1768, ib.1775, ib.ca 1780

ib.1798

Nederduytse orthographie, Antwerpen 1651

& see Dibbets

De Nederduytse grammatica ofte spraak-konst, Leiden 1625, 1626, ed. W Caron Groningen 1953

De Nederduytse spraak-konst ofte taal-beschryvinghe, Leiden 1633, ed. W. Caron Groningen 1953

Vereenvoudiging van de schrijfwijze der Nederlandse taal, 's Gravenhage 1933

Een neerduytse grammatica, in "Het groot woordenboek", Rotterdam 1648, ib.1658, ed. D. Manly ib.1762, ib.1678

A copious English and Netherduytch Dictionarie, Rotterdam 1647, ib.1663, ib.1660, ed. D. Manly ib.1675

Nieuwe taalgronden der neerduytse taal, Franeker 1705

Phaedri Fabulae, Dokkum 1695

Den Engelschen ende Neewaterduytse Onderrichter..., Rotterdam 1664, ib.1677, ib.1678, ib.1686

De Middeleeuwsche oorkondentaal te Oudenaarde, Gent 1968

Vereeniging der schrijfwijze der Nederlandse taal, 's Gravenhage 1933

De Nederduytse taalkunde gemaklyck gemaakt, Amsterdam 1783, = Nieuwe en volledige Nederduytse spel-en spraakkunst, ib.1791

Nieuwe taalgronden der neerduytse taal, Franeker 1705

Phaedri Fabulae, Dokkum 1695

De Middeleeuwsche oorkondentaal te Oudenaarde, Gent 1968

De Nederduytse taalkunde gemaklyck gemaakt, Amsterdam 1783, = Nieuwe en volledige Nederduytse spel-en spraakkunst, ib.1791

De Nederduytse taalkunde gemaklyck gemaakt, Amsterdam 1783, = Nieuwe en volledige Nederduytse spel-en spraakkunst, ib.1791

Nieuwe Engelsche en Nederduytse woordenboek, Dordrecht 1789-1801, ed. A. Stevenson ib. 1823-24

& see Marin

Kerelike Rednooering over de woorden van Paulus Tit.III., Leyden 1733

Het geloof der vaderen...in het elyde hoofdtekust van den brief aan de Hebreuwen, Leyden 1753

Achilles en Polyxena, Rotterdam 1614

Brief Menelaus aan Helena, np 1615

Nederlandsche Historien, Amsterdam 1703

Warenaar, (1617) ed J. Bergsma Zutphen n.d.

Bauo, Amsterdam 1626
(Hooft ct.)

P.C. Hooft's werken, Amsterdam 1671
Waerningen op de hollandsche tael, (ca. 1638) in Zwan q.v.
Aanmerkingen over de geslachten der zelfstandige naamwoorden (1700) = Lijst der gebruikelijkste zelfstandige naamwoorden, Amsterdam 1723, ib. 1733, ed. A. Kluit ib. 1759, ib. 1783
& see Hannot

Abraham den Aartsvader, (1727) Rotterdam 1780
see p. 449
Den drukker aan den lezer, in Eikelenberg 1739 q.v.
Natuurlyke Historie, Amsterdam 1761-85
Tafereel uyt het Hof van Eden, Dordrecht 1693
Verklaringe over ses voorname Texten, Dordrecht 1682
La langue flamande. Son passé et son avenir. Projet d'une orthographe commune aux peuples des Pays-Bas et de la Basse-Allemagne, Bruxelles 1844
De verbuigingen der onmiddellijke en niew-nederduitsche sprake, Brussel 1830
Noodige Waarschouwingen, in "De psalmen des Propheten Davids", (1624) in Zwan q.v.
Een critiek op de 'Vereenvoudigde', in "Opvoedkundig Tijdschrift" 1903
Veraag over de verhandeling van den heer Behaegel, Gand (1833)
Woordenlijst voor spelling en uitspraak, Gand 1839
De dubbelle schakeling, 's Gravenhage (ca. 1715)
De vermeeste molenaar, Amsterdam 1713, ib. 1714
= Het onbesturven Wauwte, ib. 1718
Proeve van taal- en dichtkunde, Amsterdam 1730, ed. F. van Lelyveld Leyden 1782-91
Corneille verdedigd, hier komen by eenige byzondere aanmerkingen, zo over de Poëzy, als de Nederduitsche Taal en Rytmtrant, Amsterdam 1720
Aantekeningen op "De Grondbeginsals der Nederlandische spelling", Nijmegen 1863
(pseud. of A. van der Linde)
De beginselen van Gods koninkryk in den Mensch, (1689) Amsterdam 1700, ib. 1740
De gedichten, ed. J. A. Worp Groningen 1892-9
Korenbloemen, 's Hage 1658, Amsterdam 1672
Hofvijver, 's Gravenhage 1653
Inleyding tot de grondregels der Vlaemsche Spraek- en spelkonste, Dendermonde 1735
I.S.U.C.
Jaarsveldt, J van
Theoretisch praktische und vergleichende Holländische Sprachlehre, Amsterdam 1833
Verscheidenheden uit het gebied der Nederlandische taalkunde, Deventer 1844 (esp. pp. 1-89)
Taalkundig handboekje, of alphabetische lijst van alle Nederlandische woorden, die wegens spelling of taalkundig gebruik aan enige bedenking onderhevig zijn, ed. J. H. van Dale Schoonhoven 1874
G- en Ch-geschiedenis, in "Archief" III, 95
Bezwaren tegen de spelregeling voor het Woordenboek der Nederlandische Taal, Deventer 1865
Mijne toetreding tot de spelling van het Woordenboek der Nederlandische Taal, Deventer 1867
& in "Taal en Letterbode", Haarlem 1874, 276
see Janssens
Verbeterde vlaamsche spraek- en spel-konste, Brugge 1775
Nieuw zak-woordenboek der Nederlandische en Engelsche talen, Dordrecht 1808

Hoogstraten, David van

Hoogvliet, Arnold

Hoogvliet, J

Hoolwerf, Simon van

Houttuyn, Martin

Hove, Paulus van

Hovens, Hubert van den

Huybert, Pieter Antoni de

Huydecoper, Balthazar

Huydecoper, Balthazar (Junior)

Huygen, Pieter & Jan

Huygens, Constantijn

Inleyding tot de grondregels der Vlaemsche Spraek- en spelkonste, Dendermonde 1735
I.S.U.C.
Jaarsveldt, J van
Jager, Arie de

Janson, Baldwin

Janssens, Balduinus
A grammar of the Dutch language, London 1792, 1803
Nauw-keurige Neder-lander, (ca.1655) in "Friesche Rijmerye" ed. E. Epkema Ljeauwert 1821
see Cuno
see Verpoorten
Kort aenwijsing tot eene prompte letter of spelkonst med de welke men alle talen besceeedelyk zal kunnen schrijven ofte spellen, ca.1740
Dictionaire flamand, ca.1740 (both in MS only)
Twistgesprek, (1641) in Rydscoper II, p.919
poems in Klooos Kraam q.v.
Het leven is verrukkulluk, Amsterdam 1661
Verhandeling over de klankkunde, (1699, in MS) in "Lambert ten Kate" by A. van der Hoeven, 's Gravenhage 1896
Aenleiding tot de kennis van het verhevene deel der nederduitsche sprake, Amsterdam 1723
Lofzangen, (transl. of Prudentius) Leyden 1712
dedication poem in Eikelenberg 1714 q.v.
De verborghen Wetenschappen van het Christelijck Leven, Antwerpen 1710
see "Volmaakte kern..."
Keuren en ordonnantien der stad Haarlem, Haarlem 1755
Kilian, Kornelis
Etymologicum teutonicae linguae, sive Dictionarium Teutonico-Latinum, Antwerpen 1599, Alkmaar 1605 ed. G. van Hasselt Utrecht 1777
Kilianus Auctus, Amsterdam 1642
review of Bilderdijk's "Sprakkleer", in "De Recensent..." 1827
Historisch verhael, Amsterdam 1677
dedicated, Leeuwarden 1656-7 (ed. H. Rintjus)
Een nieuw alfabet, in "Ons Eigen Blad" 1956 & 1957
Vertoog over de tegenwoordige spelling der Nederduitsche Taal, in "Werken" of My. der Ned. Let. Leyden 1772-8, vol. III (1777)
(Das Konigliche Nider-Hoch-Teutsch und Hoch-Nider-Teutsch Wörter-Buch, Nürnberg 1719)
Review of Bilderdijk's "Sprakkleer", in "De Recensent..." 1827
Koolman, Klaas
Kort Begryp van de stadt Aerschot, Brussel (approb. 1766)
Kramer, Matthijs
Kurzgefasste nider-teutsch oder holländische Grammatica, Nürnberg 1716
Neue Holländische Grammatica, Amsterdam 1755
Vollkommene niederdeutsche oder holländische Grammatik, ed. A. A. van Meerbeek Leipzig 1774
Das Königliche Nieder-Hoch-Teutsch und Hoch-Nieder-Teutsch Wörter-Buch, Nürnberg 1719
Nieuw Woordenboek der Nederlandsche en Hoogduitsche Taal, Leipzig 1768
Nieuwe Hoogduitse Grammatica, ed. Wilhelm van der Heck, Amsterdam 1757
Antwoord over de verbeteringe der schoolen, in "Verh. Zeeuwsch Gen." 1782
Christelycke offerands, Amsterdam 1640
Minne Spiegel ter daugthen II, Amsterdam 1662
Kruyskamp, Cornelis
Moest de spelling eenvoudiger, in "Algemeen Dagblad" 15 January 1972

Kunst wordt door arbeid verkregen Nederduitsche Spraakkonst, Leiden 1770

Kuyper, Cornelis
Vierde deel der Nederdytsche spellinge,Amsterdam nd
Vijfde deel der Nederdytsche spellinge, Purmerende nd (both circa 1690)

Laecelijckhe Cluchte van een Boer die in een Calfs-vel benaeyt was, Amsterdam (1615)
"Laconis Flandri Presbyteri" Linguae Teutonicae Exxlex, Hulst 1666
(=Laco Flandrus,priest;...Ex excellentibus lexicis?)

Laet, Jan de
address to author, in Van der Werve q.v.

Lambrecht, Joos
Over uitspraak en spelling, voornamelijk in de Nederlandsche taal, Amsterdam 1870

Lambrecht, Joos
De gedichten, Amsterdam 1721

Lanen, Henricus
in "Magazijn v.Ned.Taalkunde IV"

Langendijk, Pieter
Over de spelling van sommige woorden, meest van uitheemschen oorsprong, in Med.Kon.Ac.der Wet. 1865,160

Laesmailje, J
De vermakelijke spraakkunst, Amsterdam (1865)

Laesmailje, Katherina
also printer of several of the books used

Lessen, J
poems in Klioos Kraam q.v.

Leterschik
introduction to Hexham, in Manly revision 1672,1678

Leutenius, Petrus
Aanmerkingen op de Nederduitsche Taal, (1653)
ed. W.J.H.Caron Groningen 1958

Leuwensche Bijdragen, 's Gravenhage 1896-

Leuytende Talen, Utrecht 1930-

Leydekker, Jacobus
Philosophisen Duyvel, 1692
Eere van de Nationale Synode van Dordregt, Amsterdam 1705
dedictory poem in Tuinman 1723 q.v.

Leydekker, Cornelis Gentman
dedictory poem in Tuinman 1723 q.v.

Lindeboom, Johannes
De wijzen van Oosten binnen Jerusalem, Leiden 1696
Troostreden, Leiden 1697
Rabbelary van de rabbelende P.Rabus, Leiden 1693
& see "Lof-reden", & "Zeeuwse Wedergalm"

Lodenstein, Jodocus van
Uyt-spanningen, (1676) Amsterdam 1681,ib.1695,ib.1703
Middelnederlandse Spraakkunst, Antwerpener 1943-49
Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Zuidvestbrabantsch in de XIIe en XIVe eeuw, Brussel 1937

Loey, Adolphe van
De oudste middelnederlandse oorkonden, Gent 1934
(Versl.& Med.Kon.Vl.Ac.)

Loey, Adolphe van
Loey, Adolphe van

Luyken, Jan
Duytsae Lier, Amsterdam (pub.Wagenaar) 1672, & ed. M.Sabbe Zutphen 1926 (= Amsterdam 1671, pub. Veenendaal)
Maatschappij tot Nut van 't Algemeen (earlier "Bataafsche Maatschappiy...")

Grammatica of Nederduitsche Spraakkunst, Leiden 1814, ib.1829
Spel- en lees-boekje voor eerst-beginnenden, Amsterdam 1786, Leiden 1789,ib.1805
Spel- en lees-boekje voor de jeugd, Leiden 1807, Amsterdam 1859
Spelboekje voor eerstbeginnenden, Leiden 1803
Trap der jeugd, Leiden 1737,ib.1791,ib.1793
Rudimenta, Leiden 1805, Gent 1853
(the grammar is often attributed to Siegenbeek, and the 'Rudimenta' to Bolhuis)

& see Bolhuis & Varick

Maerlant, Jacob van

Magazijn voor Nederlandsche Taalkunde, 's Gravenhage 1847-52

Man, I de

Mander, Karel van

Manly, D

Marchant, Hendrik Pieter

"Marin, Pierre"

Regels van de Vereenvoudigde spelling,(1934)in Daman

Dictionnaire portatif Hollandois et Francois, (1696)
ed.E.Zeydelaar Dordrecht 1773,ib.1787
Nieuw Nederduits en Frans Woordenboek, Amsterdam 1701
Compleet Nederduitsch en Fransch Woordenboek, Amsterdam 1717; ("Groot...")Dordrecht 1730, ib.1752,Amsterdam 1763

Dictionnaire portatif francois-flamand, Amsterdam 1751
=Dictionnaire portatif Francais et Hollandois,
ed.J.Holtrop Dordrecht 1773,ib.1786
Dictionnaire Complet portatif Francais et Hollandois, Amsterdam 1710,Dordrecht 1743
=Nouvelle méthode pour apprendre les principes et l'usage des langues francaise et hollandois,
(1694)Deventer 1751, Utrecht 1767, ed.I.I. Gilbert Amsterdam 1800

Waarschouwinge, in "Het boek der PsàLnen Davids", Antwerpen 1590

De Byencorf der H.Roomsche Kercke, np 1574
Œuvres, Bruxelles 1857-60

see p.271

in Klioos Kraam q.v.

Heidelberg 1927

Woordenschat,(1650)Amsterdam 1654,ib.1669, ib.1688, ib.1745

Dictionaire ou Promptuair Flanseng-Francoys,Anvers 1591-92(two versions of engraved title-page, one dated 1587, one dated 1591 resp.1592)
Rotterdam 1602
Le grand Dictionaire Francois-Flameng; Den Schat der Duysche Tale, Rotterdam 1613, ib.1630, ib.1636,ib.1640 (the latter anonymous)
rev.J.L.d'Arsi Rotterdam 1651,ib.1663
rev.J.L.d'Arsi & T.La Guve Rotterdam 1682, ib.1694,
Amsterdam 1699
(sometimes known as the "Waesbergh"dictionary, after the printer of all editions)

Mercalis, Jakob

Nestlingh, Dirk

"Meurier, Gabriel"

Verhandeling over den oorsprong en de natuur der taalen in het algemeen beschouwd,Groningen 1771
Conjugaisons...pour ceux qui desirent apprendre Francois, italien, Espagnol & Flaman,Anvers 1558
Deviz familiers propres à tous marchands desireux de...parler Francoys et Flaman,Rotterdam 1590
Mierlo, Joannes Josephus Franciscus van
tegen regel 8 en 9 van het voorstel-
Marchant, in "Onze Taaluit" III, 49
Moerbeek, Adam Abrahamzoon van
neue vollkommene holländische sprachlehre
(1791) Leipzig 1804
& see Kramer
Moka, J J
Nederduitsche spraakunst naar het Hollandsch,
Gent 1823
Moller, H W E
Vondels spelling, in "Tijdschrift..." 1903, 106
Montanus, Arnoldus
Dictionarium Latino-Teutonicum novum, Amsterdam 1664
Montanus, Petrus
Bericht van een nieuwe konst, genaamd de spreakekonst,
(1635) ed. W. J. H. Caron Groningen 1964
Moonen, Arnold
Nederduitsche spraakunst, Amsterdam 1706, ib. 1719,
ib. 1740, ib. n. d.
Vragen aan den Here J. v. Vondel (ca. 1671) in Vondel's
"Werken" ed. Van Lennep XII, 9
& see Lindeboom
Morand, Pierre de
'V Licht der Neder-duytscbe schryfkonst,(1612)
quoted in Amzing, original lost
De voornaamste verschillen over de spelling kortelijk
aangewezen, en de bekentenissen van Klaas
Najer aangaande sijn letter en spelkonstige
bewijsen verdedigt tegen den schrijver van de
Haagsehe Mercurius Amsterdam 1711 (see Doedyns)
& see Tydelean
Mullisch, Harry
Soep lepelen met een vork, Amsterdam 1972
Multatuli (pseud. Eduard Douwes Dekker)
Ideeën 43, 45, in "Versamelde Werken"
Amsterdam 1950-60
De geschiedenis van Woutertje Pieterse, ed. N. A.
Donkersloot Amsterdam 1933
Nusschenbroek, Petrus van
Beginsels der Natuurkunde, Leiden 1739
& see Doedyns, & M. S.
Nyin, ?
Bekentenissen, in "Amsterdamse Courant" ca. 1700
Eenvoudig vertoog brief-wys geschreven aan Jakob
Marcelis, Amsterdam 1702
& see Doedyns, & M. S.
Nauta, G A
taalkundige aantekeningen op de werken van
G. A. Bredero, Groningen 1893
(De) Navorscher, Amsterdam 1851-1959
Neckere, Philippus Jacques de
Bewerpe van een Vlaemsche Spelling, Yper (1815)
Nederduitsche Letteroefeningen, Gent 1834
Nederduytschen Letter-schik, Leuven ca. 1775
Niervaert, C Dz van
Onderwijs in de Letterkonst, (ca. 1600) Delft 1676,
Purmerend 1743
Nieuw Nederduitsch Speldeboek opgesteld tot onderwijs der Vorstelijke Kinderen,
Rotterdam 1730
Nieuw Nederlandsche Taalmagazijn, 's Gravenhage 1853-57
(De) Nieuwe Taalgids, Groningen 1907-
Nil Volentibus Arduum
Verhandeling...van der Letteren Affinitas of
verwantschap, (ca. 1673) Amsterdam 1728
Nolet de Brouwere van Steeland, Joannes Carolus Hubertus
Z or S twee brieven
aan Dr. J. W. Wolf, Brussel 1846
Noot, Jan van der
Gedichten, ed. A. Verwey Amsterdam 1895
Ode, Amsterdam 1944
Het Bosken en het Theatre, ed. W. A. P. Sbit Amsterdam
1953
Nouvelle grammaire flamande: see La Gru, & "Grammaire plus exacte..."
Nouvelle grammaire pour apprendre le Flamand, Anvers 1817, ed. J. des Roches
Bruxelles 1821
Nut
see "Maatschappij tot Nut..."
Obreen, Henri
Ogier, Willem
Olinger, l'Abbe

Oostzaee, Hendrik Marinus Christiaan van
Beknopte uitspraakleer der
Nederlandsche taal,(1848) 's Hertogenbosch 1838

Onze Taaltuin, Rotterdam 1932-42

Oppy, ? van den see p.131
Oraak Haarlemse Courant see Haje

Opstaljen, Paul van
Versamelled werk, I:Verantwoording...Spelling,
('s Gravenhage 1952-6)

Oudaen, Joachim
Voorschaduwing van het Zegepralende Ryk...Jesu
Christi, Rotterdam 1666

Overdiep, Gerrit Plebe
review of V.Ginneken, in "Onze Taaltuin" I,53

Overschie, Francois Jakob van
Civd nieuws of volbragte beloft,Delft 1735
Aan 't Hoof der Land-Poëten onser tyd Huebert
Kornz Poot, Delft 1715-6

Paardekoper, Petrus Cornelis
Syntaxis, Spraakkunst en taalkunde, Den Bosch 1965

Palm, Kornells van der
Nederduitsche spraakkunst voor de jeugd,
Rotterdam 1769, ib.1774-6

Over de verbeteringe der schoolen..., (cf.Kron)
Louwerkrans aan den Heer Willem Swinnaas, Raad en
vroedschap in den Briel, over zijn Engelse,
Nederlandse en Munsterse krankseelen,n.p.1665

Cypressen op het Grav van de Heer Rumoldus Rombouts,
voornaam leeraar te Leiden,n.p.,n.d,(ca.1690?)

Otia Cattavicena of Katwykse Speeluren, Katwykse
Oudheden, Leyden 1688

Catti Aborigines Batavorum, Leiden 1697, ed. F.v.d.
Schelling Leiden 1745

Pater, Lucas
Index Batavicus, Leiden 1701

Pauwels, J L
Poesy, Amsterdam 1774

F.B.
Taalkundige Kroniek: spelling en spellingwijziging,
in "Dietse Warande..." 1955,433

Pels, Andries
see Bincken

Voorspreke aan den lezer, in "Quintus Horatius Flaccus
Dichtkunst op onze tyden en zeden gepast"
(1677) Amsterdam 1707

Pepliers, J R des
Nouvelle et parfaite grammaire royale françoise et
hollandoise, Amsterdam 1777

Pers, Dirck
Bellerophon, Amsterdam 1614

Philologus (pseud)
Baschus Wonderwerk, Amsterdam 1628

P.H.F.
see Vorsluys

see Poeraset

Pielat, Bartholomaeus
l'anti grammaire or d'oude spraek-konst verworpen,
Amsterdam 1673

Nomenclature nouvelle...nieuw vocabularium, ib.1676
Rhapsodia van Nederduitsche Taalkunde,Amsterdam 1776
Aanmerkingen over het misbruiik der letter V, ib.1676
Verhandeling over...de zelfstandige en byvoeglyke
Naamwoorden, die in hunne Buiginge de letter
D of T verreissen, Amsterdam 1774

Plantijn, Christoffel
Thesaurus Theutonicae Linguae, Schat der
Neder-duytscher spraken, Antwerpen 1573
Speldwerk of waerschouwinge an den neerduitschen schrijver van de spelding, Haerlem 1632
=Orthographia belgica, Amsterdam 1637
Der Herdooperen Ansicht op Amsterdam, Haerlem 1632
=De verlieerde Lubbert, Amsterdam 1673
Gedichten, 1692-1723
Foerset, P N
De spelling van Moonen in eenen brief verdedigt door P.H.P, 's Gravenhage 1703
review of Gargon, in "Boekzaal..." 1722a, 229
Het huylige herte, Antwerpen, d.
Het masker van de wereldt afgetrokken, Antwerpen 1646
Novum Dictionarium Belgico-Latinum ex optimis authorum, Maastricht 1739, ib. 1753
(based on work by Pomey)
Gedichten, Delft 1722-23
Gargon, in "Boekzaal" 1722a, 229
Het heylige herte, Antwerpenn. d.
Het masker van de wereldt afgetrokken, Antwerpen 1646
Novum Dictionarium Belgico-Latinum ex optimis authorum, Maastricht 1739, ib. 1753
(based on work by Pomey)
Gedichten, Delft 1722-23
Prisma vreemde woorden boek, ed. A. Kolstere, Utrecht 1967
De schaamtelooze Leidschendamsche Dominé Broer Knellis, Rotterdam 1693
& see V.d.Linden
Vlaamsche Bibliographie (1330-1390), Gent 1393-1902
Fyl, Roelof van der
De Hellschendische liis, met de Brabandsche-Lely, 's Gravenhage 1629
Rapport van de Nederlands-Belgische commissie voor de spelling van de Bastaardwoorden, 's Gravenhage 1967
& see "Zindvoorstellen...")
Grammar. ca. 1820 (see p. 304)
Elémens de la logique, Roulers 1817
see p. 23
De Vlaamsche Bibliographie (1330-1390), Gent 1393-1902
Quintyn, Gilles Jacobsz
De Schaamtelooze Leidschendamsche Dominé Broer Knellis, Rotterdam 1693
Reael, Laurens
De Vlaamsche Bibliographie (1330-1390), Gent 1393-1902
Rīn, Léonard van
De Ho Hāndschelii, met de Brabandsche-Lely, 's Gravenhage 1629
De Morgenstond, Leeuwarden 1690
Rintjus, Hendrik
Theodorus Rombouts, Sigebertus
De Vlaamsche Bibliographie (1330-1390), Gent 1393-1902
Rodenburg, Theodoor
De Vlaamsche Bibliographie (1330-1390), Gent 1393-1902
Rodriguez, Juan Francisco
De Vlaamsche Bibliographie (1330-1390), Gent 1393-1902
Rombouts, Sigebertus
Den grooten dictionaris eu schat van dry talen, Duytsch, Spansch en Fransch, (1632)
Antwerpen 1639-40
Ronsard, Pierre de
Naar een betere spelling, Tilburg 1957
see p. 360, 368
Roorda, Taco

Rotgans, Lukas

Ruyten, Gerlach

Rusting, Salomon van

Ruyter, Michel de

Salverda de Grave, J.J.

Sanderus, Lambertus

Santens, Gerard Cornelis van

Scilla, (1709) ed. L.S. rengholt Zwolle 1966

Schaert, Matthias

(De) Schacht-kiste der Philosophen en poëten, Mechelen 1621

'Schagen, M

Godgeleerde, historische, philosophische... vermakelykheden, Amsterdam 1732-36

'Scharder, Carel Theodorus

Schelling, Pieter van der

Hollands Tiendregt, of verhandeling van het regt tot de tienden, Rotterdam 1727

Schepers, Jacob van der

Nederlandse spellinge, (1612) ed. F.L. Zwaan Groningen 1957

'Schmeren, Gert van der

Schone, J

Schottelius, Justus Georg

De spellingvoorstellen, in "Levende Talen" 1967, I, 186

Auszüchterliche Arbeit von deutscher Handt Sprache, Braunschweig 1663

Schuman, Anna Maria van

Over het droevig verval der Christenen, in "Anna Maria van Schurman en de stude der vrouw" by A.M. Douma Amsterdam 1924

'Schutz, Joan Christiaan

Proeve eener aanleiding tot de nederduitsche taalkunde, (ca. 1750) in "Taal- dicht- en letterkundig Kabinet" I, II & VI

Schwiers, Conrudos

Scriverius, Petrus

"Seelendragers, Antoon Karel Joser" review of Rombouts in "Wetenschappelijke Tijdingen" Gent 1958

Seewel, Willem

A new dictionary, English and Dutch, Amsterdam 1691

=A large..., Amsterdam 1708, ib.1727-35

=A compleat dictionary English and Dutch... entirely improved by Egbert Buys, Amsterdam 1766

=A compendious guide to the low-dutch language, Amsterdam 1700, ib.1740, ib.1747, ib.1754, ib.1760, rev. ib.1814

Nederduytscse Spraakkonst, Amsterdam 1708, ib.1712, ib.1724, ib.1733, ib.1756

Korte verhandeling wegens de Nederlandse spelling, in "Boeckaal..." 1703b, 106

De Schryver aan den Leezer, in "Boeckaal..." 1704a, 7

Aanmerkingen op het boekje genaamd de spelling van A. Noonen verdeedigd, Amsterdam 1708 (= Poerast)

& see F.la Grue

Scheurman, Anthoni Maria van

Nederduytscse spellinge, (1612) ed. F.L. Zwaan Groningen 1957

De strijwijk der Kollevijners, Amsterdam 1912

Nederduytscse spellinge, (1612) ed. F.L. Zwaan Groningen 1957

De strijwijk der Kollevijners, Amsterdam 1912

Vocabularius qui in titulatur Tauisonista, Cologne 1477

De strijwijk der Kollevijners, Amsterdam 1912

Nederduytscse spellinge, (1612) ed. F.L. Zwaan Groningen 1957

The spellingvraagstuk, in "De Gids" 1911, I, 213

De aldus vryhaldt, staatsregeering en weten der Batavieren, Rotterdam 1746

& see Alkemade & Pars

Schanten, Carel Theodorus

Schelling, Pieter van der

De spellingvraagstuk, in "De Gids" 1911, I, 213

Het spellingvraagstuk, in "De Gids" 1911, I, 213

De spellingvraagstuk, in "De Gids" 1911, I, 213

Een compleet dictionary English and Dutch... entirely improved by Egbert Buys, Amsterdam 1766

A compendious guide to the low-dutch language, Amsterdam 1700, ib.1740, ib.1747, ib.1754, ib.1760, rev. ib.1814

Nederduytscse spellinge, (1612) ed. F.L. Zwaan Groningen 1957

Korte verhandeling wegens de Nederlandse spelling, in "Boeckaal..." 1703b, 106

De Schryver aan den Leezer, in "Boeckaal..." 1704a, 7

Aanmerkingen op het boekje genaamd de spelling van A. Noonen verdeedigd, Amsterdam 1708 (= Poerast)

& see F.la Grue

Schanten, Carel Theodorus

Schenk, M

'Schenk, Jacob van der

'Schepers, Gert van der

Schone, J

Schottelius, Justus Georg

'Schermers, Jacob van der

'Schertzen, Gert van der

'Schumann, B Th K

Schurman, Anna Maria van

'Schoen, J

Schouw, Piet van der

'Schoon, J

'Schouten, Carel Theodorus

'Schering, Pieter van der

'Schuur, Jacob van der

'Schumacher, B Th K

'Schurman, Anna Maria van

'Schoen, J

'Schumacher, B Th K

'Schurman, Anna Maria van

'Schuetz, Joan Christiaan

'Schwert, Conradus

Scriverius, Petrus

'Seelenaeyers, Antoon Karel Joser" review of Rombouts in "Wetenschappelijke Tijdingen" Gent 1958

& in "Uit het orthografisch laboratorium" by C.B. van Haeringen in "Nieuwe Taalgids" LII, 54

& see Verschueren

Seewel, Willem

A new dictionary, English and Dutch, Amsterdam 1698

=A large..., Amsterdam 1708, ib.1727-35

=A compleat dictionary English and Dutch...entirely improved by Egbert Buys, Amsterdam 1766

=A compendious guide to the low-dutch language, Amsterdam 1700, ib.1740, ib.1747, ib.1754, ib.1760, rev. ib.1814

Nederduytscse spellinge, (1612) ed. F.L. Zwaan Groningen 1957

Korte verhandeling wegens de Nederlandse spelling, in "Boeckaal..." 1703b, 106

De Schryver aan den Leezer, in "Boeckaal..." 1704a, 7

Aanmerkingen op het boekje genaamd de spelling van A. Noonen verdeedigd, Amsterdam 1708 (= Poerast)

& see F.la Grue

'Schoon, J

'Schuyten, Carel Theodorus

Schelling, Pieter van der
Sibranda, Joannes

Siegenbeek, Matthijs

601.

Verhandeling over de Nederduitsche spelling,
Amsterdam 1804, 1b.1810

Verhandeling over de invloed der welluidenheid...
on de spelling der Nederduitsche taal, in
"Verhandelingen der Bat.Nv.Taal- en
Dichtkunde" I, Amsterdam 1804

Waarschuwing tegen eenige in zwang gebragte
verbasteringen van de uitspraak onzer moedertaal,
Leiden 1836

Woordenboek voor de Nederduitsche spelling,
Amsterdam 1805, 's Hage 1817, Dordrecht 1829

& see My.+tot Nut..., & Carlebur, & Simpel

Struik, Ludolphe

Zowel mag de tweespraak waarin de Hollandsche
taalregels van Welland en de spelling van
Siegenbeek tegen die der voornaamste Vlaamse
Taalopbouwers opgewogen worden, Iperen ca.1827

Nieuwe denkbeelden of leerregels over de spraakkunst
... uyt het Frans vertaalt... en door den
veraarder vermeerderd, met Leerregels over de
spellinge, Amsterdam ca.1761

Simpel, David de

Natuurkundige Regelmaat der Taal,
'ss Hertogenbosch 1824

Simpel, David de

Staal, Jan

Natuurkundige Regelmaat der Taal,
'ss Hertogenbosch 1824

Sinkel, Jan

De gemeenzame Geest, Amsterdam 1679

See Zoet

Speelman, Cornelis Jsz

De gemeenzame Geest, Amsterdam 1679

See "Hollandsche..."

Staender, Jan Jansz

Spiegel, Hendrik Laurensz

Herb-spiegel, (1614) ed.A C de Jong Amsterdam 1930

Twe-spraak vande nederduitsche letterkunst,
Leiden 1584, Amsterdam 1614, Wormerveer 1649,
ed.K.Kooiman Groningen 1913

Staalpart van der Wielen, Johannes

"Zijn leven en keur uit zijne lyrische gedichten" ed.
G J Hoogeveert Bussum 1920

Stammetsz, J L

Volkomen Wiskundig Woordenboek, ed. & trans. by
W.La Bordes Leiden 1740

Staring, Antoni Christiaan

Wijzijnde iets over onze spelling, Zutphen 1816

"Texten en varianten van A.C.W.S" by J.M.de Vries
Zwolle 1958

Starter, Jan Jansz

Brieven, ed.G.C. Opstelten Haarlem 1916

De Friesdhe Lusthof,(1621) ed.J.van Vloten Utrecht
1864

Stukken, Menno

Nieuwen voorschriftboek,(1714)Tielt 1792, Veurne 1833

Spiegels, Hendrik Laurens

"Texten en varianten van A.C.W.S" by J.M.de Vries
Zwolle 1958

Steyn, Gerard van

Liefhebbery der Reekenkunst, Enkhuisen 1743-50

Stijn, Klaas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stuveling, Garmt</td>
<td>Het spel van de spelling, in &quot;De Gids&quot; 1972, 169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaen, Michiel de</td>
<td>Werken, (1636) ed. V. Ceelen Antwerpen 1923-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweerts, H</td>
<td>see Zwaers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taal en Letterbode, Haarlem</td>
<td>1870-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taal- en Lettercon, Zwolle</td>
<td>1891-1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taal-, Dicht- en Letterkundig Kabinet, Amsterdam</td>
<td>1781-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taalkundig Magazijn, Rotterdam</td>
<td>1835-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.A.C.P.</td>
<td>Nieuw Nederlandsch speldeboek, Utrecht 1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tael- en Dicht-kundige By-dragen, Leyden</td>
<td>1760-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talen, J G</td>
<td>see Buitenrust Hetema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terbruggen, J A</td>
<td>see Bruggen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thijm, Joseph Albert Alberdingk</td>
<td>Over de spelling van de bastaartwoorden in 't Nederduitsch, Amsterdam 1843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De Nederduitsche spelling, Utrecht 1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>articles in &quot;Algemeen Letterlievend Maandschrift&quot; 1846-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>review of Carlebur in &quot;De Gids&quot; 1857 II, 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>under pseud. &quot;P. Foreestier&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal en Letterkunde, Leiden</td>
<td>1831-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollens, Hendrik</td>
<td>Nieuwe Gedichten, in &quot;Dichtwerken&quot; Leeuwarden 1855-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulman, Carolus</td>
<td>Fakkel der Nederduitsche Taal... Hier achter is gevoegd Oud en Nieuw of Vergelyking der oude en nieuwe Nederduitsche taal, Leyden 1722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vervolg op de Fakkel... Middelburg 1731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nederduitsche Poëzy, Middelburg 1723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rymlust, Middelburg 1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulp, Nicolaas</td>
<td>Observationes medicarum, Amsterdam 1657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyleman, Meinard</td>
<td>defence of spelling used in &quot;Proeve&quot; of Dulceos anteomnia musce, q.v. vol. I (signed &quot;M.T.&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tysens, G</td>
<td>Klearchus, dringeland van Herakles, Amsterdam 1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursulines...</td>
<td>see &quot;Recueil&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valcoogh, Dirrick Adriaenssz</td>
<td>Regel der duytse Schoolmeesters, (1591) ed. P.A. de Plaque Groningen 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentijn, Abraham</td>
<td>Alle de wercken van P. Ovidius Nasso, Amsterdam 1697, lb. 1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerius, Adriaen</td>
<td>Neder-antsche Gedenck-Clanck, Haerlem 1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandenhoven</td>
<td>see Hoven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varick, Gerrit van</td>
<td>Rudimenta of gronden der Nederduitsche Spraak, Leiden 1798, lb. 1799, lb. 1802, lb. 1805 (a Nut work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Velde, Isaac van der</td>
<td>De tragedie der werkwoordsworpen, Groningen 1956, lb. 1960 (revised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venne, Adriaen van de</td>
<td>Taferesele van de belacchende werelt, 's Graven-hage 1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbeet, G</td>
<td>Memorie of getrouw verhaal van... Neerlands, Oostindien, Delft 1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdayen, René</td>
<td>see Lambrecht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vereeniging voor wetenschappelijke spelling</td>
<td>Programma, in Hermens p. 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhandelingen uitgegeven door de Hollandsche Maatschappye der Weetenschappen te Haarlem, Haarlem 1755-93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verhandelingen uitgegeven door het Zeeuwse Genootschap der Wetenschappen te Vlissingen, Middelburg 1769-92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verpoorten, J D</td>
<td>Woordenschat orit letter-konst...door J.D.V., (1742) Antwerpen 1759, lb. 1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verschueren, Jozef</td>
<td>introduction to Modern Woordenboek. Vijdje hertzeide druik geheel in nieuwe spelling, Turnhout 1949-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Konsequente progressive spelling, op.cit. Turnhout 1961, with W. Fée &amp; A. Seelstraeyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versluys, Petrus</td>
<td>Eenvoudige aanmerkingen over het gebruik der V, in &quot;Boekssaal...&quot; 1765a, 473 (by &quot;Philologus&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wrin gedagten...over den Boom der Kennisse des goeds en des kwends, in &quot;Verh.Holl.My&quot; 9iiii, 136 (1767)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Verwer, Adriaan

Linguae Belgicae Idea Grammatica..., Amsterdam 1707 (by "Anonymus Batavus")

Brief aan A. Reland...tot rekenschap van de aanmerkingen van A. Moonen op de Idea, Utrecht 1709

Nederlands See-rechten, Amsterdam 1716

Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek, 's Gravenhage 1835-

De nieuwe voordelige schoollessen, Middelburg 1716

Den gezalvd Christen, Middelburg 1723, ib.1737

De Cheveinsde Docht van Joosje, Amsterdam 1667

' t Loff van de mutse, Leiden 1612

Brabbeling, Amsterdam 1614, (Brabbelingh) ib.1669

Alle de gedichten, (1602-14) ed. N. Beets Utrecht 1831

Nieuw vlaamsch-fransch woordenboek, Leuven n.d.

Vlaemsche en fransche woordenboek, Loven 1836-37

*Verwijs E, & Verdam J.

Vincent, Ysbrand

Visscher, Roemer

Visscher, Ann Roemers

Visschers, Petrus

*Vlaerdings Redenrijk-bergh, Johannes

Vloten, Johannes van

Vollenhove, Johannes

Vulmaakte en nuttige kern der fransche en nederduitsche talen, Amsterdam 1755

= Kern der Fransche..., ib.1776

Treurspelen begreepen in twee deelen, Amsterdam 1661-65

Olyftack aan Gustaf Adolf, in "Werken" ed. J. van Lennep Amsterdam 1865-68

Palamedes, Amsterdam 1625, ib.1626, 1b.1630, ib.1652, ib.1660, ib.ca.1675

Maeghden, Amsterdam 1643

& see Moller, & Leupenius

Voorreden van de noodich...

*Voorst, Did.Cornelis van der

Overs de verbeteringe der schoolen (cf. Krom)

Voorstad, Andries

see Index

*Vooya, Cornelis Gerrit Nicolaas Nederlandse Spraakkunst, Groningen 1947

& G. Stuiveling

*Vos, Hendrik J de

*Vries, J de

*Vries, M de

Vriesland, Victor E van

V.W.S.

Vynck, P de

Waesberghe, J van

Wagenaar, Jan

Wassenbergh, Everwinius

*Vaders, J van

*Vellecke, Pieter

*Veldekeren, Willie

*Werve, Jan van der

see Carlebur, & Simpel

Bezinning over spellihg, in "De Standaard" 24 June 1961, in "De taal waarmee wij leven" by M. van Nierop Antwerpen 1962

Den schat der duytseren talen, (1550) Antwerpen 1559, ib.1568, Delft 1614, Amsterdam 1664, ib.1750
Wester, Hendrik
Westerbaan, Jacob
Wayden, D van der
Wijk, Axel
Wilcocke, Samuel Hull
Wille, Jacobus
Willems, Jan Frans

Bevatlijk onderwijs in de Nederlandsche spel-
en taalkunde, Groningen 1797
Lof der zotheyd, (1659) in Huydecoper II, p319
Alle de gedichten, 's Gravenhage 1672
Inleyding tot een vastgegronde nederduitsche
letterstellinge, Utrecht 1651
Regularised English, Stockholm 1959
A new and complete dictionary of the English and
Dutch languages, London 1798
A new pocket dictionary..., London 1811
Taalbederf door de school van Kollewijn,
Amsterdam 1935
Over de Hollandsche en Vlaensche schryfwyzen van
het Nederduitsch, Antwerpen 1824
Over de nieuwe vlaensche sprakaunsten, in
"Belgisch Museum" I, 224
Brieven van, aan en over J.F.Willems 1793-1846,
ed. A.Deprez Bruge 1965
Inleiding tot de Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche
taal, Culemborg n.d. (ca.1904)
De ontwikkelingagang der Nederlandsche
Letterkunde, Haarlem 1922-7
De nederlandsche spelling, Leiden 1859
Leerboek der Nederlandsche spelling, Leiden 1866
Woordenlijst voor de spelling der Nederlandsche
taal, 's Gravenhage 1866, ib.1872, ed. A.
Kuyver ib.1893
Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal,
's Gravenhage 1864-
Schats der Nederduitsche sprakaunsten, Utrecht 1734
Nederduitsch-Fransch woordenboek, Dictionnaire
Francois-Hollandois et Hollandois-François,
Utrecht 1783
Letterkonst, Leiden 1683
Dictionarium Belgico-Latinum, Leiden 1684
De getrouwe herderin, Rotterdam 1719
Brieven, ed. N.Japikse Amsterdam 1919
see E.O.P.
see L.te Winkel "Woordenboek..."
comments in "De Broederjand"
& see Nolet de Brauwere van Steeland
De Menest en de Dominees pruij, (1772) ed.
M.C.A.van der Helijden Utrecht 1968
Historie van den heer Willem Leevend,
's Gravenhage 1734-5
Historie van Mejuffrouw Cornelis Windschut,
's Gravenhage 1793-6

With, Katharina de
Witte, Jan de
"W.W.T.
"Wolf, J W
Wolff, Elizabeth
& Agatha Deken

letter.see L.te Winkel
letter.see L.te Winkel
letter.see L.te Winkel
letter.see L.te Winkel
letter.see L.te Winkel

De Nederlandsche Scheeps-bouw-konst, Delft 1697
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lelyveld</td>
<td>277-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lennep</td>
<td>56,171,343,306,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lescaille (J)</td>
<td>4,360,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lescaille (K)</td>
<td>48,237,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessen</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leydekker (J)</td>
<td>193,237,246,252,292,432,448,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leydekker (C)</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindaboorn</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linden</td>
<td>7,8,10,106,162,185,189,224,232,237,239,288,359,400,406-7,450-2,471,513,550,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodenstein</td>
<td>25,69,193,285,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loey</td>
<td>6,14,37,47,62,89,96,118,155-6,172,187,192,204,231,235,244-5,258,317,332,345,375,393,421,427,448,463,518 (including Obreen &amp; V.Loey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokeren</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loots</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubach</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luyken</td>
<td>36,52,72,102,156,169,187,232,236,257-8,384,395,397,399-400,431,448,470,486,496,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maerlant</td>
<td>317,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>159,172,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mander</td>
<td>99,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manly</td>
<td>34,102,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maatsch.tot Nut...</td>
<td>10-1,26,66,80,87-8,125,133,135,166,178,254,269,332,341-2,360,365-6,418,437,459-60,476,499,511,519,522,550,557,571,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marchant</td>
<td>49,59,83,123,139,328,345,349,426,443,445,461,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marnix</td>
<td>91,151-2,187,207-8,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsman</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martimus</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meer</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meijer</td>
<td>36,72,106,116,121,124,153,175,214,222,257,315,318,330,339,369,388,399,416,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merckels</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meesingh</td>
<td>165,188,232,278,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meurier</td>
<td>97,205,231,252,325,376-7,421,428,464,486,498,557,561,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mierlo</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noke</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moeller</td>
<td>210,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montamus (A)</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norand</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nostart</td>
<td>30-2,559,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.S.</td>
<td>75,125,174,193,238,289,291,341,360,370,387,423,433,473,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mulisch</td>
<td>18,183,229,275,329,344,352,402,425,503,517,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multatuli</td>
<td>56,105,441-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musschenbroek</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylin</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Najer</td>
<td>238, 259, 289, 423-4, 449, 471, 473, 581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauta</td>
<td>436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neckere</td>
<td>11, 55, 80, 111, 130-1, 158, 221, 269, 304-5, 327, 347, 365-6, 390-1, 399, 410, 429, 448-9, 471, 477, 479, 487, 511, 515, 543, 587, 589, 566-9, 575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned. Lettersohik</td>
<td>53, 223, 254, 263, 360, 511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niervaert</td>
<td>104, 126, 213, 253, 266, 315, 384, 498, 510, 521, 538, 552, 557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niervaert</td>
<td>253, 266, 315, 384, 498, 510, 521, 538, 552, 557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nieuwe Gr. pour apprendre...</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuttig en Noodig speldboekje</td>
<td>127, 223, 300, 341, 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogier</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olinger</td>
<td>558, 561, 566, 570, 576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oosterzee</td>
<td>306, 441, 478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opper</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oprecht Haarlemse Courant</td>
<td>432-4, 447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostaijen</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudaen</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overdijp</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overschie</td>
<td>5, 54, 66, 127, 219, 259, 389, 397, 399, 407, 452, 474, 552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paardenkoper</td>
<td>59, 228, 272, 309, 412, 517, 519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pater</td>
<td>177, 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pauwels</td>
<td>308, 412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pepliers</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers</td>
<td>103, 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philologus</td>
<td>295-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pielaat</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieterson</td>
<td>127, 135, 158, 223, 254, 268-9, 278, 296, 297, 409, 541, 571, 584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plantijn</td>
<td>6, 20, 51, 61, 97, 105, 118, 151, 156, 187, 205-6, 250, 253, 269, 313, 315, 326, 337, 346, 353, 376, 399, 427, 456, 464, 473, 482, 485, 491, 521, 535, 549, 551-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plomp</td>
<td>7, 22, 33, 52, 69, 99, 100, 114, 116, 209, 236, 246, 314, 381, 429, 468, 470, 494, 506, 530-1, 536, 557, 570, 582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluimer</td>
<td>161, 369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poerant</td>
<td>12, 42, 49, 75, 77, 162, 189, 198, 217, 286, 290, 297, 320, 407, 473, 497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polsters</td>
<td>25, 103, 153, 210, 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomey</td>
<td>26, 37, 154, 188, 200-2, 218, 221, 388, 549, 553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poot</td>
<td>42, 109, 124, 157, 188, 218, 222, 257, 268, 340, 360, 388, 400, 452, 473-4, 498-9, 538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisma vr.wbk.</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pynl</td>
<td>178, 440, 506, 558, 560, 564, 569-70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quintijn</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabus</td>
<td>7-8, 10, 48, 161-2, 237, 287-8, 450-2, 513, 550, 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>60, 113, 228, 272, 323-4, 329, 335, 349, 351, 372, 402, 446-7, 462, 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re</td>
<td>304-5, 411-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reael</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renier</td>
<td>31, 138, 270, 441, 460, 487, 557, 574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revius</td>
<td>23, 69, 99, 121, 210, 256, 315, 380, 467, 518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhyn</td>
<td>127, 191, 241, 259, 294, 408-9, 411, 459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>2, 24, 35, 104-5, 214, 395, 530, 250, 555, 557, 560, 565-8, 570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riebeek</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rintjus</td>
<td>48, 169, 251, 284, 356, 397, 404, 509, 526-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The attached article was accepted for inclusion in the first issue of Dutch Studies, Summer 1973, but due to lack of space has been held over until the 1974 issue.

In the flourishing culture of the Northern Netherlands in the early seventeenth century, a proportionate amount of attention was paid to the state of the language. Between 1623 and 1625 several of the leading literary figures, including Hooft and Vondel, had joined in a series of meetings to discuss many aspects of linguistic usage in literature. In this atmosphere it is to be expected that several grammars of the language would appear, and this is indeed the case.

Until 1620 there had only been one work with any claim to being a complete vernacular grammar, the Twe-spraak presumed to have been written by Hendrik Spiegel in 1584, and reprinted in 1614. In addition to this work of fairly limited scope there were only the various spelling handbooks, about nine in number, though some of these, such as that of Jacob van der Schuere, are very detailed.

In contrast to this, in the few years between 1624 and 1635 three more spelling works and some six grammatical works appeared, ranging from the introductions by De Hubert and Ampzing to the detailed phonetic investigations by Montanus. Of these the first to have any claim to being a full grammar is that of the Leiden mathematician Christiaen Van Heule, whose Nederduytse Grammatica appeared in 1625. This was reissued in a considerably revised form in 1633. After 1635 (Montanus) no significant new work appeared for over 15 years.

The many contacts between the Netherlands and England in the fields of culture, commerce and combat, encouraged the compiling of foreign language handbooks. These were almost exclusively in the form of vocabularies and phrase-books set out in the way of conversations, for example the English-Dutch
French Latin Schole-master, whose first English edition was published in 1637 by Michael Sparke, London. Many of these conversation booklets include rudimentary grammatical notes in the shape of verb paradigms, e.g. in the Grooten Vocabulaer Engels ende Duyts of 1639 (published by J. Waesberghen), and, less frequently, a section on pronunciation, as in Meurier's book of 1558, adapted for English in Le Meyre's Scholemaster of 1606, and some of the similarly titled works of later date, notably that of 1646. The Conjugations of Thomas Basson (1586), adapted from Meurier, is unique in giving only paradigms and no dialogues or vocabulary. But none of these can be called full grammars of Dutch for foreigners.

In the light of this, when, after compiling the first proper Dutch-English and English-Dutch dictionary in 1647-48, it occurred to Henry Hexham to include a comprehensive grammar, it can be seen that there was nothing written in English on which he could base his work. He was therefore forced to use a native Dutch grammar and translate it into English. As can be seen from the notes above, even in Dutch there were at that time few works of adequate compass or suitable content to act as a base for his grammar, the only reasonably comprehensive books being the Twe-spraack, the two editions of Van Heule, and a school grammar written by Richard Dafforne in 1627. Of these Dafforne is a self-confessed compilation from existing works, so that by far the most thorough and broadly based is that of Van Heule, and of this work the second edition contains much more than the first. It seems almost inevitable then that this work should have been chosen by Hexham. The radical change of function from a treatise on the native language to a foreign language primer naturally occasioned a great deal of careful editing and
remoulding, in which Hexham seems to have acquitted himself with mixed fortunes, though on the whole adequately.

This same grammar, Van Heule 1633, was also to form the basis of another, slightly more limited work in English when, in 1661, Willem Beyer published a trilingual grammar of French, Dutch and English. Not only is the work in three sections, respectively the French, the Dutch and the English grammars, but each grammar is also in all three languages, arranged in parallel text format, three columns to a page. The French and English grammars fall outside the scope of this discussion, but the Dutch grammar is of great importance, being only the second full Dutch grammar written in English, and the first in French. It is also the first grammar in English to be available as a separate work. Beyer was just as limited as Hexham as to possible foundations for his work, Van Heule being still the only comprehensive grammar, although several other works had appeared since 1648, and the Twe-spraack had been once more reprinted (1649).

A third work for English speaking students appeared in 1664, the Instructor by François Hilleniust, and English schoolmaster in Rotterdam. This too is based on Van Heule, though many of the latter's ideas are modified in the light of contemporary trends. Hilleniust put more of his own thought into his adaptation, though it is still a scarcely disguised précis of Van Heule 1633. Lack of space rules out a detailed discussion here on the relationship of Hilleniust to Van Heule, but it can be pointed out that his work was in much more widespread use than Beyer's (whose circulation was possibly restricted to the Netherlands), and was the standard text of English students until replaced by Sewel's Guide in 1700 and the grammar in his dictionary of 1691.
The function of Beyer's work (in this respect similar to Hillenius) - the teaching of elementary Dutch - was the same as Hexham's, but the approach of the two is radically different. Before enlarging upon this, it is helpful to give some of the biographical facts known on Beyer.

Very little is in fact known about him. He is not listed in any of the standard English, French or Dutch bibliographies or biographical dictionaries, even though he wrote in all three languages, about all three languages, and his works are present in a great many countries (France, Belgium, England, Germany, U.S.A., Sweden, but according to the Centrale Catalogue not in The Netherlands!). We know some biographical detail from his own introduction, included (thoughtfully) in both editions of the grammar, where he says that 'il y a maintenant au delà de trente ans que je m'exerce en l'instruction de la jeunesse', giving instruction 'à écrire en toutes sortes de caractères, à chiffrer, à calculer, à tenir le livre à l'Italienne, & tout ce qui peut servir aux Marchands; je les instruis encore dans le Fracoy & le Flamend, & les faires exercer en l'Anglois, pour y orthographier correctement & lire promptement: afin d'obtenir ce but, je fais translater à mes disciples quatre fois de jour, & tout passe l'examen'.

It is interesting to note that even then problems arose for foreigners with English spelling! He at least considers himself to have been a succesful teacher since about 1630, which, although it is mere propaganda for his school, helps to place the date of his birth before or about 1610.

Amongst his ancestors he proudly claims 'Juste van der Hoock, Capitaine courageus, & Adrien Beyer, Bourgemaistre de la ville de Schoonhoven, fidelles serviteurs du feu Prince d'Orange GUILLAUME premier'.
The name Willem Beyer does crop up in contemporary records. A certain "Willem Beijer", described as French schoolmaster at Mijnsheerenland van Moerkerken in the Hoekse Waard district of the province South Holland ("Beijerland"!), figures in a marriage contract of 1 May 1653, along with Geertruyt Joostendochter, born in Dordrecht. The two had been betrothed on 20 April of the same year, and presumably married in Mijnsheerenland. In addition the same records produce a "Willem Ghijsbrechtsen Beijer" of Mijnsheerenland in a deed of 10 July 1632. Furthermore A.J. van der Aa in his Aardrijkskundig Woordenboek records that in this same village the tomb of a certain Willem Beijer is remarkable for its carved headstone.

As all except one of the grammatical works of the Willem Beyer under discussion here were published in Dordrecht, it seems a reasonable assumption that the Willem Beijer and the Willem Ghijsbrechtsen Beijer mentioned in the records and the grammarian Willem Beyer are one and the same person. Without examining the inscription of the headstone (if it still exists) it cannot be known if this too belongs to him.

The following published works of this schoolmaster are known to exist:

- La vraye Instruction des trois langues la Françoise, l'Anglois, & la Flamande, Jasper & Jean Goris, Dordrecht, 1661
- Vestibule introduisant à la vraye instruction des trois langues, la francoise, l'angloise et la flamende, à l'usage de l'école de Guillaume Beyer, J & J Goris, Dordrecht, 1662 (this is merely a vocabulary, without grammar, despite the similarity in title to the previous work).
- Les compliments Francois; contenus diverses fleurs choisis de l'éloquence. De la traduction de G. Beyer. De fransche plicht-pleginghe ... Vertaelt door W. Beyer, A Vermerck,
Haarlem, 1665 (French-Dutch parallel text)

De rechte onderwijzinge van de Fransche, Engelsche en Nederduytse Talen ... Den tweeden Druk, vermeerderd en van veele fonten gesuyvert, De Weduwe van Jasper, en Dirck Goris, Dordrecht, 1681 (also with English and French title pages)

Quelques mots choisis des substantifs les plus usitez.

The last mentioned is a vocabulary and dialogues bound with the grammars, and which, although mentioned on the title pages, has a separate pagination but no title page of its own. After page 6 it bears the page-heading of the grammar. It may bear some relationship to his 'Vestibule' of 1662, though it is only half the length. It is probably ultimately borrowed from one of the contemporary dialogue books.

Of his other works nothing has been traced, but it is known for certain that at least one did exist, since he himself writes in the introduction to the earliest listed work that 'le public a vu deja auparavant quelque chose de ma main; mais celuy qui prendra la peine de confronter l'un avec l'autre en trouvera l'excessive difference, qui se découvre a un chacun a voir seulement le titre de ce livre'. It concerns a linguistic work therefore with a strong resemblance to the one in which he is writing. Whether this is an earlier edition of the 'Vestibule' or some totally different work is not known, but it is unlikely to have been an earlier print of the grammar since the 1681 edition is clearly inscribed as 'Den tweeden Druk'.

The only contemporary mentioned in bibliographies is 'een pastoor van Assendelft Willem Beyer, die in 1663 werd gekozen tot thesaurier en secretaris van het haarlemsch kapittel, en 10 jaar later werd afgezet "ob scandalosam et vitam minus castam"'. Although one of Beyer's books was printed in
Hearlem, there is nothing to suggest that the two are the same person (fortunately for his pupils!). This is moreover a very common name - there is also a contemporary Guilielmus Beyer writing theological works in Antwerp.

From what we know of him, Beyer marks himself off from the other writers of Dutch grammars in English in that Hexham, Hillenius and Richardson (the writer of the Anglo-Belgica of 1677) all had very strong connections with the church: although Hillenius was by profession a teacher he was also a very active preacher. Furthermore Hexham, Hillenius and Richardson were all English (and even Sewel was of English descent). Beyer is therefore the only Dutchman of these four first grammarians, and also the only full-time professional teacher with no known connection with the church - assuming again that the unchaste priest from Hearlem is no relation!

Excellent accounts of what is known on the lives of the other writers are to be found in the articles mentioned in the footnotes. It would be superfluous to repeat them here, where Beyer is the main object of interest, and also presumptuous to give extracts.

The grammar of Beyer and its contemporaries

In the articles of Leroux and Scheurweghs the sources of Hexham are identified, the main one being undoubtedly Van Heule 1633, with certain sections taken from other works. Dibbets justifiably amended their conclusion to make the main secondary source Dafforne instead of Van der Schuere, for example in the section on diphthongs and the treatment of pronunciation. The general judgment of Leroux and Scheurweghs is harsh: "[Hexham] did not realise that the amalgam he was producing must be a mixture with much incoherence and inconsistency. Therefore he could not have produced a great grammar, even if he had had the
necessary insight into the language he was describing. However, in view of the fact that he had no direct model to fall back on in describing Dutch grammar for English readers, and that as far as is known he had no training in lexicography or the compiling of grammars, his effort is in many ways creditable, as I hope to point out below, when comparing his work with that of Beyer and Hillenius.

The latter, like Hexham, used Van Heule "slavishly and extensively," and indeed long passages in both Hillenius and Hexham are no more than direct translations from Van Heule 1633. In this respect Beyer differs. He did not, on the whole, translate, he adapted. This could well be a product of his professional aptitude as a schoolmaster, though this did not seem to have helped Hillenius.

Beyer's approach is to digest his source, then to completely restructure it, picking out paragraphs here and there, combining sections, eliminating repetitions, unifying and editing. It is clearly the fruits of a long and intensive use of Van Heule's grammar in his school, where he would have had ample time to notice how the work could be streamlined to fit his own needs. In this he is even more ruthless than Hexham, and his grammar is little over half the length of the latter's. It is still undisputable based on Van Heule, and although he paraphrases most of what he borrows, it is relatively simple, if somewhat time-consuming, to find the original paragraph in the source. Again unlike Hexham, Beyer seems to have used no other sources, but like Hexham little is original to the writer himself. A great deal of what Hexham retains is omitted by Beyer, since the latter was aiming primarily at a much younger audience - his pupils - necessitating a simpler approach.

Not only was Beyer very selective in his choice of material, but he was evidently well acquainted with it, which is once more
consistent with his having used it as his school text until deciding to write his own. The order of the comments in the book seldom resembles that of Van Heule, though the overall course is the same, starting with spelling, progressing through nouns and adjectives, and ending with verbs. However, he gleans liberally from other sections where relevant, and to show just to what extent he did this, the succession of paragraphs of Van Heule used in Beyer is given at the end of this discussion. This paraphrasing rather than translating of the original material naturally involves a great many modifications, simplifications, clarifications etc. vis à vis Van Heule. These are too numerous, and mostly too minor (though rarely insignificant) to mention here.

Beyer and Van Heule 1633

First let me give an example of what Beyer borrowed directly:

Beyer p.110 De woorden die in het tweede geval in n
Van Heule p.55 De woorden die in het tweede Geval in M
Beyer eindigen, komen by haer geen by-woorden lijden:
Van Heule eyndigen, en komen by haer geen By-woorden lijden,
Beyer want men zegt in het tweede geval des Heeren, niet
Van Heule want men zegt in het tweede geval Des Heeren, niet
Beyer des grooten Heeren: alsoo ooc niet des zwakken
Van Heule Des grooten Heeren, also ooc niet Des swacken
Beyer menschen, des leevende Propheten: uit de zelve
Van Heule menschen, Des leevenden Propheten, uyt de zelve
Beyer reden schijnt te komen dat men niet zeggen
Van Heule reden schijnt het datmen niet zegghen en
Beyer mag, des goeden Godes.
Van Heule mach Des goeden godes.

The English (and French) versions are straight translations of this, though naturally do not show the directness of the borrowing as clearly.
Some of Beyer's amendments are telling. Van Heule (p. 3) writes that 'Enige geleerden achten dat de Byzwoorden van het Mannelic geslacht in Ë behoren te eyndigen', where Beyer writes that 'Enige achten dat het ledeke de in den Hoemer van 't eenvout des mannelijke en vrouwelijke geslachts in Ë behoort te eindigen' (p. 107). Most of the borrowings are much more freely rendered than these two examples, and occasionally Beyer inserts a comment of his own. His spelling system differs from Van Heule's, and from time to time he points out that either system is acceptable. Thus, after describing his use of final -k instead of -c, he adds that 'Enige evenwel meinen dat de k eigentlik dient om de woorden te beginnen en de c om se te eindigen; dese woorden zouden se schrijven, Koning of Konink; maer in't tegen deel lievlic: welke spellings ik niet zoude durven verwerpen' (p. 103). The 'Enige' here alludes to the rules contained in Van Heule's book.

It is impossible to enumerate all the original points and comments for the reasons stated above, but it is certainly possible to give a few notable examples, and to indicate trends, or rather the underlying motivations, since Beyer was a systematic worker. In this respect he shows a certain similarity to the editing tastes of Hexham, the material omitted by both falling into a few well-defined categories. All references to contemporary arguments concerning language variants are omitted by both compilers, though Hexham includes much that is not present in Beyer, notably the section on diphthongs which he took from Dafforne.

A vast amount of detail is omitted by both compilers, both in the form of exceptions to rules, irregularities, variants and such like (e.g. Van Heule pp. 32-33, 52ff), and in the many exact categorisations and subdivisions indulged in by Van Heule, for example in the derivative nouns (pp. 34-39, 42-46) and adverbs.
(pp.98-101). All these omissions can be gathered under the global heading detail, which both Hexham and Beyer rightly consider irrelevant to the purposes of their books. In some sections (notably the classification of adverbs) Hexham retains considerably more detail than Beyer; in fact in that specific section he has more subdivisions than Van Heule! Such detail was fully at home in Van Heule, being a scholarly treatise on the native tongue, but was quite out of place in a foreign language primer; the source work is as it were stripped to the barest bones.

Many sections in Van Heule lent themselves easily to this process. Beyer edited out the entirety of pp.102-144, and 152-168, covering en bloc the sections on punctuation, poetics, dialects; and the discussion of syntax (much of which is repetition, or rather modification, of what had already been said under accidence). Hexham retained the section on syntax, which accounts for his book being longer than Beyer's. A more detailed plan of what parts of Van Heule were used by the two writers is given below.

One striking and at first sight strange omission in Beyer is the paradigm of any of the verbs, and any comment on verbal conjugation. This is, however, fully justified by the nature of his book. Having already given the conjugation of the Dutch verbs as the translation of the French conjugations in the French grammar, there is absolutely no reason for him to repeat them here. Consequently he refers the reader back to that previous section (see p.138). He naturally retains the few comments (pp.139-144) peculiar to Dutch verbal usage.

These few categories alone cover almost all the omissions: derivations, verbs, syntax, poetics, and dialect features account for the dropping of almost 90 of Van Heule's original 168 pages.
Several aspects of Van Heule's usage were changed by Beyer. Like Hexham he abandons the four bulging system in favour of the traditional six-case system, and like Hexham he updates some of the comments on spelling and usage. For example Van Heule uses final _ç, as in 'ooc', and Beyer comments that 'The spelling which is made by ç, I could wish rather to have it made by k' (p.102). Some of Beyer's changes merely reflect new or modified theories, such as the use of 'mannelen' (men) in the nom.pl. (oblique cases only in Van Heule and Hexham), differentiation forms 'geene, gene' ('geen, gene' in Van Heule) for 'none, no', and 'yonder', and the rationalisation of the positioning of the apostrophe, where Van Heule felt 'het wel zo cierlic, ende de minste moeyte ... als men de verkorte woorden van de bystaende woorden, met een By-teyken afscheyt', giving 'k·achte, s'jaers' (I consider, annually) etc. (p.147). Beyer places the apostrophe where the letter is omitted: 'k·achte, 's·jaers' (p.100).

Hexham used the same system as Beyer, differing slightly from Van der Schuere and Dafforne who both used 'khebbe, 's·Mans' (I have, of the man), - i.e. joined together as one word.

Some of the changes reflect changes in the language: the substitution of 'het binnenste, het buitenste, het bovenste, het onderste' (the inside, outside, top, bottom, - p.118) for 'het binnen' etc. (Van Heule p.20), the alternative feminine inflexion of the participle 'gebondene' (bound - p.123) where Van Heule only allows 'gebonde' (p.26), the use of the article with certain town names, as occasionally found in 'het Athenen, het Ieruzalem, het Roomen' (according to Van Heule p.22), to which Beyer doubtfully adds 'nor these also perhaps' (p.121).

Some significant restructuring occurred in the categorisation of pronouns, where the complex oppositions of Van Heule (p.68-70) are simplified to the standard divisions of 'personal pronouns, Demonstratives, Possessives, Relatives, and Interrogatives' (p.130).
The rules for plural formation (p.112) are also streamlined, Van Heule being somewhat inelegantly structured. The ordered mind of the efficient schoolmaster is evident in Beyer's habit of rearranging Van Heule's lists of examples into alphabetical order (e.g. pp.113, 115).

There is apparently only one instance of confusion on Beyer's part: the alternative inflexions of the masc. nom. adjective 'de nieuwen of nieuwe mensch' (the new person) and similarly 'een goet of goede meester' (a good master) are felt by him to show that such words "seeme to be of the doubtful gender" (p.123-125). Van Heule had correctly realised that they were merely variant inflexions - 'eenige mannelicke woorden ...(konnen) twederleye By-woorden by haer ... lijden' ('some masculine words allow two forms of adjectives to be used with them' - p.28).

A possibly significant amendment occurs on page 98. Van Heule (p.7), in discussing sandhi-assimilation in 'dood-fliegen, af seggen', mentioned that 'tot verzoetinge der Silben, wort deze verzachtinge der Letteren, zeer dienstelic gebruykt, door welk oogmore de Hooch-duytschen en de Vriezen, de Z, D, ende de Y gemeynelic in Z, T en F veranderen, zeggende Zone, Toot, Vroom in plaetse van Zone, Doort, Vroom'. Beyer will have none of this: 'From [his] ... ariseth the unpleasing pronunciation of the Frisians, both of the v and the z, which they always utter as f and g, which is very offensive' (p.98). Not only does he narrow the field of vision by omitting the reference to German usage, but he thoroughly disapproves of such a pronunciation, whereas Van Heule is impartial, if not actually finding it pleasant!

Beyer, the provincial schoolmaster, lacks the breadth of vision and scientific objectivity of the mathematician and scholar Van Heule.

Line Hexham, Beyer adds relatively little to the original material, but he does give 'stiller, sneller' as alternative
comparative forms to "stilder, snelder" (quieter, swifter - p.129), and updates the spelling and pronominal usage: *gy* is universally used instead of *Du*. Beyer adds a note to the effect that the use of *gy* in the singular was influenced by French *voue* (p.132), which Van Heule does not mention.

Beyer was a little more tolerant of spelling variants. Where Van Heule mentions that "als naer T, K of C seene D volchzt zo verandert de D veeltiljs in T" (following T, K, or C often changes to T), and similarly Z becomes S, — both "in het spreken" (in speaking, - my italics, p.149), Beyer records that this happens "yea often also in writing" (p.98). Other spelling changes involve the (not fully consistent) substitution of -uw for -u and -w, as in "eeuwe, nieu" (century, new), the use of -ck instead of -c, as in "rijck" (rich), and some vowel differences. Beyer also introduces the use of accents to distinguish "ze from *gy* (shee)... but *ze* with an accent for *Oceen* (p.101). This accent could also be used on "the e derived from two other... as mee-klincker or *meklincker*, consonant, because it cometh from *medeklincker*" (p.103).

Some of Beyer's spelling agrees with Van Heule, such as the use of final -t in "woort, hant" (word, hand) etc., where Hexham has -dt. It must be borne in mind however that the situation with respect to the spelling of the various writers is extremely confused. Hexham and Van Heule recommend the same system, but Beyer modernises it. Yet all three in practice do not apply their recommended systems with anything even vaguely approaching consistency, and both Beyer and Hexham use systems at variance — in some respects radically — with the tenets of their own works. All three actually use different systems.

Some of the details omitted by Hexham are retained by Beyer, such as the alternative spelling *peirt* for *paerd* (horse, - p.103, Van Heule p.9), and the use of *den* in the masc.sing.nom.
before vowels (p.107, Van Heule p.31). The marginal comment on page 67 that die and deze are derived from de, rejected as superfluous by Hexham, is retained by Beyer (p.131).

Hexham's attitude to Van Heule's innovations

The various attempts at innovation or language reform in Van Heule had a mixed reception from Hexham. Some were dropped, such as the distinction of ons (us) from ons' (our) - the latter with apostrophe because of the inflected form onse and the former being invariable. Similarly Van Heule's tentative subjunctive forms hebbeën, zyën, wezeën (p.90, 91, 94, 95) are ignored, as is the suggestion of hım in the dative (p.73). Each of these is an attempt by Van Heule to differentiate homonyms: hebben could be indicative or subjunctive, hem accusative or dative. And each of these abortive attempts is jettisoned by Hexham. But that does not mean that all such attempts were ignored. Van Heule had been very impressed by the declension system of German articles (see especially p.50), with their distinctive forms for each case, gender and number. Such clarity he would like to see also in Dutch, and he suggested parallel differentiaational forms.

Although some of his reforms (such as him, hebbeën) would have involved the spoken language, the majority (including ons') were purely orthographical. This is true of his new forms for the articles with denn, derr (p.49-52). The former is dative plural to distinguish it from den in the masc.sing.acc., the latter is fem.sing.dat. to distinguish it from the gen.plural and the fem.sing.gen.. This differentiaational spelling pattern is transferred to the pronouns heurr, onzenn, onzerr, dienn, alenn etc. (p.73ff), but not to the adjectives, since 'denn goeden ...' was adequate.

Not only is this innovation kept by Hexham, but he also extends it by analogy to include dieserr, heurr-lieden, which are not found in Van Heule. It is thus a deliberate and conscious
retention. This could possibly be taken to show that such forms did enjoy some currency, or it may just mean that Hexham himself was convinced by Van Heule’s arguments. All references to these differentiation forms are edited out of the revised edition of Hexham’s grammar and dictionary undertaken by Daniel Manly in 1672-5.

One non-orthographical innovation which was dropped is the declension of words by buizing – i.e. the number of inflected forms, whereby den man (acc.) and (van) den man (abl.) are considered the same, since no new form is involved. This is too radical for Hexham, who substitutes the traditional six Latin cases, as Van Heule had used in his first edition.

Van Heule’s defence of du as second person singular is dropped by Hexham on the very good grounds that such usage was dead by 1648, except ‘in words of vilifying: as Du schelm, Thou rogue’. For Van Heule du and gy(ly) were the normal singular and plural forms, whereas for Hexham the forms are respectively shy and phylieden.

One very radical thought of Van Heule’s is totally ignored by Hexham (as by Beyer and all others) – namely the avoidance of double consonants by the consistent use of double vowels, using ‘Beeden, wijlen, zeegen; beden, wilen, zegen’ instead of (respectively) ‘Beden, wilen, zegen; bedden, willen, zeggen’ (p.149-150, marginal note). In his formulation of this elegant system (where only -en is the sign of the plural, e.g. ram ramen, raam ragen) Van Heule had been inspired by the French and Italian consonantal usage ‘waardoor eene uytnemende lichtickevt en zoethyet gebracht (wort)’.

Dover’s attitude to Van Heule’s innovations

The tentative innovations of Van Heule described above, mostly attempts at artificial differentiation of homonyms, are treated
by Beyer in almost the same way as by Hexham. **Hebbeën, zyën, wozën**, and **him** are dropped, **derr, denn, etc.** are kept, but **ons/ons**, rejected by Hexham, is retained by Beyer (p.134) - at least in theory - the comment is kept but his usage does not always conform, and **ons** is frequently used for **ons'** (e.g. p.133). Like Hexham Beyer makes analogical extensions of the **denn, derr** system when inserting his own tables, giving forms not to be found in the original, yet fully consistent with the rule (cf. his comment on p.133-134, not to be found in Van Heule)\(^{17}\).

**Hexham and Beyer**

As discussed above, the approach of these two adapters differs in many ways, though both have much the same aim: the moulding of a streamlined foreign language primer - in English in the case of Hexham, in English, French (and Dutch) in the case of Beyer - from a detailed treatise on the native language. It is interesting to compare the differences in their approach and the effect on the resulting work.

Both omit much the same sort of material, such as irregularities, anomalous inflexions, variants, derivation rules, dialect variants, historical developments, contemporary controversies etc., - all of which was placed under the comprehensive heading **detail**. With this in mind it is perhaps surprising to note that the pages of Van Heule used by the two adapters are by no means the same (see the table given below). Considerable passages used by the one are totally ignored by the other. Of the first 140 pages of Van Heule, Hexham omits pages 11, 23, 26-33, 45-46, 52, 55-58, 60, 99, 114, 130, 136-137, - only 23 pages. Of these same 140 sides Beyer omits pages 8-10, includes 11, omits 12-17, 31-33, 35-46, 48-52, 64, 66, 90-96, 99-140 - a total of almost 80 pages, plus a great many odd paragraphs. After Van Heule's page 140 Hexham uses nothing, but Beyer uses the section on loan words (144-145) and spelling.
variants (146-151), incorporating them in appropriate places in the material drawn from earlier chapters. The only material used fully by both writers is pages 18-22, 24-25 (adjective declensions, genders), and 67-86 (pronouns, types of verb) - a mere 27 pages; and up to p.140 only 11 pages of Van Heule are used by neither writer. This leaves about 102 pages used by only one of the two, and this is usually Hexham.

In view of these figures it is noticeable, remarkable even, that both works constitute comprehensive and largely adequate grammars, granted their limited aims. Given their difference in length Hexham naturally contains much not in Beyer, but this in no way affects the usefulness or adequacy of the latter. It is probably a tribute to Beyer's talent as a schoolmaster that he so skilfully constructs a work to fit his own requirements exactly, from so comprehensive a work as Van Heule's. It must also be borne in mind that Beyer was probably aiming at a substantially younger audience than Hexham, and so needed to concentrate more on the basic material.

The views of the two adapters vary somewhat, but on no occasion is this radical. Both prefer the six-case system which a foreign learner would be more acquainted with, both amend and update Van Heule's comments on punctuation and spelling, especially in the Manly revision of Hexham where the now totally irrelevant paragraph (Uu.v0) on the use of -c, -ch, -t, is dropped in its entirety; both reject Van Heule's hebbeSn forms, and, most significantly, both retain the denn, derr system inspired by German usage. Only Beyer retains ons/ons/, and only Hexham retains the differentiaational use of mani (nom.pl.) and mannen (oblique cases). Both retain the form den in the nom.sing. - Beyer as an alternative for both masculine and feminine, and Hexham as the normal masc. form. This latter usage caused Hexham's omission of Van Heule's discussion on the phenomenon - it was no longer relevant. The
new function of the works caused both writers to expand the treatment of verbs, by giving the paradigms so necessary to the foreign learner, though Beyer does not actually do so in the Dutch section.

In the compiling of his grammar Beyer seems to have used only Van Heule in the 1633 edition, which he had possibly used in his school, annotating his own modifications in situ. Hexham on the other hand performs very few alterations on Van Heule's text, but also used Dafforne (1627), and possibly also Van Heule's first edition (1625).

Conclusion

In their desire to compile a foreign language primer in English, Hexham had no model to adopt as basis, and Beyer had only Hexham, which work he either did not know or did not value. They were both forced therefore to use a native grammar, however unsuitable its approach, and adapt it to the new function. The later works of Richardson and the anonymous Dutch Tutor of 1658 preferred to canibalise Hexham. The only worthy grammar at hand was Van Heule, in the latest edition of 1633. In their efforts to edit the work the various writers employed widely differing tactics, Hexham and Millenius merely translating specified parts, Beyer paraphrasing and completely recasting such parts of the work as he felt indispensible. Each of them makes use of many different parts of the source material, but present, broadly speaking, fairly comprehensive grammars which are adequate to their purpose. Sometimes the results are not altogether as coherent as would be demanded in later times, but il faut juger des écrits d'après leur date. To a greater or lesser extent all update the comments of the source where appropriate, though often in different ways, for example they each have a different swelling system, and each in turn differs from Van Heule's. All three works are important evidence of the widespread use of Van Heule as the standard work on Dutch grammar during that period.
Van Heule's ideas therefore, if not his name, will have been known outside Holland. Beyer's work may have been known in France, though this is difficult to say, and the same holds for the other countries in which the few copies of his work are to be found. Hexham, the much more concise Tutor, and the much more common Hillenius and Richardson were certainly known and used in England (Hexham was only published as part of the dictionary). And although Van Heule in Holland would in all probability be (well-)known only to scholars, intellectuals, and literary figures (P.C. Hooft knew and admired it), all English speakers learning Dutch from a grammar would have had to use a work based on Van Heule, be it directly (e.g. Hexham or Hillenius) or indirectly (the Tutor), and would therefore possibly also have used some of the forms suggested by him. It is intriguing in this light to speculate on the reaction of contemporary Dutchmen on seeing derr, denn, onzerr, heurr-lieden etc. being used as "standard" Dutch by foreigners!

Judging from some of the more extreme forms used by these contemporary Dutchmen however, it is doubtful if they would have been oversurprised on seeing such forms. The same applies to any Frenchman who might have used Beyer. Beyer obviously had a far greater readership than his own school in mind, otherwise there would have been no point in including French and English versions of each grammar,—unless he was expecting to receive French or English pupils at his school! It is important to note moreover that in using his book as a school text in Holland, Beyer may have contributed to any tendency to use the differentiaitonal forms taken over from Van Heule.

For the purpose of comparison with Beyer, a table is given below of the route followed by Hexham on his journey through Van Heule. The route is simplified, not noting where odd paragraphs are
omitted, and the page numbers refer to the 1633 edition. Note especially the only two deviations from the straight line:


The somewhat more tortuous route followed by Beyer shows amply the different approach. It is necessary to proceed by page and paragraph since he rarely treats a page or section as a whole and not infrequently works his way through a section backwards:

2iii: 3ii, iv, v; 149i: 148viii, vii, vi, v; 7ii: 3i: 6iii: 7i.

The division of Van Heule into paragraphs cannot be done without subjectivity, but comparison of the texts should make clear which "paragraph" is meant. To anyone who can digest this plan it will be obvious that Beyer did not exactly follow the straight line adopted by Hexham!

John Gladhill
Footnotes


1a This is presumably Adriaen Huygontz. Beyer, who filled several functions in the magistrature, not of Schoonhoven, but of Rotterdam, between 1573 and 1589, including that of burgomaster in 1581, 1582, 1584, 1588 and 1589, as I am informed by R.A.D. Renting and C.R. Schoute of the Rotterdam and Schoonhoven Archives respectively, to whom I am indebted for this information. Adriaen Beyer died in 1594, leaving 6 children from his first marriage.

2 Oud Notarieel Archief 64, fol. 435.

3 Oud Notarieel Archief 57, fol. 772.

4 I am indebted to P.P.A. Vrolijk of the Gemeentelijke Archiefdienst in Dordrecht for this information.

5 This geographical dictionary of the Netherlands was published at Gorinchem, 1839-1851.


11 My italics

12 A classification by the number of possible different inflected forms, not by the number of cases: see later in the article.

13 'Just as aesthetically pleasing, and less trouble, if one separates the abbreviated words from those adjacent with a punctuation sign'.

14 N.b. for schof, schoven he also gives the meaning 'fourth part of a day', in addition to that given by W.J.H. Caron in the reprint of Van Heule's grammar in the Trivium series (No. 1 part 2, 1953); the word is related to English 'shift'.

15 'For the sweetening of the syllables this softening of the letters is used to great effect, for which purpose the Germans and the Frisians usually change z, ð, and v into s, t and f, saying Sone, Toot, Froom [Son, dead, pious] instead of Zone, Doot, Vroom'.

16 'Whereby an exceptional lightness and sweetness is introduced'. The same thought occurred to Garut Stuiveling in De Gids (1972), 170.
17 These forms are also found in Richardson's *Anglo-Belgica* of 1677, where he gives *haurn* as the gen.pl. (p. 99). This is almost certainly borrowed from Hexham, as Richardson also uses the diphthong/triphthong section absent in Van Heule but borrowed by Hexham from Dafforne. Hillenius does not use such forms. The *Dutch Tutor* of 1658, 1669, 1674 (reprinted 1970, Scalar Press No. 249; not to be confused with the *Dutch Schoolemaster* which it superseded) similarly uses Hexham as the source of its brief grammar, often quoting verbatim.

18 // indicates some of the most important places where material is used by Hexham which did not originate in Van Heule 1633.

19 **m** - a marginal note in Van Heule 1633, incorporated in the text of Beyer. a, b, indicate half-paragraphs, where such a subdivision is significant.