Jan Noordegraaf

HOOGVLIET VERSUS VAN GINNEKEN
Dutch linguistics around the turn of the century [1]

0. Introductory remarks

In 1915 the Dutch linguist and anthropologist Jan P. B. de Josselin de Jong (1886-1964) remarked that two factors had "shaken the firm belief in the correctedness of the principles of the "*junggrammatische* school, which until recently (had) governed the method of Indo-Germanic linguistics, in a rather worrying way" (1915: 87). First of all, linguists like Hugo Schuchardt (1842-1927) and Christianus Cornelius Uhlenbeck (1866-1951) had argued that several problems in Indo-European linguistics could not possibly be solved by the sole means of a comparative study within the language group concerned. A number of years later Uhlenbeck talked of the "vanity" of the theory "that was founded on merely one language family ...", the "one-sided and soulless theory of the neo-grammarians", who tried to solve the whole world of language with the help of sound laws and analogies. Where they have reached major findings, it has been "in spite of, not by virtue of their methodology" (Uhlenbeck 1918: 36). Secondly, "modern language-psychology" had also made an important contribution towards a more distanced and critical attitude regarding the neogrammarian framework. In this respect de Josselin de Jong (1915: 88) pointed to the work of Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920) and of Jacobus J.A. van Ginneken (1877-1945). It had already become clear in the 1890s that linguists in several West European countries were becoming more and more aware of the limitations of historical-comparative language research as it had been undertaken especially in Germany.

For Dutch linguistics, this period at the turn of the century is an interesting one. The term "Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands" (*ABN*, 'Common Standard Dutch') was introduced : the ideal of a standard spoken language was now considered feasible; proposals towards a spelling reform were made. Dialect research too went through an important development (cf. Hagen 1992); attempts also were made at introducing innovations in language teaching. Linguistic research in general was flourishing (cf. Romein 1967).

Where linguistic theory is concerned, a number of interesting events can be observed. In this contribution I would like to pay attention to a now lesser known Dutch linguist of the period, Jan Marius Hoogvliet (1860-1924). Dissatisfied with the situation in contemporary linguistics, he sought to introduce a form of non-historical linguistics that, in his view, was totally new and original, and in which non-Indo-European languages were emphatically involved. Hoogvliet's major work, *Lingua* (1903), was extensively discussed by Jac. van Ginneken; it prompted him to write his *Grondbeginselen van de psychologische taalwetenschap* (1904-1906), translated as *Principes de linguistique psychologique* (1907), in which he tried to surpass the theories of both his compatriot Hoogvliet and the German linguists Wilhelm Wundt and Hermann Paul. In this article I will go into the work of both Dutch linguists and the controversy that arose between them. In this way I hope to illustrate some aspects of the linguistic climate in the Netherlands around the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The structure of this article is as follows: after some general remarks about the Dutch situation in Hoogvliet's time, I will sketch Hoogvliet's life and work, concentrating especially on *Lingua*. Subsequently, I

---

1. Originally published in *Historiographia Linguistica*. 15 (1988): 207-238. The final version of this paper was written during my stay at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Studies at Wassenaar in the academic year 1987-1988. All quotations in Dutch have been translated into English.

will discuss van Ginneken's work and his reaction to Hoogvliet's approach. The aftermath of their conflict will also be briefly discussed. I will conclude with some remarks of a general nature.

1. Dutch linguistics 1875-1900: Some general remarks

Since the beginning of the latter half of the nineteenth century historical linguistics had gained a firm foothold in the linguistic curricula of the Dutch universities. This development was formally laid down in the new Higher Education Act of 1876 The doctorate in Dutch language and literature was instituted and to meet the exam requirements new chairs in linguistics were created. Because of this, Germanic linguistics became fully established as an important subject, and with it comparative-historical linguistic method.

   The younger Dutch linguists in this period felt themselves especially inspired by German linguistics, particularly by the work of the *Junggrammatiker*. It is, therefore, not surprising that Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte* (1880, 1920[5]) was obligatory reading for every Dutch linguist for many decades. In aid of teachers' training, a Dutch adaptation by P.J. van Malssen Jr. appeared in 1900, It was entitled *Het leven der taal inzonderheid dat van het Nederlandsch* ('The life of language, particularly of the Dutch language').

   Hermann Paul's (1846-1921) view on language was also the major example for the linguists associated with the periodical *Taal en Letteren* (1891-1906). This 'Taal-en-Letteren' movement was primarily a pedagogic movement, largely indigenous in origin, which aimed at reforming the teaching of the mother tongue (cf. Noordegraaf 1991a). Thus the living language was seen as central to its teaching, and to this end a drastic spelling reform was regarded as necessary. To justify their language-pedagogic postulates linguistically, members of *Taal en Letteren* often referred to the Neogrammarian tenets, especially such as were codified in Paul's *Prinzipien* (van Essen 1983: 53). The significance of Paul's influence can be seen, for instance, in the fact that the Slavist Nicolaas van Wijk (1880-1941), also a contributor to *Taal en Letteren*, published a school textbook in 1906, entitled *De Nederlandsche Taal* ('The Dutch Language'), that has been rather aptly characterized as a Dutch grammar following Paul's mould (van Haeringen 1954: 52). Another member of this circle, Roeland Anthonie Kollewijn (1857-1942), made far-reaching proposals for a simplification of Dutch spelling. He became the leader of a national movement which, incidentally, only saw most of its proposals finally realized in 1947. Kollewijn, who had become interested in linguistics after having read William Dwight Whitney's (1827-1894) *Language and the Study of Language* (1867), had studied at Leipzig. In *Taal en Letteren* he published translations of sections from Jespersen's *Progress in Language* (1894).[2]

   On the whole it can be said that in the last quarter of the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth century, Dutch linguistics was predominantly historically oriented. But the historical-comparative approach was not appreciated equally positively in each individual quarter. In his introduction to *Taal en taalstudie* (1877-1881), the Dutch version of Whitney (1867), its editor, the Dutch anglist Jan Beckering Vinckers (1821-1891) reminded that not so long ago it was still considered a ridiculous show of pedantry - "ein Attentat gegen den heiligen Geist der Philologie" (Wundt) - in circles of Dutch classicists that the distinguished Danish scholar Johan Nicolai Madvig (1804-1886) called upon the use of Sanskrit to explain certain linguistic phenomena in Latin and Greek. In the 1870s, the famous Leiden Greek scholar Carel Gabriël Cobet (1813-1889) turned against several of the "homines comparativi". He put the findings of their "nova Etymologiarum ars" on a par with the results of the etymology practised by Alexandrian scholars (cf. Beckering Vinckers 1877: iv).

---

2. A good survey of this period is given by van Essen in his excellent monograph on Kruisinga; cf. van Essen 1983: 34-71. The Dutch Whitney editions are the following: *Language and the Study of Language* was adapted from the third edition of 1870 by Jan Beckering Vinckers as *Taal en taalstudie: Voorlezingen over de gronden der wetenschappelijke taalbeoefening* (Eerste Serie: Haarlem: Erven F. Bohn 1877; 2nd ed., 1884; Tweede Serie: ibid., 1881). Note that only the first seven lectures have been translated into Dutch. *The Life and the Growth of Language* (Whitney 1875) was translated by G. Velderman as *De taal in haar leven en ontwikkeling geschetst* (Arnhem: P. Gouda Quint 1879).

But besides the old-fashioned philologists who wanted to have nothing to do with the comparativists, there were also Dutch linguists who had other, more theoretically founded objections to this exclusively historical approach, which was the prevailing mode of thought. Already in the 1850s the Dutch classical scholar Hendrik Jan Nassau (1791-1873) had pointed to the one-sidedness of German historical linguistics;[3] in the 1890s this was done by Cobet's student J.M. Hoogvliet.

2. Jan Marius Hoogvliet (1860-1924)

2.1 The life and times of J.M. Hoogvliet

Following his study at Leiden grammar school, Hoogvliet enrolled as a classics student at Leiden University in 1878. In 1885 he obtained his doctorate with a classical philological dissertation entitled *Studia Homerica*. Thereafter, he worked as a classics teacher in several places. In 1902 he permanently established himself in The Hague als private teacher in modern and classical languages. Hoogvliet, who remained a bachelor, died there in 1924.

Hoogvliet was a polyglot and an enthusiastic traveller, with a particular love for Scandinavia. A fervent pacifist, he attended several world peace conferences, in which his knowledge of languages stood him in good stead. This became apparent, for instance, in 1910, when he addressed a large audience at the Stockholm world peace conference in excellent Swedish. In 1903 he was appointed 'privaat-docent' (external unsalaried lecturer) in Scandinavian languages at the University of Utrecht.

Hoogvliet's relations with Scandinavian countries date back to his student days. In the spring of 1880 he inquired in a letter written in Danish to the Copenhagen emeritus, Johan Nicolai Madvig (1804-1886; see on him Hauger 1994), after the career opportunities for a student of comparative linguistics in Denmark, Sweden or Norway. In a reply, dated 23 April 1880, also written in Danish, Madvig first of all complimented the Dutch student on his command of Danish. Giving a short survey of the state of historical-comparative linguistics in Scandinavian universities he remarked:

> You may conclude from the above-mentioned that, at this moment, the three
> Scandinavian countries do not offer a promising perspective for a young man who prefers
> to study comparative linguistics and wants to make a living out of it.[4]

A few years later, Hoogvliet had the opportunity to meet Madvig in person. Provided with a letter of introduction by Cobet he visited Madvig a number of times when travelling in Denmark and Sweden in the summer of 1882. It was, incidentally, not surprising that someone like Hoogvliet should seek contact with

---

3. In his extensive review of Matthias de Vries's (1820-1892) Leiden inaugural lecture Nassau (1854) gave a highly critical dissertation on the German school in general and on Jacob Grimm in particular. In 1853, de Vries was appointed professor of Dutch language and literature at Leiden University; it was Jacob Grimm who was his venerated guide in linguistics, with whom he corresponded regularly, and whom he visited several times. However, according to Nassau comparative historical grammar did not encompass the whole of the study of language. He argued in favour of the study of the living language and maintained that the study of meaning was more important than "the etymological side of language". Referring to Madvig he rejected the idea of language as an independent organism. See Noordegraaf 1985: 335-37, 1993: 304-308 for details.

4. "De vil af det her anförte se, at de tre skandinaviske Lande for Øieblikket ikke frembyde nogen lovende Udsigt for en ung Mand, der fortrinsviis dyrker den komparative Sprogvidenskab og paa dette Studium vil bygge en ydre Existens". This letter is in the Hoogvliet collection of the Gemeente Archief at The Hague; it is not mentioned in E. Spang-Hanssen, J.N. *Madvig-bibliografi* (København: Det kongelige bibliotek, 1966) nor are Hoogvliet's letters to Madvig.

this Danish classical scholar, for Madvig was not a stranger to the Dutch world of learning, including undergraduates. In 1840, he had been appointed member of the Royal Netherlands Institute of Sciences and Arts, and many a Dutch student was to learn Latin and Greek from Madvig's school grammars, which by then had already been translated into Dutch. An old man, Madvig visited Leiden University in 1875 at its tercentenary, where he met, among others, his long-time opponent, the distinguished Greek scholar, Carel Gabriël Cobet (1813-1889), and where he was hailed by the Leiden student community (see van Proosdij 1954).

Hoogvliet's interest in comparative linguistics, as is evident from his correspondence with Madvig, did certainly not derive from Cobet. In the preface to his *Studia Homerica* Hoogvliet thanks, among other people, Henri (= Johan Hendrik Caspar) Kern (1833-1917), the distinguished Sanskrit scholar and expert in many non-Indo-European languages. Besides the study of Greek "grammatica comparata plurimum semper mihi arridebat", Hoogvliet (1885: vi) writes; in this, Kern always was "praesto [...] quoties in difficilis scientiae spinosis initiis haerebam". Also in later years, Hoogvliet kept up contacts with this Leiden 'mahaguru', a polyglot who had the urge to learn more and more exotic languages. Kern's student C.C. Uhlenbeck (1918: 36-37) later characterized him as having been averse to the teachings of the Neogrammarians; it would not do "to solve the whole life of language in sound laws and analogies". In essence, everything in language is psychic; Kern never doubted this.

Whatever Hoogvliet may have learned from Cobet, Kern, and other teachers such as the Dutch scholar Matthias de Vries (1820-1892) and the Old Germanic scholar Pieter Jakob Cosijn (1840-1899), we also know that he studied Whitney's *Language and the Study of Language* (1867) and Max Müller's *Lectures on the Science of Language* (1861-1864) in his student days. I suppose that he was also familiar with Madvig's views, possibly through the latter's *Kleine philologische Schriften* (1875), of which a copy had been donated by the Danish *Altmeister* to the Leiden university library on his visit there. In Hoogvliet's later work, however, references to these and other linguistic sources are almost totally absent. It has always been his claim that he came to his theoretical insights at an early stage and completely independently (cf., e.g., Hoogvliet 1903: v). Not only did he express his views regarding language and language teaching enthusiastically within the Leiden debating society *Literis Sacrum*, where his fellow members included later professors such as the Dutch scholar Albert Kluyver (1858-1938) and the classical scholar Derk Christiaan Hesseling (1859-1941), but also in the Dutch press. This may be illustrated by a somewhat curious episode from his student days: his polemic with the adherents of the constructed language Volapük.

2.2 Volapük, the 'World Language'

Towards the end of the 1880s the German pastor Johann Martin Schleyer (1831-1912) presented his new universal language Volapük, to the world. This "world language" was supposed to succeed where all other schemes had failed. The Volapük movement experienced a spectacular growth, spreading rapidly from Germany into Austria, France, and the Low Countries (Large 1985: 67). Among Dutch linguists, however, it received little support.[5]

In August 1884 the First Volapük International Congress was held in Friedrichshafen on Lake Constance, and much attention was paid in the Dutch press by supporters and opponents to the idea of

---

5. In 1888 the subject 'universal language' was discussed in the Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences, and Volapük in particular came up in the discussions. It was proposed to set up a committee to examine the advisability of a universal language. Kern refused to be appointed member of the committee. He did not believe in the use of a world language and called Volapük a piece of rubbish. According to him, one better had to choose the 'low-Malayan language', because it was very easy to learn. One month later the members of the committee, among whom Matthias de Vries and Pieter Jakob Cosijn, declared themselves against the plan to participate in creating a universal language and against acceptance of Volapük (cf. *Verslagen en Mededeelingen van de Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen* 3e reeks, deel 5, 223, 271-72. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller, 1888). Afterwards Schleyer complained about the resistance his ideas were met with in the Netherlands. Cf. Noordegraaf 1988: 178-179.

world language. Hoogvliet, too, intervened in the discussion. Inspired by what Max Müller had written on this subject in his well-known *Lectures on the Science of Language* (see Hoogvliet 1884b: 9 for pertinent quotations; cf. Müller 1913,II: 52, 69), he published an extensive letter to the editor in the daily *Het Nieuws van den Dag* in October 1884, in which he expounded his views on the matter in general. First of all, he stated that it would be better to let things develop in a natural way. In language itself a leveling process is present and with a closer contact between nations, a common language will develop of its own accord, probably English or French. Besides this, Hoogvliet raised an objection of a more fundamental nature: the essence of language cannot be imitated. Language may be a product of nature, but it is intangible and invisible. The idea of a constructed language was based, in his view, on a mistaken conception of language, the result of our "drilling method" in teaching, which shows nothing of the true nature language but only a vague inkling given in the grammar books.

Hoogvliet's comments provoked reactions from various sides. When his criticism was presented to Schleyer himself, the latter appeared not to be impressed. To a Dutch devotee he wrote: "Sagen Sie gütigst solchen aufgeblasenen Kritikastern, sie sollten auch zuerst nahezu 2 Menschenalter hindurch unausgesetzt Sprachstudien betreiben, bevor sie sich aufs hohe Rosse kindischer Kritik setzen" (cf. Muller 1888: 111). In another paper, which appeared shortly afterwards in the weekly *De Amsterdammer*, Hoogvliet expanded his arguments. An artificial language could only be succesful, he claimed, if it succeeded in reproducing the essence of language in its entirety, and this was hardly possible, since "language *does not exist otherwise* than in the use of it" (Hoogvliet 1884b: 9). The most essential separation between individual languages was to be seen in sentence structure and expression. This difference was caused by a different generation of thoughts, and it was here that the difficulty of learning a foreign language lies. Learning the principal words and word forms was rather easy and might be a matter of no more than a couple of days. The attractiveness of the new world language seemed to be that there were no native speakers of Volapük who could determine the correctness of a phrase in that particular language.

Several years later, Hoogvliet would emphatically state that the "world language lunacy" had originated from a wrong conception of language in general. The "volapük bacillus has come into being in an atmosphere of a theory of pure elements, an atmosphere merely of declensions and conjugations without meaning or function" (Hoogvliet 1889b: 65). As a *remedium paratum* Hoogvliet (ibid.) recommended an "atmosphere of undiluted theory of function", in which the volapük bacillus would succumb within a few seconds. In his view it was syntax that is the most important part of grammar; the character of a language lies more in its particular way of expressing a particular thought than in its forms and sounds. Everything that concerns single words, he said, was lexicological detail and did not belong to grammar proper. The real grammar of a language, i.e., the facts that are qualities of the language structure as a whole, could be considered on the basis of two or three random pages of literature (cf. Hoogvliet 1889a: 53).

From this episode we can not only conclude that Hoogvliet was an eager polemist - which he remained for the whole of his life -, but also that his views regarding language and linguistics had reached full expression by 1884.

2.3 Hoogvliet's linguistic views

2.3.1 Introduction

Although Hoogvliet published on purely classical-philological subjects a number of times after having received his doctorate, it is clear that from an early stage on his interest was aimed at questions of a general theoretical nature and their applications to the teaching of language. In the expounding of his ideas a remarkable continuity becomes apparent. For instance, number 28 of the 35 "stellingen", points to be defended, added to his doctoral dissertation, is devoted to language typology. It reads: "Between analytic and synthetic languages there is no essential difference to be found in its nature" (1885: 83). It is a thesis he would only elaborate on 18 years later (cf. Hoogvliet 1903: 172-174).

Stelling number 33, reads as follows:

> The only unmistakable touchstone for the judging of extinct languages is the analogy with the living ones. No single linguistic rule should be included in an ancient language which cannot be elucidated by several analogous examples from the languages existing at present. (1885: 84)

In my view this is an application of the "uniformitarian principle", and it means that for Hoogvliet priority lay with language as it was in reality, not as it "may have possibly been in ancient times", and certainly not as it "pleased some grammarian to represent it" (Hoogvliet 1889b: 68). He acknowledged (ibid.) that the essence and character of a language might be explained more clearly by adding comparative remarks now and again.

Hoogvliet also tried to apply his theoretical insights to his teaching. In 1888 his *Proagoon. Eenvoudige handleiding tot de studie der Grieksche taal* ('an elementary guide to the study of Greek') was published. The system put forward in this book he later applied to other languages (Latin, French, English, Dutch, Sanskrit, Gothic). Most of the language textbooks he published in the years after this can be related to this "handbook of general linguistic knowledge", *Lingua* (1903), in which his method is elevated to a learning method which he believed could be applied to the acquisition of all languages.

2.3.2 Hoogvliet's *Grondbeginselen*

In 1895 Hoogvliet published part of his 1903 handbook in a preliminary version to gain financial support for making the publication of the entire work possible. The title of this brochure of 40 pages was *Grondbeginselen der Algemeene of Univerzeele spraakleer* ('Principles of general or universal grammar'). Twenty five different languages, including Turkish, Chinese, Japanese and Sanskrit, formed the basis of his research and he hoped, within some fifteen to twenty years, to also include "ways of talking of the *uncivilized* nations" in his "general scheme of language". The *Grondbeginselen* in its final form would cover some two hundred and fifty pages. After this, "eight *concentrated grammars* of *selected languages*" would follow, each with a lenght of some twenty five to forty pages. The principal rules of the grammars of each of these languages would be "outlined concisely and clearly in *a single terminology*, according to *one stable system of order* in complete accordance with the principles developed in the body of the book" (Hoogvliet 1895: 4).

Hoogvliet claimed to have aimed in all of his linguistic writings up to that point at freeing "the science of general or comparative linguistics *of the German slave yoke*".

> Which of you, Dutch linguists, will join this good but troublesome fight! Which of you will help to build a *completely unbiassed* science that does not smell of Germany in everything ! - Englishmen, Russians, Danes and Swedes will probably all be our allies! (1895: 5)

Anti-German sentiments pervade his preface and his pursuit of a "new, entirely *independent, original, non-German science of language*" (1895: 7) also becomes evident from the contents of the illustrative chapter he included in this prepublication version, as he thought it to be most characteristic of the projected work as a whole. In that chapter, "Begrippen in woordgedaante" ('Concepts in the shape of words'), Hoogvliet tries to come up with a classification of the parts of speech that is valid for all languages. In his *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, Hermann Paul had, as Hoogvliet (1898: 123) later sneeringly commented, evaded this question by claiming that a logical classification of the parts of speech would always prove to remain impossible: "Der Versuch, ein streng logisch gegliedertes System aufzustellen ist überhaupt undurchführbar", Paul (1898: 327) writes when discussing "Die Scheidung der Redeteile". Hoogvliet blames Paul for "laziness in thinking" and refers to his own classification as proof that a fully satisfactory solution to this problem has been found.

Under the title of "Een algemeene spraakleer" ('A general grammar'), his college friend Albert Kluyver wrote an appraisal of the *Grondbeginselen*, in which he reminded the readers of how Hoogvliet went his own way already as a student. An astute observer, Kluyver tries to characterize Hoogvliet's position within contemporary linguistics in the following terms:

The forms of language are phenomena of an historical order - that is the theory with which the present generation has been brought up [...]. But another way of looking at language is also possible and exists, although it receives less attention from contemporary scholars. One may choose the forms of one particular language in one particular period as the subject of one's studies and raise the question of how these forms, analysed into their elements, relate to the elements of thought, be it that one simply considers language as an expression of thought, or, in Condillac's theory, as "a method to analyse thought". This study was practised in the last century and then one also tried to rise above the particular qualities of some particular languages [...]. In this way one arrived at the "grammaire générale" or "grammaire universelle", and it is this name that the title of the work to be published by Mr Hoogvliet reminds us. (Kluyver 1895: 274)

In this context I would like to point to some other remarks by Hoogvliet himself.

At a conference speech given in 1898 Hoogvliet loudly hailed the new "phonetic direction" in linguistics. While previously language was considered to be something written, spoken language was now taken as the starting point for linguistics. Hoogvliet mentions Henry Sweet (1845-1912), Otto Jespersen (1860-1943), Paul Passy (1859-1940), Wilhelm Viëtor (1850-1918) and others as pioneers. The insight that language does not consist of letters, but of sounds, was seen as an important step forward, but it was hardly sufficient. Sounds in themselves were interesting, but what was more important was, briefly, all that cannot be seen in language: "Everything that is *thought* and *soul* in language we personally consider more important and precious than any other matter that falls within the competence of the study of language" (Hoogvliet 1898: 120-121). He deplored the fact that in linguistic works the mental factors of language were too often overloooked; in his own work he strived for a description of language phenomena that would do more justice to "the psychic element in language" (1898: 121).

2.3.3 Hoogvliet's *Lingua* (1903)

The year 1903 saw the publication of Hoogvliet's major work, *Lingua*. The theory advanced in the 176 pages of this book, is the summa of what he had been working on since the early 1880s. *Lingua* is an example of a general grammar containing an outline of the psychological underpinning, a grammar for all languages in the world. It is its aim

> to provide a certain sort of linguistic *insight*, which enables one to recognize all details in the grammars of individual languages as temporary modifications of something which belongs to the general characteristics of human thought and feeling and may, therefore be found everywhere, in one form or another. (Hoogvliet 1903: i)

Hoogvliet tried to develop a system in which all types of languages, living and extinct, Indo-European and non-Indo-European, civilized and uncivilized, could be classified. Too often only Indo-European languages had been drawn into the discussion, Hoogvliet said; he argued that he had tested his system on all points against the grammars of a number of non- Indo-European languages. Moreover, Hoogvliet strived to make his system not only philosophical and logical and psychological, but "in a certain sense also *physical* and even *mathematical*" (1903: i). In this way he sought to establish a new science: in additon to historical-comparative linguistics he wanted to introduce a "general anthropological-comparative study of language", which found the way imperfectly paved by its older sister, historical-comparative linguistics. The non-historical study of language had a right to exist beside the historical one, Hoogvliet claimed; it was no less scientific than the other (1903: vi). He also thought there was a practical advantage attached to his work: whoever studied it, would be able to learn the grammar of any given language from a book of no more than twenty to thrirty pages. All that remained would be the matter of memorizing; as Hoogvliet said: "The system of concepts *will once and for all be handled for all languages* by perusing this general grammatical textbook" (1903: iii), a claim also made in tradition general grammar.

Like Gaul, *Lingua* consists of three parts. The first part, "De denkende mensch" ('Thinking man', 7-43), offers a concise psychology, "im wesentlichen eine teilweise originale Darstellung der psychologischen Grundlagen der Sprache, unter Berücksichtigung der neueren Forschungen von Paul, Wundt u.a." (Golling 1904: 1006). It may be seen as proof for the general scientific probability of his theory of language; and it is this theory that is his primary concern. The second part (44-107) describes human language with its stock of words and sentences. Especially the classification of the parts of speech is extensively treated. With regard to this classification the Dutch scholar Adriaan Barnouw (1904: 192) noted:

> Maßstab für seine [Hoogvliet's] Einteilung ist ausschliesslich die Funktion, welche die einzelnen Begriffe in dem vollständigen Gedanken erfüllen, ohne die mindeste Rücksicht auf historisches Wissen. In diesem Abschnitte entfaltet sich Hoogvliets Originalität unter grosser Scharfsinn.

By introducing a purely "logical" classification of the parts of speech, irrespective of incidental characteristics of form of the individual languages and based on some variant of "Vermögenspsychologie", Hoogvliet believes that he had refuted Paul's view that a classification, valid for all languages, would be impossible. The third part (108-176) deals with grammar in the stricter sense, i.e., conjugation, declension, gender etc. Here Hoogvliet expounds his theory of what he calls "woordstukjes" ('word bits'). The common view was that the forms of language were historically analysable only, but psychologically indivisible sediments of earlier creative periods of language growth (cf. the reviews by Vollgraff 1903, Dèr Mouw 1903: 1). Against this traditional view Hoogvliet poses the hypothesis that they are still construed by speaker and hearer out of "stem" and "word bits", which he calls "morphomores" later on (cf. 1910: 39; 1911: 325; 1925: 55). Morphomores comprise the endings of declension and conjugation; they only differ from "independent words" in a lesser degree of awareness on the part of the language user. For the fully conscious, slow thought they no longer exist, only for the elusive half-conscious thought that precedes thinking in forms of language. A proces of amalgamation takes place: the stem which expresses the "representation" and the morphomore which expresses the "relationship" are always connected by means of a mental synthesis.

Hoogvliet's method operates as follows. He starts with the assumption that, in the utterance of thoughts by means of language, the human brain operates in essentially the same way for all ages and individuals. Despite the vast variety in language, there is a certain unity of structure. To be able to expose this, to be able to analyse thought in this particular respect, Hoogvliet analyses language, in particular the structure of the word. He dissects it and seeks to determine the meaning of the stem, the seat of the principal meaning, and of the affixes that may be observed with it. The "morphomores" have a meaning that remains the same in itself and is independent. If one understands them, the prerequisite has been fulfilled to understand the whole language (cf. Hesseling 1924: 91).

As I mentioned above, the "morphomores" are independent entities only at the level of half-conscious, elusive thought. Words exist at another level of consciousness, the fully conscious, slow, thought; at that level the morphomores have merged into entities of a higher rank (cf. Hoogvliet 1903: 110). This theory is largely demonstrated by means of examples from Dutch, but material from other languages is also taken into consideration.

Further clarification of Hoogvliet's views may be offered. As he sees it, variable words, like the verb, consist of a stem, to which two to five word bits may be added; these additions express a "temporary additional meaning". These morphomores, i.c. inflectional morphemes concerning tense, person etc., appear in a fixed order before or after the stem according to a universal formula (cf. Hoogvliet 1903: 133), although they need not all be present simultaneously. Thus, the Greek word λελÜσοιτο (lèluzòjtò) can be analysed as follows: λÜ is the stem, and the other elements (λε, σο, ι, τ, ο) are word bits or morphomores; at the level of 'deep structure' they have an independent meaning.

Lingua is, in many respects, a "peculiar book" (Vollgraff 1903). All grammatical distinctions in all languages of the world, for instance, can, according to Hoogvliet, be visualized without exception by simple line drawings; a number of them are also printed in the book. In this way, he claims, it is possible to transform the "mismash" of very heterogeneous linguistic data into "one single coherent whole" (1903: 65) or, in other words, to achieve significant generalisations. As I cannot enter into a detailed discussion of

other peculiarities of *Lingua* - and they are numerous - here, I will limit myself to a few brief comments. First, Hoogvliet assumes that we never learn the forms of declension and conjugation as a whole, but that these forms arise anew in speaker and hearer on every single occasion. The genesis of language forms takes place individually and psychologically "thousands, yea, millions of times" (1896: 7). This seems to me to be an application of the uniformitarian principle, on which one of the theses added to his dissertation was also based.

Second, Hoogvliet's work with the morphomores reminds one of the way in which words are construed in Volapük (cf. Large 1985: 64 sqq.). It seems clear to me now why Hoogvliet turned sharply against Volapük: such a constructed language would be superfluous if the same could be achieved with the help of natural languages, if these can be learned in an easy manner. It is evident that Hoogvliet completely put his trust in natural language, of which classical Greek seemed to him to be the most ideal representation (cf. Hoogvliet 1894: 574).

The theory of morphomores also gives him the opportunity to put the typological differences between languages into perspective. The difference between analytic, synthetic, monosyllabic and agglutinative languages is largely apparent; this classification is mainly based on spelling. The only difference is that in some languages the *woordstukjes* are "screwed more tightly and in others more loosely". But that is a gradual difference, not one in character and essence (1903: 173-174).

As usual Hoogvliet does not give any references. The only book he mentions as a source (in 1895) is *Anfangsgründe der chinesischen Grammatik* (1883) by Georg von der Gabelentz (1840-1893). *Lingua* itself, however, is "to a large extent" (1903: iv) a reaction to Paul's *Prinzipien*, especially as far as his classification of the parts of speech is concerned. Also, in direct opposition to Paul, he forwards the idea that a non-historical view of language need "hardly be less scientific" than the historical view of language (1903: vi; cf. Paul 1898: 19). With this, we touch upon an important characteristic in Hoogvliet's work: we may call it mainly synchronic in character, as did Hendrik Josephus Pos (1898-1955) in as many words in his course in general linguistics during the academic year 1928-29. In those lectures,[6] Pos, who was then, among other things, professor of general linguistics at the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam, paid ample attention to Hoogvliet's *Lingua*. Pos remarked that what Hoogvliet practised was "statistical analysis"; with this term Pos made a link between Hoogvliet and Saussure. I do not know yet whether it actually was Madvig who had a profound influence on the development of Hoogvliet's linguistic thought in the early 1880s, but I think it is safe to conclude that Hoogvliet endorsed Madvig's statement that "die *Fertige Sprache* mit ihren existirenden Formen die wesentliche Aufgabe ist" and that

> die Gültigkeit und Wahrheit des Wortes nicht in dem liegt wovon es hergekommen ist, sondern in dem was es in dem Bewusstsein der Besitzer der Sprache geworden ist. (Madvig 1843: 17)

I do not know any other Dutch linguist in the last quarter of the nineteenth century who occupied himself synchronically in such a conscious way as Hoogvliet.

2.3.4 The reception of *Lingua*

Hoogvliet's work was generally not treated unsympathetically. The German linguist Ludwig Sütterlin (1863-1934) discovered in *Lingua* several views similar to his own (cf. Sütterlin 1907: vii); other scholars, like H.J. Pos, found interesting analyses in it. Furthermore, after having referred to the medieval *grammatica speculativa*, Joseph Golling noted in his concluding paragraph

---

6. Pos's lecture notes can be consulted at the Universiteitsbibliotheek Amsterdam. It is not generally known that Pos was not only a linguist and a philosopher, but also an expert in the field of the history of linguistics. As his lecture notes show, from 1924 until 1930 he gave a course on the history of linguistics each year. His 1930-31 and 1931-32 courses at the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam deal with the views of modern linguists (Paul, Wundt, Vendryes and others). Cf. Noordegraaf 1990, 1991b.

dass eine Universalgrammatik auf solch breiter Grundlage wie die vorliegende noch nicht
unternommen wurde und diese daher das nicht ganz unberechtigte Misstrauen, das man bisher
solchen Arbeiten entgegengebracht hat, wohl zu erschüttern geeignet ist. (Golling 1904: 1008)

The book did, however, call forth all kinds of objections, also from some of Hoogvliet's old friends. I will
mention only two such reactions here.

The Dutch linguist, poet and philosopher Johan Andreas Dèr Mouw (1863-1919) had devoted a whole
book to Hoogvliet's linguistic method in 1900, because he was of the opinion that in the theoretical-
scientific views of his friend he had found an effective means to reform the teachings of the classical
languages. Dèr Mouw was one of the few who took Hoogvliet's views seriously (cf. Fresco 1987) and he
was the only one who extensively tried to defend them. He reacted to the publication of *Lingua* with an
extensive review (Dèr Mouw 1903), which, however, remained unpublished. Although he praised
Hoogvliet calling him a genius and an original thinker in the concluding paragraph, he also expressed sharp
criticism. The philosophical bases of Hoogvliet's method are not considered sound: among other things,
epistemological and psychological questions are mixed up. Dèr Mouw showed more praise for the second
part of the book; he considers a succes Hoogvliet's attempt to come to a purely "logical" classification of
words that is completely independent of form.

Kluyver, whom we have mentioned earlier (section 2.3.2) concentrated on other aspects. An historical
linguist, he preferred to leave the first chapter to the psychologists. He did not seem to be convinced by the
chapter on the parts of speech: one always comes to the realization, he claimed, that a process is going on,
since in none of its expressions can life be described in a rigid system. Furthermore, he had some criticism
on Hoogvliet's observations concerning historical and comparative matters. Having asked himself
rhetorically whether Hoogvliet has reached his goal, he felt compelled to conclude: "While I have every
regard for Dr. H's talents, I do believe he expects too much of his book" (Kluyver 1903: 362).

The most extensive and devastating reaction, however, came from someone who was still a student
when *Lingua* was published: Jacobus van Ginneken.

3. Van Ginneken's critique of Hoogvliet

3.1. J.J.A. van Ginneken S.J. (1877-1945)

When Jacobus Joannes Antonius van Ginneken went to study at Leiden University in 1902 he was already
25 years old, having been educated at several Roman Catholic training colleges. Seven years earlier he had
entered into the Society of Jesus. When his superiors, who were little impressed by his exuberant, romantic
poems, had told him to concentrate on linguistics, he became the "most brilliant student of the brilliant
Uhlenbeck" (Heeroma 1968: 79). In 1907 he received his doctorate - cum laude - on the dissertation
Principes de linguistique psychologique, a translated adaptation of *Grondbeginselen van de psychologische taalwetenschap*,
which had appeared in two parts in 1904 and 1906. It received ample attention abroad, but was met with
less appreciation by his brethren (Brom 1955: 274).

When the Leiden chair of Dutch linguistics became vacant in 1915, van Ginneken seems to have been
among the *papabiles*. The situation, however, did not admit an appointment, as Nicolaas van Wijk wrote to
him from Leiden; his membership of the Societas Jesu might also have met with resistance. In 1919 van
Ginneken was passed over again for an appointment at the Municipal University of Amsterdam. According
to some he was an anti-Semite and an anti-socialist and therefore not considered suitable for the position.
In 1923 he was appointed professor of Dutch language and literature, comparative Indo-European
linguistics and Sanskrit at the recently founded Catholic University of Nijmegen. He remained there until
his death in 1945.

Several years after he had received his doctorate, van Ginneken published a work in which he
approached language from a more sociological angle, the *Handboek der Nederlandsche taal* ('Handbook of the
Dutch language') of 1913-14, of which only two out of the ten planned volumes appeared. In this larg-scale
description of the "sociological structure of the Dutch language" he felt himself especially inspired by the

leading French linguist Antoine Meillet (1866-1936). Around 1926 he came to the conviction that sound changes were not only psychological, but that some were based on heredity. In his mind he considered a "van Ginneken's law" alongside Grimm's law and Verner's law. Consciously going back to biology, "after Schleicher's example", he was of the opinion that "behind and underneath the psychological technique of sound tendencies a biological factor was hiding, which was worth observing in its capricious and mighty preference" (van Ginneken 1929: 22). His attempt to apply the laws of Mendelian genetics to linguistics, however, "found little response in Prague or, for that matter, in any other linguistic quarters" (Vachek 1968: 10; see van der Stroom 1995 for details).

Less well-known are the activities he developed in the period 1919-24 within the so called "significs movement", for which the Dutch poet Frederik van Eeden (1860-1932) had taken the initiative a few years earlier. Van Eeden was a friend of Victoria Lady Welby (1837-1912), the author of *What Is Meaning?* of 1903. Together with van Eeden and the mathematicians Luitzen E.J. Brouwer (1881-1966) and Gerrit Mannoury (1867-1956) van Ginneken held "signific dialogues" about the problems of human understanding (cf. Noordegraaf 1980: 52-56; Schmitz 1990). In his dissertation he had already referred to earlier "significs" work by van Eeden (cf. van Ginneken 1907: 239).

His last publication, which appeared posthumously in 1946, was *Het mysterie der menschelijke taal* ('The mystery of human language'). In the course of the years, human language had become a mystery to him in which he saw God's image reflected. With this the circle closes: starting from a prophesying romanticism, van Ginneken "ended up with spirits like Friedrich Schlegel and Bonald", as Brom (1955: 287) remarks in his fair, though highly critical memorial lecture of 1945. From Brom's obituary it becomes clear that van Ginneken was a complex and controversial personality and this may explain something of the sharpness of his attack on Hoogvliet.

3.2 *Van Ginneken on* Lingua

In his review article "Psychologische taalwetenschap", published under the pseudonym J. van Groenendaal in the periodical *Taal en Letteren* 13, van Ginneken (1903) reacted to *Lingua*, in particular to its first part. The fact that *Lingua* dealt with "general knowledge of language" was a reason for him to study the book. Van Ginneken begins by talking about the introduction. He interprets Hoogvliet's non-historical, anthropological-comparative linguistics" as "comparative psychological linguistics". "Is such a thing possible?", he asks himself. Van Ginneken states that historical linguistics, apart from tracing direct causes which have influenced language outside the individual, is not able to indicate which direct causes within the individual make language what it is. Psychological linguistics, however, is able to do this; it is a new science which may be of much use to its older sister. Given the psychic unity of man, data may be taken from all languages in the world. And just as geology studies the present situation before unveiling the past, linguistics should

> first closely study and check the influence of the separate internal causes on individual language at present, before deciding upon the complication of psychic factors that worked in the past, by way of the linguistic monuments earlier generations have left us. (van Groenendaal 1903: 415)

Van Ginneken considers the empirical basis on which Hoogvliet's handbook is founded to be too narrow. This does not mean that he considers none of Hoogvliet's statements true; rather he thinks that they are based on too uncertain "truths". Nevertheless his provisional judgment is that *Lingua* is a "good book"; it is well thought-out and it contains much truth. It therefore requires a very critical reaction.

In the second part of his review, van Ginneken treats the first chapter, in which the "mental factors of language" are discussed. Firstly he gives a survey of the three trends in contemporary psychology Hoogvliet could have tied in with: rational psychology (Steinthal, Lazarus, Schopenhauer, Hartmann); experimental psychology (Wundt), and in connection with this, comparative psychology; and, finally, pathologic psychology. Regarding this last school of thought, van Ginneken expresses himself very positively concerning the work of the French psychiatrist Pierre Janet (1859-1947) and his "masterly book" *L'automatisme psychologique* (1889). His main objection to Hoogvliet is that he is not consistent. Van

Ginneken agrees with Hoogvliet that the "true grammatical elements of language" fall within the area of sub- or half-conscious human thought. But, he asks, how is it possible that Hoogvliet bases himself on rational psychology "which seeks support with the data of fully conscious thought ?" (van Groenendaal 1903: 552).

Van Ginneken then surveys one by one all of the subjects treated by Hoogvliet, and tries to indicate as much as possible the sources Hoogvliet may have used but did not mention. Hoogvliet was very annoyed about this procedure, by which "every remark, every idea that is offered in *Lingua* [...] is given to some German or other man of note as his property" (Hoogvliet 1904: 153). His repeated claim is that *Lingua* has been an original work which is solely the product of his own thinking (cf. 1895: 5).

Van Ginneken's conclusion regarding the first part of *Lingua* is that it cannot stand "scientific scrutiny": the number of facts is "excruciatingly small", and while others have systematized those facts, Hoogvliet did not make use of their results. Neither did he profit from what had become known about the origins of linguistic phenomena in experimental and pathological psychology. It is for that reason that, at the end of his review, van Ginneken promised two articles in which he would seek to fill the lacunas left by *Lingua*. He wanted to present the missing facts, as well as "the almost certain conclusions, partly built on the foundation of facts by others" (van Groenendaal 1903: 559).

Hoogvliet reacted very briefly to van Ginneken's review. In an irritated "brief reprimand" (1904) he states that he is surprised about the arrogant tone in which the unknown author has adressed him, but also that he is looking forward to the future articles by the reviewer. These articles never appeared: van Ginneken's criticism of Hoogvliet resulted in the *Grondbeginselen der psychologische taalwetenschap*, published between 1904 and 1906. As van Ginneken told one of his students in later years:

> From my review of Hoogvliets book *Lingua*, my dissertation grew. There I promised to expand my ideas in *Taal en Letteren*. My work was appearing in *Leuv[ensche] Bijdr[agen]* before my *candidaatsexamen* (approximately B.A., JN). I had to keep pushing the publisher to get everything printed in time, but I finished the book nonetheless.[7]

3.3 From the Grondbeginselen *to the* Principes

Van Ginneken's 'revisor' had considered his attack on Hoogvliet "fierce and belittling" and advised him to refrain from such remarks directed at Hoogvliet in the future.[8] On the whole van Ginneken kept to this advice, and in the preface to the *Grondbeginselen*, published in *Leuvensche Bijdragen*, he states: "If this study has any merit, it is that the writer has not desisted from learning from his predecessors". However, in the accompanying footnote he cannot suppress a jibe at Hoogvliet, at the same time identifying himself as the reviewer of *Lingua*:

> And as such we will soon be in direct opposition to Dr HOOGVLIET's *Lingua*, Amsterdam 1903. For information concerning the motivation for this study and its relation to the book mentioned, I refer to my two articles in *Taal en Letteren*, XIII, 1903 [...]. (van Ginneken 1904-1906,I: iii)

---

7. This note I found among various other personal notes made by van Ginneken's former student J.M. Renders. These notes are at the Katholiek Documentatiecentrum at Nijmegen. Other archivalia concerning van Ginneken can be found in the van Ginneken collection of the Nijmeegse Centrale voor Dialect- en Naamkunde and also in the Archief van de Nederlandse Provincie der Jezuïeten at the Nijmegen Berchmannianum. It appears that a great number of van Ginneken's personal papers were burnt up during the severe winter in the last year of World War II.

8. Nijmeegse Centrale voor Dialect- en Naamkunde, Archief van Ginneken, file "Psychologische Beschouwingen".

In the *Grondbeginselen* Hoogvliet is only mentioned once more (1904-1906: 107) and in the French version every reference to Hoogvliet has been deleted. Van Ginneken now sought his opponents at an international level: Paul and Wundt. In the *Principes* directions indicated already in the *Lingua* review are consistently pursued. Like Hoogvliet, van Ginneken sees the speaking subject as central, but in opposition to his Dutch rival he produces a critical eclecticism out of principle (1904-1906: vi): he quotes more than 600 authors and hopes to ensure of an extraordinarily broad empirical basis, for in Wundt, too, "There is far too much theory and too little fact to please us. *The facts are quoted merely as illustrations of theories, not as proofs of them*", van Ginneken (1907: v) argues quoting an English reviewer of Wundt. Incidentally, the aim, structure and argument of the *Principes* remind us of Wundt's *Die Sprache*, and although van Ginneken expresses his disagreement with Wundt, he is quite strongly influenced by the latter's *Völkerpsychologie*. The large amount of data is ordered by van Ginneken in a scheme derived from psychology. He tries to link sound laws with Pierre Janet's laws of psychological automatism (Janet 1889), being the patterns governing people's involuntary actions. The facts of language are thus captured in psychological categories. It is therefore not surprising that, shortly before his death, van Ginneken admitted to one of his students that he had practised linguistic psychology rather than psychological linguistics (de Witte 1950: 4). In fact, he was not so much concerned with grammar, which mainly took the structure of language as its subject, but with the structure of the human mind as it expressed itself in language as the real target.

Van Ginneken's attempt at capturing linguistic changes in the laws of psychological automatism "muss aber wie ich glaube auf Ablehnung stossen", according to Delbrück (1919: 151), who compares van Ginneken's psychological categories with the Kantian categories applied to language by Gottfried Hermann (1772-1848) in the early nineteenth century. Paul (1920: vii) cannot follow van Ginneken either "in dem Bestreben die Sprachenentwickelung aus wenigen allgemeinen Gründsatzen restlos abzuleiten".[9] Although the explanations given in the *Principes* on the basis of Janet's research were defended by the Norwegian scholar Alf Sommervelt (1892-1965) - "his young friend" (cf. van Ginneken 1929: 10) - as late as 1961 (cf. Sommervelt 1961: 287), it can be said that van Ginneken's *Principes*, although protected by the authority of C.C. Uhlenbeck, the most influential and respected Dutch linguist in the first quarter of the twentieth century, did not influence a period of several decades or became part of the essential intellectual baggage of every linguist. Van Ginneken's all-out attempt at psychologizing linguistics, with which he had hoped to surpass Wundt, was too personal, his style was too exuberant to be able to identify with, and his desire for grand syntheses failed to impress more sober-minded scholars (cf. Uhlenbeck 1977: 490).

4. Hoogvliet's answer to van Ginneken

In later years Hoogvliet did no longer write a direct reply to Ginneken. We can, however, deduce the objections he had against van Ginneken's ideas from a number of pieces written in the years 1911-1913. There Hoogvliet starts from the supposition that language is rational expression. This is evident in his attack on the well-known Dutch man of letters Lodewijk van Deyssel (1864-1952), whose sensitivist prose he considers a phenomenon of degeneration. Moods, colour- and light effects cannot be expressed other than by word representations and thought complexes; in other words, the emotional and volitional is only expressed or interpretable by means of intellectual forms or their transformations. Language is largely a cognitive medium, feeling only ranking second to it (Hoogvliet 1912: 266).

In an article of 1911 Hoogvliet critically exposes a number of Wundt's ideas. Wundt holds, in his opinion, a great number of wrong views on language and he seems to have no idea of Hoogvliet's theory of

---

9. In their well-known book *The Meaning of meaning* (1923) Ogden & Richards mention the "extraordinary phantasies of van Ginneken, a subtle linguistic psychologist [...], influenced doubtless by Meinong as well as by Theology [...] It is plain that on any such view [as put forward by van Ginneken] a scientific account of thinking is ruled out from the very beginning" (Ogden & Richards 1946: 50).

morphomores (1911: 325). In the same piece Hoogvliet also indicates what is fundamentally wrong in van Ginneken's approach: in his conception of language he attributes far too much importance to "feeling". According to Hoogvliet, two kinds of language can be distinguished: "unburdening language" ('ontboezemingstaal'), which concerns feelings and experiences, and "concept language" ('begrippentaal'), which expresses thoughts. The "unburdening language" includes interjections, conjunctions etc.; everything van Ginneken says about language in general applies to this category. For "concept language" philosophy and logic can be the only measure, not in the sense of the learned seventeenth or eighteenth-century systems, but "a *simple common logic* and *philosophy*, which is the subconscious property of every human mind" (1911: 324). Two years later he put it like this:

> Was *im Allgemeinen* in der Sprachwissenschaft unserer Tage bedauert werden muss, ist [...] dass man den Schlüssel zur Wesenserklärung der menschlichen Sprache mehr in der *Pyschologie* als in der *Logik* zu suchen bestrebt ist. Nach meiner felsenfesten Ueberzeugung hat die menschliche Psyche und ihre Lehre für viele andere Sachen eine grosse, für die Sprache aber eine ziemlich geringe Bedeutung. Es ist ja die Seele *individuell* und das Wesen der Sprache ist es *nicht*, kann es nicht sein, indem ja gerade mittels der Sprache die Individuen *zu einander geführt werden*. Das Wesen der Sprache und zumal ihres Kerne der *Grammatik* muss daher in irgend etwas von solcher Beschaffenheit gesucht werden, dass es sich für alle Individuen völlig *gleichsteht* und keinerlei Verschiedenheiten zulässt. Von der *Psyche* aber mit ihren Unterscheidungen der *Lust* oder *Unlust*, des *Guten* oder *Schlechten*, des *Geliebten* oder *Verhassten* u.s.w. gilt das Sichgleichstehen *absolut nicht* [...] es ist vielmehr alles dies bei jeden beliebigen zwei Individuen *möglichst verschieden*. -- Der Kern des Sprachwesens ist also *kein* psychologischer sondern ein *logischer*, aber *die Logik der menschlichen Sprache* ist *nicht* die Aristotelische, nicht die Kantische, die Hegelsche [...] Logik, sondern eine viel einfachere in unterbewusster Form in *allen* menschlichen Individuen befindliche *Normallogik*, welche ich in meiner Universalgrammatik *Lingua* darzulegen versucht habe.[10] (Hoogvliet 1913: 60-61)

I think that, in this way, Hoogvliet shares Edward Sapir's (1884-1939) view that language moves for the most part "in the ideational sphere", whereas "volition and emotion come in as distinctly secondary factors". Sapir (1921: 39), called van Ginneken's major opponent in the area of language psychology by Anton G. van Hamel (1945: 67), also rejected the views of the "brilliant Dutch writer, Jac. van Ginneken", since he denied the "prevailing cognitive character" of language.

While van Ginneken considered mental activities such as "adhésions", 'sentiments' and "appréciations" the deepest essence of all linguistic phenomena, Hoogvliet believed in a *Normallogik* that would be the same for all times, as the core of language. It appears to me that Iordan's (1937: 293) statement about Saussure is, *mutatis mutandis*, also applicable to Hoogvliet: "He [...] sees in language solely a means of mutual understanding between men, a product of reason, to the exclusion of any interference on the part of fancy or emotivity". Hoogvliet's theory of morphomores looks equally rationalistic: it is as though language were a "mechanism" (cf. Hoogvliet 1896: 13), "constructed from a number of parts, closely and intricately assembled, a machine therefore, that we must learn to handle by getting to know its components" (Iordan 1937: 293).

It is tempting to oppose the "logical" Hoogvliet with a "romantic" van Ginneken (cf. Brom 1955: 274, 287), but that would hardly do justice to van Ginneken's complex personality. A typical quotation to define their positions must suffice here and perhaps it is instructive to use their contemporary Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) as *tertium comparationis*. In 1917 van Ginneken had the occasion to make a comparison between the lectures on general linguistics given by C.C. Uhlenbeck around 1906 and the *Cours de linguistique*

---

10. Hoogvliet's attempt "die in die Irre gegangene Sprachwissenschaft wieder von der psychologischen zur logischen Methode zurück [zu] führen" (Herbig 1916:719) was met with sharp criticism on the part of his some of his reviewers. Lecoutere (1914:93-94), for instance, remarked that, in his view, the logical approach to language had led linguistics into error. See also Meillet's (1914) short and dry appraisal of Hoogvliet (1913).

générale (1916), which had only recently become accessible to him. His opinion was that Uhlenbeck's course had to preferred: although it was - "not to my regret" - inferior to the Genevan course in the sharpness of systematic exclusions, it appeared to surpass Saussure's course in an incomparable way "in its flowering richness of variegated facts and world-wide horizons" (van Ginneken 1917: 12).[11] It is the latter that always attracted van Ginneken's "visionary mind" (cf. Weijnen 1948: 57).

5. Concluding remarks

In the first of the altogether 44 theses van Ginneken added to his doctoral dissertation the idea was put forward that the official study of Indo-European had been reduced to a "one-sided positivism". As a remedy he recommended "comparative practice of the non-Indo-Germanic languages" for breadth, and "study of the mental causes" for depth. Just like Hoogvliet he wanted to introduce a new kind of linguistics in addition - and in contrast - to historical linguistics (van Groenendaal 1903: 413-415; van Ginneken 1907: i-iii). Both his work and Hoogvliet's may be viewed as an attempt to break away from the Neogrammarian "yoke". Although van Ginneken felt a close affinity to the Neo-linguists (cf. van Ginneken 1923: 6) and denounced the one-sidedness of the "Prussian science" of the Leipzig school of linguists (van Ginneken 1923: 12), he tried to bridge the breadth of the former and the soundness of method of the latter (cf. 1907: 533). His conception of general linguistics, however, remained largely historically coloured and it continued so for many years, even after linguistics had developed in a more synchronic direction. Hoogvliet, on the other hand, hardly ever discussed language change. The fact that Hoogvliet, as opposed to van Ginneken, emphasized logic (cf. Hesseling 1924: 92), has to do with his functional-synchronic conception of language. First and foremost concerned with the actual functioning of the present language, his conviction was that language is mainly a means of communication, a "verkeersmiddel" as van Haeringen (1917: 81) once put it (quite in line with Paul's "Verkehrsmittel"), and as such it should be governed by logic.

This brings me to the observation that both Hoogvliet's "Principles of general or universal grammar" - *Grondbeginselen der Algemeene of Univerzeele spraakleer*, the original title of *Lingua* - and van Ginneken's *Principes de linguistique psychologique* may be considered as reactions to certain aspects of Paul's *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*, just as one can see Saussure reacting to the *Prinzipien* (cf. Koerner 1972). The first edition of the *Prinzipien* appeared in 1880, when Hoogvliet practised historical linguistics as a student at Leiden "with heart and soul" (Hoogvliet 1903: vi).

One of the questions which can be put forward here is the following: Was J.M. Hoogvliet a curious accident, or in other words, was he the only scholar who at the turn of the nineteenth century was working within the framework of general grammar ? One might be inclined to think so, for in his contribution to the *Concise History of the Language Sciences* Wheeler claims that "[b]y the end of the nineteenth century, general grammar was a forgotten, often misunderstood, chapter in the history of grammatical studies" (Wheeler 1995: 174). I must confess, however, that I am not fully convinced by his arguments. I should like to point out, for example, that in the introduction to his *New English Grammar* Henry Sweet discussed the "science of language" including various types of "explanatory grammar". One of them is "general grammar". General or philosophical grammar, he says, "is not concerned with the details of one special language of family of languages, but with the general principles which underlie the grammatical phenomena of all languages" (Sweet 1900: 3).

Moreover, in 1899, Sir Richard C. Temple, the author of *A Brief Exposition of a Theory of Universal Grammar* (1883), applied his "Theory of Universal Grammar" to a group of "savage languages" as his paper in *The Indian Antiquary* shows. Given the "practical impossibility of using the usual inflexional system of Grammar, as taught in Europe, for the accurate descrection of a group of agglutinative languages" Temple

---

11. Cf. van Ginneken's review of the *Cours* in the fifth "Band" of the *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch* (1918). His comment about the second edition of the *Cours* was quite curt: "Sehr ungleich von Wert. Neben tiefen Einblicken in das Leben der Sprache, dilettantische Freisinnigkeiten" (*Indogermanisches Jahrbuch* 10 (1926), 37.

was "led to make the attempt to construct a general theory on logical principles, which should abandon the inflexional treatment, its conceptions and its terms" (Temple 1899: 197). I think there are various parallels with Hoogvliet's approach, however, it is beyond the scope of this article to go into that matter now. At any rate, I should like to argue that general grammar had not yet been forgotten around 1900.

In a small country with a conservative educational regime like the Netherlands, Hoogvliet soon acquired the reputation - and not always undeservedly - of being a stubborn man who was always ready to promote his views both orally and in writing. He did not succeed in achieving convincing results in teaching. In the world of science, his abhorrence of a belief in authority and his idiosyncratic "logical" approach combined with a new and unconventional terminology met with the considerable scepticism on the part of linguists who were largely historically and psychologically oriented. Although attempts were made by himself and others, an academic career was never in store for him. Despite his fame and great enthusiasm (cf. Barnouw 1904: 190), this lack of academic success put Hoogvliet into relative isolation. A younger contemporary, like the general linguist and classical scholar Hendrik J. Pos, was one of the few who, as becomes apparent from his writings and lecture notes, studied Hoogvliet's views in depth and took them into consideration in his own reflections on linguistic theory.

References

Barnouw, Adriaan Jacob
    1904   Review of Hoogvliet 1903. *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*. 112.1-2: 190-194.

Barbiers, Sjef
    1994   "Taalkunde en taalonderwijs volgens Hoogvliet". *Forum der Letteren* 35, 209-223.

Beckering Vinckers, Jan
    1877   "Voorrede van den bewerker". *Taal en taalstudie. Voorlezingen over de gronden der wetenschappelijke taalbeoefening* door William Dwight Whitney. Eerste serie. Haarlem: F. Bohn, i-xii.

Brom, Gerard
    1955[1945] "Pater Van Ginneken". *Roeping*. 31: 273-288.

Delbrück, Berthold
    1919   *Einleitung in das Studium der indogermanischen Sprachen*. 6th rev. ed. Leipzig. Breitkopf & Härtel.

Dèr Mouw, Johan Andreas
    1900   *Dr. J.M. Hoogvliet's opvatting van taalstudie en methode van taalonderwijs*. Amsterdam: S.L. van Looy. (Repr. in *Verzamelde Werken*. VI. *Verspreide geschriften* by Johan Andreas Dèr Mouw. Amsterdam: G.A. van Oorschot, 255-387.).
    1903   Review of Hoogvliet 1903. Unpubl. ms., 41 pp. (Printed in Noordegraaf 1987, 11-33.).

van Essen, Arthur J.
    1983   *E. Kruisinga: A chapter in the history of linguistics in the Netherlands*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff.

Fresco, Marcel
    1987   "Über das Verhältnis von Sprache, Denken und Welt. Ontologische Fragen unter besondere Berücksichtigung der Philosophie von J.A. dèr Mouw". *Logos and Pragma: Essays on the philosophy*

of language in honour of professor Gabriel Nuchelmans. Ed. by L.M. de Rijk & H.A.G. Braakhuis. Nijmegen: Ingenium Publishers, 259-81. (Artistarium, supplementa, 3.)

van Ginneken S.J., Jacobus Joannes Antonius. (See also J. van Groenendaal)
1904-1906   *Grondbeginselen der psychologische Taalwetenschap.* 2 vols. Lier: Jozef van In & Cie. (= Offprint *Leuvensche Bijdragen* 6 & 7.)
1907   *Principes de linguistique psychologique.* Paris: M. Rivière; Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz; Amsterdam: E. van der Vecht. (= Bibliothèque de philosophie expérimentale, 4.).
1917   *Als ons moedertaalonderwijs nog ooit gezond wil worden.* Nijmegen: Malmberg.
1918   Review of Ferdinand de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale* (1916). *Indogermanisches Jahrbuch.* 5: 22-23.
1923   *De nieuwe richting in de taalwetenschap.* Utrecht & Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt / J.W. van Leeuwen.
1929   "Zeker, voor een deel terug naar August Schleicher". *Donum natalicium Schrijnen.* Nijmegen & Utrecht: Dekker & van de Vegt, 10-22.

Golling, Joseph
1904   Review of Hoogvliet (1903). *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie.* 21: cols. 1006-1008.

van Groenendaal, J. [*alias* J. van Ginneken]
1903   "Psychologische taalwetenschap". *Taal en Letteren.* 13: 408-424, 545-62. (Review of Hoogvliet 1903.).
1905   "Psychologische taalwetenschap". *Taal en Letteren.* 15: 576-577.

Haeringen, Coenraad B.
1917   "Over het grammaties geslacht". *Neophilologus.* 2: 81-85. (Review of Hoogvliet 1913.).
1954   *Netherlandic Language Research: Men and works in the study of Dutch.* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Hagen, Anton M.
1992   "Dutch Dialectology: the National and the International Perspective". Noordegraaf, Versteegh & Koerner 1992, 329-353.

van Hamel, Anton Gerardus
1945*G eschiedenis der taalwetenschap.* Den Haag: Servire.

Hauger, Brigitte
1994   *Johan Nicolai Madvig. The Language Theory of a Classical Philologist.* Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

Heeroma, Klaas Hanzen
1968   "De Nijmeegse Nederlandistiek". Assen: van Gorcum. *Sprekend als nederlandist* by K. Heeroma. Den Haag: Bert Bakker/Daamen, 66-86.

Herbig, Gustav
1916   Review of Hoogvliet 1913. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung.* 37: cols. 709-714.

Hesseling, Derk Christiaan
1924   "Levensbericht van Dr. Jan Marius Hoogvliet 30 Junie 1860-22 Junie 1924". *Handelingen van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leiden en levensberichten harer afgestorven medeleden (1923-1924).* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 86-95.

Hoogvliet, Jan Marius
1884a   "Eene algemeene wereldtaal". *Het Nieuws van den dag*, 1 Oct. 1884.

1884b	"Eene nabetrachting". *De Amsterdammer: Weekblad voor Nederland*, 16 Nov. 1884, 8-9.
1885	*Studia Homerica*. Lugduni Batavorum: S.C. van Doesburgh.
1888	*Proagoon. Eenvoudige handleiding tot de studie der Grieksche taal*. 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.
1889a	"Latijn en Grieksch, ja of neen?". *De Nederlandsche Spektator*. 1889: 52-53.
1889b	"Verdediging der methode "Proagoon", in den vorm eener Voorrede". *Coniunctis Viribus*. 4.1: 62-70.
1894	"De waarde der klassieke litteratuur voor den tegenwoordigen tijd". *Vragen van den dag*. 9: 561-577.
1895	*Grondbeginselen der Algemeene of Univerzeele Spraakleer. Bestemd om als grondslag te dienen voor de wetenschappelijke studie van doode en levende, Indo-europeesche en niet-Indo-europeesche talen*. Wageningen: privately printed.
1896	*Het verbum in het hedendaagsch Fransch wetenschappelijk beschreven*. Barneveld: G.W. Boonstra.
1898	"Oudere en nieuwere taalmethodes". *Handelingen van het Eerste Nederlandsche Philologencongres*. Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 108-125.
1903	*Lingua. Een beknopt leer- en handboek van Algemeene en Nederlandsche taalkennis*. Amsterdam: S.L. van Looy.
1904	"Korte terechtwijzing naar aanleiding van de artikelen geteekend met Groenendael". *Taal en Letteren*. 14: 153-155.
1910	"Taalmathézis en taalchemie". *Vragen en Mededeelingen op het gebied der geschiedenis, taal- en letterkunde*. 1,1: 26-29, 38-40.
1911	"Gewoon lezen en schrijven volgens de opvattingen der geleerden". *De Tijdspiegel*. 68,1: 320-336.
1912	"Gebrek aan zedelijken moed als nadeeligen factor op de letterkunde en op den volksgeest". *Handelingen van het 32ste Nederlandsch Taal- en Letterkundig Congres*. Antwerpen: V. Resseler, 254-264.
1913	*Die sogenannten "Geschlechter" im Indo-Europäischen und im Latein nach wissenschaftlicher Methode beschrieben*. Haag: Martinus Nijhoff.
1925	*Bevattelijke Latijnsche leercursus voor zelfonderricht*. Amsterdam: S.L. van Looy.

Iordan, Iorgu
| 1937 | *An Introduction to Romance Linguistics, its Schools and its Scholars*. Rev., transl. and in part recast by John Orr. London: Methuen & Co. |

Janet, Pierre
| 1889 | *L'automatisme psychologique: Essai de psychologoque expérimentale sur les formes inférieures de l''activité humaine*. Paris: F. Alcan. |

Jespersen, Otto
| 1894 | *Progress in Language, with special reference to English*. London: S. Sonnenschein & Co. |

de Josselin de Jong, Jan P.B.
| 1915 | "Geschiedenis der taalwetenschap". *Geschiedenis der wetenschappen*, 61-92. Baarn: Hollandia-drukkerij. |

Kluyver, Albert
| 1895 | "Een algemeene spraakleer". *De Nederlandsche Spektator*. 1895: 274. (Review of Hoogvliet 1895.). |
| 1903 | Review of Hoogvliet 1903. *Museum*. 10: cols. 359-362. |

Koerner, E. F. Konrad

1972 "Hermann Paul and Synchronic Linguistics". *Lingua*. 29: 274-307. (Repr. in *Towards a Historiography of Linguistics: Selected essays* by E.F. Konrad Koerner, 73-106. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins 1978; and in *Saussurean Studies/Études saussuriennes* by Konrad Koerner. Genève: Slatkine, 17-50.

Large, Andrew
 1985 *The Artificial Language Movement.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell; London: André Deutsch.

Lecoutere, Charles Pierre François
 1914 Review of Hoogvliet (1913). *Dietsche Warande en Belfort.* 1914,2: 92-94.

Madvig, Johan Nicolai
 1843 *Bemerkungen über verschiedene Puncte des Systems der Lateinischen Sprachlehre und einige Einzelnheiten derselben. Als Beilage zu seiner Lateinischen Sprachlehre für Schulen.* Braunschweig: F. Vieweg & Sohn.

van Malssen Jr, P.J.
 1900 *Het leven der taal inzonderheid dat van het Nederlandsch.*'s-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.

Meillet, Antoine
 1914 Review of Hoogvliet 1913. *Revue critique d'histoire et de la littérature* N.S. 77,8: 147.

Müller, Friedrich Max
 1861-1864 *Lectures on the Science of Language.* 2 vols. London: Longmans.
 1913 *The Science of Language.* London-Bombay-Calcutta: Longmans, Green & Co. 2 vols. (= Collected Works of the Right. Hon. F. Max Müller, 11 & 12.)

Muller, Hendrik C.
 1888 "Antwoord aan Dr.J.M. Hoogvliet op zijn artikel in den Spectator". *Coniunctis Viribus.* 3,2: 108-111.

Nassau, Hendrik Jan
 1854 "De Nederlandsche taalkunde in haren aard en hare strekking". *Geschriften van Dr. H.J. Nassau.* Vol. 3. Groningen J.B. Wolters 1879, 242-251. (Review of de Vries 1853.).

Noordegraaf, Jan
 1980 "Jac. van Ginneken en de signifische beweging". *Was ik er ooit eerder? Een bundel opstellen aangeboden aan Dr. H.A. Wage.* Ed. by Sjoerd A.J. van Faassen. 's-Gravenhage: BZZTôh, 41-61.
 1985 *Norm, geest en geschiedenis. Nederlandse taalkunde in de negentiende eeuw.* Dordrecht & Cinnaminson: Foris. (Geschiedenis van de Taalkunde, 3.).
 1987 *Dèr Mouw contra Hoogvliet. Universele Grammatica anno 1903.* Schiedam: Huis te Riviere Pers.
 1988 "Universele taal of universele grammatica? J.M. Hoogvliet en het Volapük". *Voortgang, jaarboek voor de Neerlandistiek.* 9: 163-196. (Repr. in Noordegraaf 1995, 59-88.).
 1989 "Een tegendraads taalkundige. J.M. Hoogvliet en de Maatschappij". *Nieuw Letterkundig Magazijn.* 7,2: 32-34.
 1990 "Pos als geschiedschrijver van de taalwetenschap". *H.J. Pos (1898-1955). Taalkundige en geëngageerd filosoof* onder red. van Saskia Daalder & Jan Noordegraaf. Amsterdam: Huis aan de drie Grachten, 153-175.
 1991a "*Taal en Letteren* honderd jaar later. Een tijdschrift tegen de schrijftaalcultuur". *Forum der Letteren.* 32: 269-280.
 1991b "Hendrik J. Pos (1898-1955) and the History of Linguistics". *Neue Fragen der Linguistik. Akten des 25. Linguistisches Kolloquiums, Paderborn 1990*, herausgegeben von Elisabeth Feldbusch,

Reiner Pogarell und Cornelia Weiss. Band 1: Bestand und Entwicklung. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 55-63.

1993 "From Myth to History. The Reception of German Historical Grammar in Nineteenth-Century Dutch Linguistics". *La linguistique entre mythe et histoire. Actes des journées d'étude organisées les 4 et 5 juin 1991 à la Sorbonne en l'honneur de Hans Aarsleff* ed. by Daniel Droixhe & Chr. Grell. Münster: Nodus Publikationen 1993, 297-317.

1995 *Oorsprong en ideaal. Opstellen over taalzoekers.* Münster: Nodus Publikationen.

1997 "Gabelentz, Paardekooper en de eenzinsdeelproef ". *Voorlopig verleden. Taalkundige plaatsbepalingen, 1797-1960* door Jan Noordegraaf. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 220-221.

2000 "Gabelentz en Hoogvliet over partikels" *Van Hemsterhuis tot Stutterheim. Over wetenschapsgeschiedenis* door Jan Noordegraaf. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 198-201.

2001 "The Man Who Knew Too Much. J.M. Hoogvliet as a teacher and theoretician of language" *Reflections on Language and Language Learning. A Festschrift for Arthur van Essen* ed. by Marcel Bax & Jan-Wouter Zwart. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 21-33.

Noordegraaf, Jan, Kees Versteegh & Konrad Koerner, eds.
1992 *The History of Linguistics in the Low Countries.* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins.

Ogden, C.K. & I.A. Richards
1946 *The Meaning of Meaning. A study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism.* Eight ed. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. (First ed. 1923).

Paul, Hermann
1898 *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte.* 3rd. ed. Halle/S.: Niemeyer. (1st ed., 1880.)
1920 *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte.* 5th ed. Ibid.

van Proosdij, Boricus Antonius
1954 *"Two thunder-clouds, closing in conflict": The meeting of Madvig and Cobet at the tercentenary of Leyden University and its historical background.* Leiden: E.J. Brill.

Romein, Jan
1967 "Taal als teken". *Op het breukvlak van twee eeuwen* by Jan Romein. Vol. II. Leiden: E.J. Brill/Amsterdam: Em. Querido, 138-153.

Sapir, Edward
1921 *Language.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. (References are to a later paperback reprint.).

Schmitz, H. Walter
1990 *De Hollandse Significa. Een reconstructie van de geschiedenis van 1892 tot 1926.* Assen & Maastricht: van Gorcum. (Dutch transl. of *Verständigungshandlungen. Eine wissenschaftshistorische Rekonstruktion der Anfänge der signifischen Bewegung in den Niederlanden (1892-1926).* Unpubl. Habilitationsschrift, Univ. of Bonn.).

Schouten, Dirk C.A.J.

1964   *Het Grieks aan de Nederlandse universiteiten in de negentiende eeuw bijzonder gedurende de periode 1815-1876*. Utrecht: Pressa Trajectina.

Sommervelt, Alf
1961   "The French School of Linguistics". *Trends in European and American Linguistics 1930-1960*. Ed. by Christine Mohrmann, Alf Sommervelt & Joshua Whatmough. Utrecht & Antwerpen: Spectrum, 283-293.

van der Stroom, Gerrold P.
1995   *The Reception of Jac. van Ginneken's Language Biology*. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU / Münster: Nodus Publikationen. (Cahiers voor Taalkunde. 13.).

Sütterlin, Ludwig
1907   *Die Deutsche Sprache der Gegenwart*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Voigtländer. (1st ed., 1900.)

Sweet, Henry
1900   *A New English grammar*. Vol. I. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Temple, Richard Carnac
1883   *A Brief Exposition of a Theory of Universal Grammar*. S.l. : privately printed.
1899   "A Theory of Universal Grammar, as applied to a a group of savage languages". *The Indian Antiquary*. 28: 197-208, 225-235.

Uhlenbeck, Christianus Cornelius
1918   "Johan Hendrik Caspar Kern 6 april 1833-4 juli 1917". *Jaarboek van de Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen 1917*. Amsterdam: Johannes Müller, 15-47.

Uhlenbeck, Eugenius Marius
1977 "Roman Jakobson and Dutch Linguistics". *Roman Jakobson: Echoes of his scholarship* ed. by Daniel Amstrong & C.H. van Schooneveld. Lisse: Peter de Ridder, 485-502.

Vachek, Josef
1968   *Dutch Linguists and the Prague Linguistic School*. Leiden: Universitaire Pers.

Vollgraff, Johann C.
1903   "Het nieuwe boek van Dr. Hoogvliet". *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*, 19 April 1903.

de Vries, Matthias
1853   *De Nederlandsche taalkunde in haren aard en hare strekking*. Haarlem: A.C. Kruseman.

Weijnen, Antonius Angelus
1948   "Jac. van Ginneken (Oudenbosch, 21 April 1877 - Nijmegen, 20 October 1945)". *Jaarboek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leiden 1946-1947*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 50-61.

Welby, Victoria

    1903   *What Is Meaning?* London & New York: Macmillan. (Repr., with an Introductory essay by Gerrit Mannoury and a Preface by Arnim Eschbach. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins 1983. (Foundations of Semiotics, 2.).

Wheeler, Garon

    1995   "Port-Royal Tradition of General Grammar". *Concise History of the Language Sciences.* Ed. by E.F.K. Koerner & R.E. Asher. Oxford: Pergamon, 169-174.

Whitney, William Dwight

    1867   *Language and the Study of Language: Twelve lectures on the principles of linguistic science.* London: Trübner. (Repr., Hildesheim & New York: Georg Olms 1973.).

    1875   *The Life and Growth of Language.* London: Henry S. King. (Repr., Hildesheim & New York: George Olms 1970.).

de Witte, [A.] Josephus Johannes

    1950   "Een psychologische grammatica ?" *De Nieuwe Taalgids.* 43: 1-9.