



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

'Sincere Simplicity'

Gerbrand Bredero's Apprenticeship with Coornhert and Spiegel

Jansen, J.

DOI

[10.1080/03096564.2016.1143286](https://doi.org/10.1080/03096564.2016.1143286)

Publication date

2017

Document Version

Final published version

Published in

Dutch Crossing

License

CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Jansen, J. (2017). 'Sincere Simplicity': Gerbrand Bredero's Apprenticeship with Coornhert and Spiegel. *Dutch Crossing*, 41(1), 4-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03096564.2016.1143286>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.



'Sincere Simplicity': Gerbrand Bredero's Apprenticeship with Coornhert and Spiegel

Jeroen Jansen

To cite this article: Jeroen Jansen (2017) 'Sincere Simplicity': Gerbrand Bredero's Apprenticeship with Coornhert and Spiegel, *Dutch Crossing*, 41:1, 4-20, DOI: [10.1080/03096564.2016.1143286](https://doi.org/10.1080/03096564.2016.1143286)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03096564.2016.1143286>



© 2016 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 18 Mar 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 50



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

‘Sincere Simplicity’: Gerbrand Bredero’s Apprenticeship with Coornhert and Spiegel

JEROEN JANSEN

University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Like many authors in the early seventeenth century, the Dutch poet and prose writer Gerbrand Bredero prided himself on his defence of the mother tongue. The main reason for Bredero’s preference can be found in his consideration for the ‘unlearned’ public, perhaps to be associated with his being ‘unlearned’ himself. In his appreciation of the mother tongue, he closely responds to predecessors like Dirck Coornhert and Hendrik Spiegel. Moreover, he shared ideas about purism and ‘language building’ with the leading voices of the Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric, of which Bredero was a member. In this article, it will be shown how and to what extent linguistic aspects of Bredero’s prose are in line with his Amsterdam predecessors. Some of the imagery used by Bredero fits in with the idiom of Coornhert, while Spiegel’s writing exemplified the use of innovative compound words and genitives. Though Bredero is far less extreme in his experimentation with both forms, he did not refrain from leaving his own creative mark on language use, as a supposed result of a direct and active focus on common, Amsterdam burghers.

KEYWORDS Dirck Coornhert, Dutch Golden Age, Gerbrand Bredero, Grammar, Hendrik Spiegel, Natural Language, Prose Style, Purism, Vernacular

Introduction

It is widely known that many renaissance literary authors based their texts and ideas, sometimes even their style and word choice, on the classics. At a time when antiquity was accorded great authority, literary imitation in all its variety could be learnt in schools (Jansen, 2008). Analytic reading skills enabled pupils to examine content and style, and to select useful material in examples. The learning process initially focused on reading

© 2016 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

and writing. Knowledge of classical grammar and Latin (and Greek) vocabulary was essential. Quotations from the classics were compiled, arranged and learnt by heart. The classical culture served as a valuable thesaurus to students for independent appropriation of the material. In order to develop a personal style, the pupils not only had to explore their individuality, but also needed to make a thorough analysis of exemplary texts. From this baseline, renaissance authors started a literary career. But writers who did not receive an in-depth education in Latin at school, and even less at university, had to choose a different approach. Being more-or-less deprived of knowledge concerning Latin grammar and language, they were reliant on translations and other expedients. They could only keep up with the *respublica litteraria*, the elite 'Republic of letters', by the grace of the increasing appreciation of the vernacular in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, both by scientists and poets.

In 1582, the States-General of the Netherlands officially chose the vernacular as an administrative language, instead of French. Scientists like Simon Stevin (1548–1620) preferred to publish their works in the vernacular, thus marking a decline of Latin as the European scholarly language. Systematic scheduling and unification of the Dutch language became of political and cultural importance from then on. Hendrik Laurensz Spiegel (1549–1612), a prominent member of the Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric *De Eglentier* (the *Eglantine*), explored the particular possibilities of Dutch expression in the same period. To promote the vernacular, knowledge from Latin text books was transferred into Dutch treatises, as witnessed, for example, by the *Dialogue concerning the grammar of the Dutch language* (*Twe-spraack vande Nederduitsche letterkunst*). This first grammar in Dutch, based on a Latin school grammar, was printed by Plantijn in Leiden and published by the Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric in 1584.¹ Without a doubt, Spiegel acted as principal initiator and co-author of this likely collective project. The preface of the *Dialogue* was written by Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert (1522–1590). He was a famous writer, engraver, polemist, translator and thinker (Bonger, 2004), who had made efforts towards creating a well-balanced and pure Dutch language for many years and published a number of translations of classical writings. In his preface, he reminded the 'art loving readers' ('*kunstlievenden Lezers*') of his own zeal for language purification, adding the argument that most disagreements arose from bad and obscure formulations. In his view, grammar was the remedy against this evil. In the *Dialogue*, rules are given for orthography and pronouncement, for declension, modelled on the Latin, for conjugation and prosody. The most important objective of this grammar was to provide every citizen with an instrument with which he could increase his language skills. The authority of this grammar was considerable: in several grammatical works that appeared in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries concerning Dutch language, the terminology was borrowed from exactly this *Dialogue*. In others, the language rules were discussed. They were adopted, paraphrased, developed or rejected (cf. Dibbets, 1984, p. 225).

Almost all members of the *Eglentier* were middle class in background, tradesmen, clerks and school masters. The *Dialogue* was meant for those who had attended the '*Nederduitsche*' or Dutch-French schools, or the school of the chamber of rhetoric

(Dibbets 1984). One such person was the popular Amsterdam playwright Gerbrand Adriaensz Bredero (1585–1618). According to a personal testimony, he had only knowledge of ‘just a little school-kid French’ (‘maar een weynich kints-School-frans’) (Bredero 2011, p. 200), but of no Latin. Having a literary career one generation after Spiegel and Coornhert, Bredero could be called a follower of both men in many respects. Around 1611, he became a member of the Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric of which Spiegel had been a leading light. For a young author, such a membership was still a requirement because the chamber was the predominant literary institution in the first decades of the seventeenth century. In his short life, Bredero developed into a thriving dramatist of farces, comedies and popular songs (Grootes and Schenkeveld, 2009, pp. 207–211, 267).

Many important seventeenth-century Dutch authors took part in these rhetorical societies or at least started their careers in a chamber of rhetoric. It was also the place where (young) authors could present and promote themselves and review and adjust their work, and where all members could improve their social, communicative and intellectual skills (Van Dixhoorn, 2009, p. 158). In an introductory text, the authors of the Dialogue stated that ‘all chambers of rhetoric ought to be regarded as public schools of the vernacular, to which everybody, with no exception (and especially the pick of them) had free admittance, because the purification, enrichment and embellishment of the language (and not only the rhyme) was a task for everybody ...’² Therefore, they may be called a kind of public university, where all sciences were taught in the vernacular. In the meantime, the rise of the mother tongue was promoted in theory and practice (Tuyman, 1981; Van Dixhoorn, 2009, pp. 129–159). Indeed, for Bredero, the chamber was the very place where he could review his language and literary work, and where he received affirmation for striving for language purification and for worshipping the vernacular.³

That Gerbrand Bredero must have acquainted himself very well with the mainsprings of Coornhert and Spiegel has been discussed in earlier studies (see below), but it has never been explained how this worked out in specific linguistic aspects. In this article, I want to test to what extent Bredero was dependent on direct examples, such as Coornhert, Spiegel and the Eglentier in this process of ‘purification, enrichment and embellishment of the language’. Both Bredero’s adoption of ideas concerning the usage of the vernacular and his appreciation of the mother tongue as a full means of expression are brought up. The assumption is that Bredero closely followed the footsteps of his immediate predecessors but employed his own choices as a direct result of his self-awareness as a successful (and commercial) Amsterdam author, reaching out to ordinary Amsterdam burghers.

Natural language: Coornhert and Bredero

Bredero was keen on his hometown, as can be seen from his work, and he proudly signed his name with the addition ‘Amsterdammer’ (‘citizen of Amsterdam’). He located his comical drama, farces and songs in this city, looking rather suspiciously at the outside world. Lacking the ability to read Latin, Bredero would have fully profited from the translations that Coornhert had made from classical texts: Boethius (1557), Cicero’s *De officiis* (1561), the first 12 books of the *Odyssey* (1561), Seneca’s *De beneficiis* (1562),

Horace's 'Beatus ille' and Lucianus. The influence of Coornhert on the Eglentier, and therefore also on Bredero, has been demonstrated earlier.⁴ Innumerable ethical insights, which Coornhert had expounded in his *Art of Ethics* (*Zedekunst*) (1585), the first set of ethics written in a European vernacular, can be found in Bredero's work in a strikingly similar form and wording.⁵ Besides the moral lessons in Bredero's lyrical oeuvre, there is also the appeal to the individual experience and the demonstrations of self-analysis that remind us of Coornhert.⁶

The responsive attitude towards the unlearned was not the least important affinity that held both men together. Neither of them had undergone a Latin school education (Coornhert learnt Latin only later in his life). More than once, Bredero pointed at his simple nature and at the fact that he mastered Dutch as his only language.⁷ Thus, it is not astonishing that both authors made a stand against the learned 'Latinists' (especially the Latin professors). For obvious reasons, both undertook this criticism in prefaces of Dutch translations of Latin texts (Bredero translated the Latin via an intermediate French and Dutch translation). In fact, their criticism was twofold: where the Latinists published their work in Latin, they kept their wisdom for themselves and did not share it with a large group of unlearned people. And where these professors wrote in Dutch, they used 'polluted' language, a style that was overflowing with Gallicisms, that could also be seen as 'artificial' and thus as an unnatural style. Already in 1561, in the preface to his translation of Cicero's *De officiis*, Coornhert specifically criticized barbarisms. As a result of their early and profound contact with Latin, the Latinists mastered the pure Dutch insufficiently in his view: they had generally learned Latin 'before they could speak their mother tongue' ('eer sy hun moeders tale connen').⁸

The same argument can be found in Bredero half a century later. In his 'Preface to the scholarly Latinists' of *Moortje* (1617), he mentions 'folk that know other languages before they learn their own language, and who for convenience often have to manage with a foreign word when they speak Dutch in later years'.⁹ According to Coornhert, these men had managed using 'Latin, Walloon or other languages that they knew better, and from there a mixture of languages and a real Babylonian confusion was born' ('met Latijn, Walsch oft met ander talen die hun bat condit zijn: daer dan ooc nootsakelijck een mengsel van spraken ende een rechte Babilonische verwerringe wt geboren werdt'). Bredero acknowledged this as he imputes a 'mishmash of language' ('mengel-moes van spreken') and a 'corruption or confusion of words' ('verbasteringh of verwerringh van woorden') from the Latin professors.¹⁰

The fact that some 'learned' people had been influenced by other languages from their childhood and thus had little real knowledge of their mother tongue was an argument used by Bredero to defend himself against comments on his own usage. In the preface (c. 1617) to the *Jocular, amorous and serious songbook* (*Boertigh, Amoreus, en Aendachtigh Groot Lied-boeck*), he states that the supposed objection from some Latinists against his use of the Amsterdam and Waterland dialect in his songs could be blamed on their ignorance of the vernacular because they 'have learnt earlier and more foreign than Dutch' ('doch eer en meer uytheemsch dan duytsch geleert hebben') (Bredero, 2011, p. 224). Here, too, Gerbrand turned against an unnatural usage of which he located

the instigators in Leiden: ‘For my part I admit that I don’t agree with this new Leiden feeling, and that I am leaning towards the old with a heretic obstinacy ...’¹¹ What then was that ‘new Leiden feeling’ and why would Bredero prefer to stick with the ‘old’? Earlier in the same preface, Bredero talked about ‘many old and common words (‘veel ouwde en ghebruyckelijcke wóórden’) in his songs with their ‘jocular features’ (‘boertighe treckjes’), and about his application of the old Amsterdam and Waterland languages. That usage stood far apart from that used by authors such as Daniel Heinsius, at that time professor of Greek at the Leiden University, whose Dutch poems (Nederduytsche poemata) had been published in 1616. In a period in which more and more literary men started to write in Dutch instead of Latin,¹² the purification from loan-words and also the use of natural language seemed to be an important item. Indeed, humanists like Abraham van der Mijle, Janus Dousa and Daniel Heinsius had shown by means of a Dutch poem in *The Dutch Helicon* (*Den Nederduytschen Helicon*) (1610) that they were well disposed towards the vernacular language, but apparently their style and usage could not endure the criteria of ‘naturalness’, applied by Bredero. A good example is also the anthems by Heinsius on Bacchus and Christ (1614–1616),¹³ intended for the upper classes. The Latin word ‘poemata’ (poems) in Heinsius’s collection must have been an omen for the erudition inside.

In the eyes of Bredero, Heinsius would have been one of those Latinists who had learnt earlier more foreign languages than merely Dutch, who had ‘rejected those sound, old and usual words because he didn’t know them through lack of experience’.¹⁴ But then, what were those ‘old and common words’? More than a half century earlier, Coornhert had already stated that the time had come where many young writers had sacrificed the purity of language, somewhat due to their knowledge of French or Latin, so that many citizens and farmers no longer understood the judgement of their cases (Cicero, 1561, preface, fol. *7^{r-v}). Ordinary, usual words were, as Coornhert continues, ‘al gemeen’ and not ‘generael’ (general), ‘verlijckinghe’ and not ‘comparatie’ (comparison). Nevertheless, in his translation of *De officiis*, he had omitted many old words, which were, however, still good old Dutch, like ‘zege’ instead of ‘victorie’ (victory), ‘byspel’ instead of ‘exempel’ (example), ‘grontvest’ instead of ‘fondament’ (foundation) and ‘grootachtbaerheydt’ instead of ‘authoriteyt’ (authority). He did so because ‘this Ciceronian sweetness should not be hurt by the harshness of their unusualness, although I think I will use them at some time’.¹⁵ For Bredero that time had arrived. Bredero uses some of the words that Coornhert did not dare to use in 1561,¹⁶ but sometimes shifts the emphasis in his argument towards decorum: in his poems and comic drama, he presents common people, who of course expressed themselves as such. But at the same time, he does not stop to indicate the daily use of such words, as Coornhert did. Both men regarded currency as a criterion. This becomes clear from the well-known words in the preface to Bredero’s *Songbook*:

For me, I haven’t learned from another book than use. If I have been mistaken due to ignorance of foreign languages, sciences and arts, please, forgive me being an unlearned layman, and by being reasonable with respect to the ordinary Dutchman, because I, as the painter that I am,

have followed the dictum that is appropriate for a painter, that says: The best painters come closest to life, and not those who keep it for something ingenious to reproduce the attitudes of the body in an unnatural way, and all the wringing and bending of the limbs and bones, that they put upwards and bend often too unreasonably and contrary to what is appropriate.¹⁷

In this quotation, Bredero pleads for the use of simple, everyday language, deprived of every scholarly affectation. The justification of this vision was found in the content of his setting: characters picked out of the gutter in everyday situations, but also Bredero's own simplicity and the plainness of his readers played a part. The Songbook, full of love songs and jocular poetry, addressed a young urban public. They would have liked the literary form he used. Not only would they have recognized and appreciated the realism of the many songs, but also the humour and the Waterland dialect.¹⁸ Somewhat earlier in the same preface, Bredero has rounded on the self-willed writers that were influenced by a foreign word choice:

Certainly, I will never bind myself so closely to the conceitedness of some wayward writers who prefer sniffing in books by foreigners rather than considering the word choice of their fellow-citizens and countrymen, and who build unshakeable churches on their own ideas and fantasies ...¹⁹

From these passages, we may conclude that Bredero, attacking 'this new Leiden feeling', must have been aiming at the 'unnatural language cultivation' ('onnatuurlijke taalverzorging') (Bredero 1975, p. 17, sub 24), from which he could dissociate and defend himself implicitly by his choice of a natural language and common words. This would touch upon the statement in the Dialogue that the grammar of Dutch has been built from the natural properties of the language. The objective is quite similar: the usage rules had to be applied in such a way that the language was recovered in its former lustre. In this way, the Dutch language would fully profit from its perfect properties and the pure language could remain guaranteed. The freedom of the meter that is recommended in the Dialogue must have appealed to the playwright Bredero as well, a freedom 'in order that the language best resembles the ordinary way of speaking' ('op dat de taal het ghewoonlyck spreken best ghelyke'). This desire was supported by the idea that in doing so, everyday language could be approached robustly and all kinds of proverbs could be inserted easily.²⁰ Both the ordinary, everyday language and the proverbs were attractive to the comedian Bredero.

The topics in Bredero's 'Reden aande Latynsche-geleerde' ('Discourse to the Latin scholars'), introducing his comedy *Moortje*, are to a large extent based on the ideas of Coornhert and the liminaria of the trivium. Bredero's main reason to address the Latin scientists must have been the fact that he through an intermediary source had dared to 'translate' a Latin piece: Terence's *Eunuchus*. The content of this preface is briefly as follows: Bredero rejects the Terence translation by the Brabant poet Van Ghistele because of 'that crazy motley Antwerpian dialect' ('dat geckelijck gheschockiert Antwerps'), which he compares to the impure Dutch language spoken by 'starlings of courtiers and city clerks' ('spreuwen van Hovelinghen en Stadts-schrijvers'), as well as by 'busy merchants, and others who pauperize their own language and do violence to it' ('besongierende

Kooplieden, en andere die haar eyghen spraack verarmen en gewelt doen'). He considers this to be a language degeneration that could be heard all over the Netherlands. The Latin scholars may assess whether there were still other nations that had behaved just as foolishly against their mother tongue. Bredero makes use of the situation to ask the scholars to publish more in the vernacular. At last, he returns to his own work that shows how his 'translation' attends to the illiterate man. A central topic in this preface is the mishandling of language that would have resulted in language degeneration and in publications in foreign languages: both were a kind of neglect of something Bredero held in such high esteem: a pure and adequate mother tongue. Not only was language purity a victim of the unwillingness of these Latin scholars, but also the common man, having insufficient knowledge to profit from what was published in Latin at the very moment.²¹ An important source of inspiration for this preface must have been when the Eglentier addressed the burgomasters of Leiden, a stronghold of *latinitas*, and also the curators of the Leiden university, introducing the dialectic of the trivium, the *Ruygh-bewerp vande Redenkaveling ofte Nederduytsche Dialectike* (Leiden, Plantijn, 1585, reprint Amsterdam, 1614).²² Here, one can find the same request, 'that you must make of our mother tongue one native tongue of all good arts, attend to this case, consider the huge usefulness this may bring the nation'.²³

The similarity to Bredero's preface is striking: the Eglentier is also pointing at the usefulness of knowledge propagation in the mother tongue by scholars: 'One may derive from this all possibilities, seeing what pupils without much knowledge can do in a short while, consider what a learned man could do, in a long period, hoping for a reward ...'²⁴ And the Eglentier also mentions the praise for the nation and the advantages for non-Latin-speaking citizens.

One may conclude that some of the most important ideas in Bredero's 'Reden aande Latynsche-geleerde' can be reduced to Coornhert's preface to his translation (1561) of Cicero's *De officiis*, to the preface by the Eglentier to the *Ruygh-bewerp* (1585) and in part to Petrus Scriverius's dedication to Jacob van Dijck, introducing Daniel Heinsius's *Nederduytsche Poemata* (1616).

Compound words and genitives: Bredero, Coornhert and Spiegel

If we not only want to reduce Bredero's ideas on language to those of Coornhert, Spiegel and the Eglentier, but also trace their influence on the formal aspects of Bredero's language, we would do well to concentrate on the prose. My research in this field must be regarded as an initial exploration and as an elaboration of the main conclusions in the survey article on Bredero's prose by Damsteegt (1981) and on Coornhert's by Gelderblom (1989). The prose by Coornhert has, according to Gelderblom, a twofold form: in his longer texts, he embraces the eloquence of Cicero, including all kinds of stylistic features of the Roman author. In the shorter texts, in dedications and letters, there is more conciseness and obscurity (Gelderblom 1989, pp. 111–112). There are not any longer prose texts by Bredero. With regard to Bredero's prose, Damsteegt stands out as having one of the most striking conclusions due to the heaviness of the sentence construction by

the emphatic placing in front of a longer adverbial clause and an accentuated pronoun or an object instead of a subject (Damsteegt 1981, pp. 43–44). I did not find this in particular with Coornhert. The so called 'kettingzinnen' (chains of sentences) in Bredero, long chains of principal sentences and subordinate clauses of eight or more links do not correspond to Gelderblom's statement that Coornhert's prose has been conveniently arranged and structured in a logical way.²⁵ When we consider other details than syntactic phenomena, then indeed there are similarities. We find stylistic features as inner rhyme, alliterations and assonances in Coornhert and Bredero. We find the antitheses, the use of synonyms, the climax, the anaphora, the tripartition (that Gelderblom with respect to Coornhert relates to Cicero)²⁶ as well in Bredero to a large extent (cf. Damsteegt 1981).

One may expect Bredero to have a special interest in the way the mother tongue could be enriched in the view of the Eglentier. This 'enrichment' was effectuated using compound words,²⁷ amongst other things, about which it is spoken at some length in the seventh (and last) chapter of the Dialogue (*Twe-spraak*), entitled 'On the junction and richness of the language' ('Van de t'samenvoeghing ende ryckheyd des taals'). This chapter states that the richness of the Dutch language is evident in the first place because it was provided with letters in a richer way than all other languages, simple as well as joined double vowels, diphthongs and a variety of syllables (in which all kinds of letters could be mixed and turned).²⁸ At the same time, the Dutch language is rich due to its ability to express one's meaning properly ('eyhentlyck'), also by its richness of and in monosyllabic words (stems, c. q. etymons) and palindromes. The same richness is recognized in words that form another word when read backwards, as well as in word formation, due to the possibility of compound words, 'in such a way one could put together many words every day, that bring us great ornamentation and richness' ('in zulcker voeghen maghmer daghelycks veel t'samenzetten, die gróte cieraat ende ryckheid inbrenghen').²⁹

The Dialogue argues that the possibility of the Dutch language to make compound words out of two substantives enriches and embellishes the language.³⁰ Those Dutch compounds 'are more understandable because the meaning of both words is present within it' ('zyn te verstandigher om datter de betekenis beyder wóorden in is').³¹ Thus, substantives could be coupled together in this way and form one word, the so-called 'scarfed words' ('ghelaschte wóorden'), for example, 'slaapmuts' ('night-cap').³² It was the Dialogue that had put the Dutch language on the same level as the Greek, in this respect. Simon Stevin would adjust this a few years later, in his *Discourse on the Worth of the Dutch language* (*Uytspraeck vande weerdicheyt der Duytsche taal*) (1586), to discuss the supremacy of the Dutch who had even surpassed the Greeks.³³ According to the Dialogue, the Dutch language was the richest of all languages where monosyllabic words were concerned. As a consequence, the language had the pre-eminent possibility to form new compound words, like 'redenkavelen' ('reden' = reason; 'kavelen' = judge > 'redenkavelen' means: 'to argue by way of a dialectic'; the word does not exist anymore in modern Dutch).

In the Dialogue, different species of compound words are distinguished, those of a substantive and an adjective (like 'grasgroen' = 'green as grass'), those of a verb and a substantive (like 'rijmwóord' ('rhyming word') and 'klinckletter' ('sounding letter') (only the first word still exists in modern Dutch)). Divers are another species of compound words

that exist from words that are made ‘of different other parts such as good-for-nothing, diphthong, consonant, etc.’ (‘van verscheiden andere delen als duegh-niet, tweklanck, meklincker, etcetera’). The final species of compound is restricted to compound verbs: ‘boeckstaven’ (‘to record’), wóórdhouwen (‘to keep your word’) and ‘rederycken’ (‘make poems as the rhetoricians do’; the verb ‘rederycken’ consists of a substantive meaning ‘rede’ (reason (ratio), but also ‘language (oratio)) and a verb ‘rycken’ (originates from the substantive ‘ryck’ (‘rich’)).³⁴ In Bredero’s oeuvre, one will come across the last two species in particular, words like ‘gront-legghers’ (‘founders’), ‘uytheemsche-letterloosen-ongheleerde’ (‘foreign unlettered unlearned man’, which is a determinative compound, that is to say: ‘foreign’ and ‘unlettered’ have to do with ‘unlearned man’ and are to be considered as adjectives) and ‘eerelóse-geen-noot-hebbende-moetwillige-Banckeroetiers’ (‘infamous, without having any need to (declare themselves bankrupt), wanton, bankrupts’ (is also a determinative: adjectives and adjective adjuncts to ‘Banckeroetiers’)).³⁵

When talking about compound words, one can hardly omit the ideas and possible influence of Hendrik Spiegel. In around 1600, he was the influential leader of the Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric, putting forward a great deal of ideas concerning language innovation. Bredero, who entered the chamber around 1611, mentions him as one of the ‘eminent founders’ (‘heerlijcke gront-legghers’) of the Dutch language, in an oration dedicated to the chamber (Bredero 2011, pp. 76–78). Buisman has already pointed out the influence of Spiegel on Bredero in the volume of the verse Apollo (1615). Here, we find poems by Bredero, using words such as ‘oon’ (‘without’), ‘eigen wil’ (‘own will’), ‘gaww opmerck’ (‘acute attentiveness’), ‘aerden-kreyts’ (‘world’), ‘nuery-dillen’ (‘singing girl’), krijghs-bloedt-dorstigh (‘bloodthirsty for war’) and vlamvierigh (‘with flaming fire’). One can find these words used in exactly the same way in Spiegel, or they are formed in the way Spiegel usually did. Moreover, Bredero has imitated Spiegel in using certain figures and metaphors (Buisman, 1935, pp. 132–133).

The use of pre- and post-genitives may also indicate possible influence. Damsteegt has done some research on the occurrence of genitives in Spiegel’s Hertspiegel (written around 1600). Moreover, he has indicated the usualness of post-genitives in texts by Coornhert, and of pre-genitives in texts by Spiegel (Damsteegt, 1978, pp. 4–5). This may be explained by the tradition of rhetoricians, who used more pre-genitives (Coornhert did not join a chamber of rhetoric for the most part of his life). Besides, Spiegel aimed at conciseness in all of his writings. This becomes clear from his omitting a number of articles and pre-genitives in the Hertspiegel.³⁶ In the prose of Bredero, there are many pre-genitives, e.g. ‘des maackers sin’ (‘the meaning of the author’) in the preface to Rodd’rick ende Alphonsus (1615) and ‘het’s menschen gemoedt’ (‘the heart of the people’) in the dedication to Spaanschen Brabander (1617).³⁷ Damsteegt places pre-genitives of this kind in a first type, which was in his view the most common in literary and sublime language and maintained for the longest time. In this respect, Bredero as a poet keeps closer to the idiom of Spiegel than to that of Coornhert. Between the genitive and a definite substantive, the heart of a word group, an adjective adjunct to this heart can be placed as in ‘des Dochters sin-betoverende Schoonheyt’ (‘the exalted beauty of the girl’) in the ‘Inhoudt’ to Moortje (1615), but this is exceptionally in Bredero. One has to

notice that 'der' ('of the') is exclusively used for the plural, and 'des' ('of the') for male and female substantives, as it is dictated in the Dialogue (cf. Damsteegt, 1978, p. 8).

The second type is a definite substantive in genitive without an article, eventually preceded by an adjective that is bound to it, and a heart that in its turn can have a pre-ad-junct to it. It is the type that is still productive in proper names nowadays. In Bredero, this type is abundant: 'Adams Kindt' ('Adam's child') en 'Adams Kinderen' ('Adam's children') in a letter to N. N., 'Moortjes kleederen' ('Moortje's clothes') in the 'Inhoudt' to Moortje, and furthermore in different forms.³⁸ The third type consists in one or more pre-ad-juncts to a group, followed by a definite substantive and the heart (Damsteegt, 1978, p. 6). This type is rather rare in the prose of Bredero: examples are, 'haar opgeblasen glaasen kickers oogen' ('her puffed up, glassy frog eyes') and 'houten baviaens-backesen' ('wooden mug of an ape') in an oration (c. 1613) (Bredero, 2011, p. 84).

Word usage: Coornhert and Bredero

Coornhert's ambition to achieve a pure Dutch language is especially directed towards using the right words, taken from the rich and varied vocabulary of the mother tongue. He hardly mentions sentence structure: it is the words that must be clear and pure, serving eloquence (cf. Gelderblom pp. 104–105). Bredero's prose can be qualified as 'pure' and 'eloquent' in the same way. Purism is proved as he only uses Gallicisms to produce a certain (comical) effect. Eloquence arises from language variation, stylistic embellishment from using tautologies, alliterations, sentences with a threefold conditional form, metaphors and an abundant use of adjectives (Damsteegt, 1981, pp. 35–38).

But there are also direct similarities in the usage and imagery of both authors. Kruyskamp noticed that Bredero describes the theme of friendship in his drama *Rodd'rick ende Alphonsus* in terms of 'love'. Indeed, the two knights *Rodd'rick* and *Alphonsus* discuss their 'love' for each other in verses 85–112. In the letter to his friend Karel Quina, Bredero brings up 'the old love (between the two of us)' ('de oude liefde (tusschen ons beyde)') (Bredero, 2011, pp. 102–103). According to Kruyskamp, the use of this term 'love' may be reduced to Coornhert's *Art of Ethics*, especially in the 13th chapter of the fourth book, which deals with friendship ('*Vande Vriendschappe*'). Coornhert states here that 'real friendship is a righteous joy, that is free and aims at the love of the beloved' ('*Die warachtighe vriendschap is een rechtvaardige wille, die vry is ende endt op des gheliefden lief*').³⁹

The way in which Bredero considers the pure mother tongue as a 'plain dress' ('*effen klee*d') reminds us also of the idiom of Coornhert. In the preface to the Dialogue, Coornhert had pointed at the richness of the Dutch language and at the absence of the need to borrow from foreign languages because:

we have more and better ourselves; that's the reason why I intended to bring my mother tongue back to her original honour, and to purify her dress, which was rich and elegant away from the useless rags and filthy tinkering, as far as my little abilities reach ...⁴⁰

Coornhert relates those ‘little abilities’ to ‘the little booklets translated by me, and published’ (‘boexkens by my vertaalt ende in druck ghegheven’), especially Cicero’s *De officiis*. In the preface of this translation, Coornhert has used the same metaphor: ‘strange rags’ were put on the ‘coat’ of our language.⁴¹ In the preface to the *Art of Ethics*, Coornhert advises the reader to avoid ‘tinkering with strange rags of beggars on the rich coat of the Dutch language’ (‘vreemde bedellappen te brodden opten rycken mantele der Neerlandscher talen’).⁴² The struggle for a pure national language also had a political background. Coornhert was convinced that foreign landlords had contaminated the language using strange, foreign words. Therefore, the partiality to the Dutch vernacular was closely connected to a dawning realization of nationalism (Van Veen 2009, p. 56).

The imagery of language as a coat or as a dress is taken over by Bredero in his preface to *Moortje* (1617). But Bredero remoulds the ‘strange rags’ (‘vreemde lappen’), i.e. Romanizing tendencies to ‘discourses full of embellished and embroidered words’ (‘reden vol getappijte of geborduurde woorden’):

I’ve read so much about his [Terence’s] immense eloquence that I loved him before I saw him. But when he appeared to me with that strange, many-coloured Antwerpian dialect [the translation of Terence’s *Eunuchus* by Van Ghistele], I was in doubt whether I should cry or laugh. If you want, you will find a snatch of it here and there, that you will be pleased with and like a lot, if you like a language full of embellished and adorned words, as they are used by a lot of imitators of courtiers and town clerks. Hold on, busy merchants and others who impoverish and do violence to their own language, and who make rather a show of a patched up fool’s cap, rather than wanting to sparkle in an immaculate, plain coat. Ah! What a freely chosen poverty I hear through the entire Netherlands?⁴³

The plain clothes without embellishment symbolized the simplicity and untouched status of the language. That this included an aspect of decorum is evident from the ‘Summary’ (‘Inhoud’) to the *Spaanschen Brabander*: ‘three old fellows prove, showing their simple manners, language and clothes, the sincere simplicity of the Amsterdam inhabitants’ (‘drie ouwe Klouwers bewijzen met haar slechte manieren, spraack en kleedinghe, de oprechte slechtheyt der Amstelredammers’) (Bredero 2011, p. 270). Bredero has dressed his comedy *Moortje* in a similar ‘sincere’ way:

But you, very wise doctors [the Latin professors], in any case if you will take pains, you will see that I was merciful, because before he [Terence] died I dressed him decently, in one and the same manner, consequently in one style, in our way and according to my possibilities, not with beggar’s clothes from a hundred thousand gewgaws, from foreign rags and other pieces of patches, borrowed from abroad, like he was rigged out for sixty years in Brabant [i.e. the translation by Van Ghistele]. He didn’t look different from excuse me the raven of Aesop, so that he, if anybody, had appropriated his own stuff, he would definitely have come away with a flea in his ear.⁴⁴

Conclusion

According to the Dialogue, the chambers of rhetoric had to be vernacular schools that did their utmost to 'purify, enrich and embellish the language' ('zuyveren, verriyken ende verciëren des taals').⁴⁵ The same three activities characterize the literal work of Gerbrand Bredero. In his prose, he frequently mentions language usage. He takes his stand, for the most part, on ideas that were current in the Amsterdam chamber of rhetoric and that originated from the insights of Coornhert and Spiegel. We have stated that some of the imagery Bredero employed can be linked up with the idiom of Coornhert, whilst Spiegel must have been an example where the use of compound words and genitives is concerned. The current arguments about purism and usage of the mother tongue are also familiar to Bredero, but he is able to fit them into his own poetical world with a slight shift of emphasis.

Bredero proceeded from the tradition of the rhetoricians and being a renaissance author, he has purposively renewed his language, creatively imitating Spiegel and Coornhert. The motivation for Bredero to write in a pure Dutch language and his urgent request to the Latinists to apply the vernacular as their medium (cf. Jansen 2014) are an extension of the choice that Coornhert had made in translating classical authors. This choice took a definite form with the impressive undertaking of publishing a grammar book, a handbook on dialectic and one on rhetoric (1584–1587) in Dutch. With his unusual forceful creative power, Bredero has brought a syntactic–stylistic variant of the rhetoricians to life again in new and sometimes grotesque forms. Joining his predecessors, he has adapted the rules for forming compound words and derivatives in his own way. However, his huge literary impact can be found in the representation of living everyday language, the language of the common Amsterdam people, of which he propagated naturalness and commonness.

There was a huge void between his considerate, inclusive stance towards the Amsterdam 'burghers' and his reserved, reluctant attitude towards the distant neoLatin erudition. When Bredero states in the preface to the Songbook that he has not learnt from any books other than the book of usage, and begs forgiveness if he has made some mistakes due to his ignorance of foreign languages, sciences and arts, he does not pride himself on not knowing foreign languages.⁴⁶ This utterance indicates a preference for stylistic naturalness, a choice for a language register that corresponded to his own personality, to the everyday characters in his poems and plays, to the addressed public and to the mostly popular content of his farces and rustic, jocular songs (cf. Jansen 2003b, pp. 224–225). The characters in his comedies and farces are talking in a preponderant low language register, sometimes a little bit higher, but artificial turgidity is always lacking here, unless it was meant as a special effect. With this kind of decorum, he purposely dissociated himself from the mannered, pompous language of the rhetoricians and of the Brabant dialect,⁴⁷ and also from the stylistic affectedness of Leiden humanists as Heinsius.

Coornhert's style has been characterized by Gelderblom as a Ciceronian, sweet prose style that had to serve the higher object of enunciating the truth (Gelderblom 1989, p. 114). Bredero, not being able to read Latin, did not follow Cicero as a direct example,

although he could have had some knowledge of Cicero's insights and stylistic idiom via translations and treatises on this matter. But he was acquainted with Coornhert's prose and will have appreciated the latter's eloquence, in view of the many alliterations, tripartitions, assonances and rhythmical patterns in Bredero's prose. Therefore, Bredero's prose style could be called 'Ciceronian' in some ways, be it with some 'un-ciceronian' characteristics, like the sometimes quite unbalanced structure of sentences and the almost complete lack of Latinate constructions (Damsteegt 1981, p. 44).

Bredero's aspiration for language building had a social dimension, where he insisted on the translation of more classical texts and on the writing of scientific studies in Dutch, although this may have been in his own interests as well. Like Coornhert and some of his contemporaries, he stood up for a wider part of the population. It wasn't by accident that he enjoyed great popularity with the public, not only because of the way in which the themes he offered could be actualised, but mainly due to the less learned, academic, character of his poems, by which his verses were very accessible (cf. Van Vaeck, 1992, p. 62).

It was this 'sincere simplicity' ('oprechte slechtheyt') that made him one of the most popular poets of the Dutch Golden Age.

Notes

¹ Cf. Spies 1999b, pp. 51–56. The *Twe-spraak* (Dialogue) was the first part of a trivium project in vernacular by the Amsterdam chamber: three publications in the field of popular education.

² 'Toe-eyghenbrief' (Dedication letter) to the Dialogue ... (*Twe-spraak* 1584, fol. A3'): 'ghemeene scholen des Land-taals behoren gheacht te zyn, waar toe een yghelyck, niemand uytghezonderd (de bloem wtstekende) vrye toegang heeft, dies hen luy het zuiveren, verryken ende vercierien des taals (ende niet het rymen alleen) eyghentlyck betaamt ...' Spiegel 1962, p. 4. *Twe-spraak* 1985, p. 57. Jansen 2003a, p. 170; Van Dixhoorn, 2009, pp. 132–133.

³ Cf. the oration addressed to the Eglentier (c. 1611), where Bredero follows in Coornhert's and Spiegel's track in his plea for purism: those who 'embellished' their style with Latin, French, Spanish or Italian terms did not show any grace in the first place. If someone would like to prove his knowledge, he had to display that in a genuine, pure language (Bredero, 2011, pp. 76–78).

⁴ Peeters, 1989, p. 73 ff.; Spies, 1999a, p. 47.

⁵ Cf. for example Bredero, 1973, pp. 28–29, with Witstein, 1975, pp. 2–3, 18 ff.; Bredero, 1983, pp. 82, 84. Cf. Verdenius, 1933, p. 15.

⁶ His demonstrations of self-analysis were in-keeping with the tendency of the *Hert-spiegel* [by H. L. Spiegel] and Coornhert's *Art of Ethics*, according to Porteman, Smits-Veldt, 2008, p. 215.

⁷ Bredero's utterance: 'the simple first-fruits of my unlettered rhymes' ('de slechte Eerstelingen van

mijn ongeleerde Rymerijen') in the dedication to Tesselschade, introducing his *Lucelle* (Bredero, 2011, p. 150) could be a cliché, although he explicitly states that he had to use here, in the comical passages, some expressions and words of the street to please the common people ('het ghemeene volck te gevalle'). In the preface to *Griane*, he emphatically mentions his own 'simpleness' ('leeke stijl van dichten') (p. 186). In the preface to *Moortje* (an adaptation of Terence's *Eunuchus*), Bredero talks about adapting the plot in such a way that this play was situated in his own time and in Amsterdam, 'so that he obliged the simple people' ('de slechte ghemeente te gevallen') (p. 202). Bredero explained this further in the dedication to Jacob van Dijck, introducing *Moortje*. He had adapted the plot to his own period and to Amsterdam 'in order that the play would be more reliable and pleasant for the common people' ('om dat het so by de gemeente te kundigher en te angenamer soude wese') (p. 158). In his oration to the Eglentier, Bredero praises the Boethius translation by Coornhert, who had translated the text 'for the common Dutchmen in pure and clear Dutch' ('den ghemeenen Duytschen in klaar duytelijck Duytsch verduytscht') (p. 76). Everywhere in Bredero's prose, a natural, common and clear usage is emphasized, so that the less learned reader could understand it. This address to a wide audience was also, partly, a key to his success. Coornhert will have made his choice for simple words, a clear, simple style and a neat arrangement of the matters on the same grounds,

- though Fleurkens emphasizes here the instructive function (Fleurkens, 1994, pp. 28–29).
- ⁸ Cicero 1561, 'De vertaelder totten Leser' (preface by Coornhert), fol. *6^r.
- ⁹ Bredero, 2011, p. 202 ('Reden aande Latynschegeleerde'): 'lieden die eer sy haer eygen sprake kennen, andere talen leeren, die naderhand duytsch sprekende, haar dickwils om 'tlichtste met een vreemdelings woort behelpen moeten'. Cf. Petrus Scriverius's dedication to Jacob van Dijk, in: Heinsius, 1616 (Nederduytsche Poemata), p. 4 (about his countrymen who study so much Latin (and Greek) that they are nowhere strangers but in their fatherland).
- ¹⁰ Cicero, 1561, fol. *6^v; Bredero 2011, p. 202. (cf. Bostoën 1984, p. 45: "'t mengsele der vremder schuymen', in a grammar dating from 1568). The next section follows Bredero 2011, p. 233.
- ¹¹ Bredero 2011, p. 224: 'Voor mijn deel ick bekent, dat ick met dit nieuwe Leydsche gevoelen niet over een en kom, en dat ick met een kettersche stijf-sinnigheyt aan het ouwde hange ...'.
- ¹² Daniel Heinsius was for Dutch poets a key figure in this change from Neolatin to Dutch, by the publication (1616) of his Nederduytsche poemata, where Petrus Scriverius added a remarkable preface, challenging scientists to publish in Dutch and not in Latin from that moment on. Van der Sijs 2004, pp. 570–574. On Scriverius: Tuynman 1977.
- ¹³ 'Hymnus of Lof-Sanck van Bacchus' (1614), and 'Lof-Sanck van Iesus Christus' (1616) (Heinsius 1965). In the Uytlegginge (explanation) of the 'Lof-sanck van Iesus Christus' (1965, p. 320), one has noted: 'The author has written this Lofsanck [hymn of praise] in such a way that he sometimes has wanted to use some poetical words, instead of others that are more common, just as he has named the sea: Tethys, and the water: Achelous' ('Den auteur heeft desen Lofsanck soo geschreven, dat hy by wijle heeft willen gebruycken eenige poëtische woorden, in plaetse van andere, die gemeender sijn. Gelijk, als hy de zee Tethys, het water Achelous heeft genaemt').
- ¹⁴ Bredero 2011, p. 224: 'smadelijck verwerpen, om dat zyse juist door onkunde niet en kennen'. In the dedication to Jacob van Dyck to the Spaanschen Brabander (1618), Bredero was more positive about Heinsius's song of praise; in the eyes of Bredero, the addressee could count himself as the 'more learned and by God gifted men' ('geleerder en van God begaafde Mannen') (Bredero 1999, p. 210), a matter of decorum thus.
- ¹⁵ Cicero 1561, fol. *7^v: 'dese Ciceronise soeticheyt door de hartheyt haerder ongewoonte niet ghequetst en soude werden: hoe wel ic die noch metter tijt al dencke te gebruycken ...'. Bredero 2011, pp. 233–234.
- ¹⁶ For example, Bredero uses a word like 'grootachtbaarheyt' (magnificence) in the dedication to Jacob van Dijk: 'It is true, I hold your honourable Excellency [magnificence] in such an esteem, that ...' ('Wel is waar dat ick uwe E. Groot-achtbaarheyt in sulcken achtginghe hebbe ...').
- ¹⁷ Bredero 2011, p. 226: 'Wat my belangt, ic heb anders geen Boeck geleert als het Boeck des gebruyckx, so ick dan door onwetenheydt der uytlantscher spraken, wetenschappen, en konsten hebben gedoolt: verschoont my ongeleerde Leke-broeder, en geeft den Duytsche wat toe: want ick heb als een schilder, de schilderachtige spreuck ghevolcht, die daer seyt: Het zijn de beste Schilders die 't leven naast komen, en niet de gene die voor een geestich dingen houden het stellen der standen buyten de nature, en het wringhen en buygen der geleden en gebeenderen, die sy vaack te onredelic en buyten de loop des behoorlickheys opschorten en ommecrommen'.
- ¹⁸ See Jansen 2003b, pp. 221, 224. Testimonies by Bredero on p. 224, n. 36; Porteman, Smits-Veldt, 2008, p. 212.
- ¹⁹ Bredero 2011, p. 226 'Sekerlijck ick en sal my nimmermeer soo seer niet binden ande Eenrinstigheyt van sommige Een-sinnighe Schryvers, die meer der vreemdelingen boecken door-snoffelen, als de gewoonte van 't spreken haarder mede-Burgeren en Lands-luyden, doorsoeken, en op haar eyghen in-vallen en inbeeldingen onversettelijcke kercken bouwen ...'.
- ²⁰ Twe-spraack 1584, p. 60 (1985, p. 207). Cf. Koppenol 1998, pp. 262–263. In his drama (like the Schynheyligh), Bredero takes the liberty of a large metrical freedom (see Bredero 1979, pp. 39–40).
- ²¹ Simon Stevin's Uytspreeck van de Weerdicheyt der Duytsche Tael (1586) is also set against the exclusive use of Latin for scientific purposes, entailing that those who in their youth lacked the opportunity of a scholarly education are forever prevented from participating in scientific activity (E. J. Dijksterhuis, in: Stevin 1955, p. 7).
- ²² The most important Amsterdam contribution to literary developments must have been the publication of the Dutch language trivium: a grammar (the already mentioned Dialogue), a system of dialectics and a system of rhetoric. A possible relation between the 'Reden' and the dedication to the Redenkaveling ofte Nederduytsche Dialectike, addressed to the Leiden burgomasters and university curators, is already mentioned in: Kalf 1909, p. 61; cf. Bredero 1984, p. 27, n. 1.
- ²³ Spiegel 1962, pp. 67–68: 'dat ghy van onze Moeders-tale een Moeder-taal aller ghoeder kunsten maken, deze zake behertighen, ende de grôte nutbaarheid die den Vaderlande hier duer magh gheschieden overweghen wilt'. Bredero 2011, p. 205.
- ²⁴ Spiegel 1962, p. 68: 'Nöpemde de moghelyckheid, die mooghy hier an afnemen, bemerckende, wat leerlingen niet verder ziende als om zelf de zake wys te werden, in een korte wyle hebben kunnen doen: overleggen wat een geleerder, in langheid van tyd, midts hope van lóón, in zulx zoude vermoghen'.

- ²⁵ Damsteegt 1981, p. 43; Gelderblom 1989, p. 109. This section is partly based on Bredero 2011, p. 51–53.
- ²⁶ Gelderblom 1989, pp. 110–111 (about ‘stylistic features that demonstrate that Coornhert was a talented representative of a prose tradition that is rooted in Cicero’).
- ²⁷ According to the Dialogue enrichment of language is effectuated by: 1. compound words; 2. the formation of denominative verbs; and 3. a compound by means of prepositions and the derivation using ‘voorzettinghen’ (prefixes) and ‘volghers’ (suffixes). The latter two points I will omit here.
- ²⁸ Twe-spraak 1584, p. 105. Cf. Twe-spraak 1985, p. 516. These ideas are based on those of the Antwerp philologist Goropius Becanus.
- ²⁹ Twe-spraak 1584, respectively pp. 7, 104, 106, and pp. 91–92. Spiegel 1962, p. 54; Twe-spraak 1985, pp. 516–517.
- ³⁰ Twe-spraak 1584, pp. 91–92: ‘In that way one can put together a lot every day, that brings about great embellishment and richness’ (‘in zulcker voeghen maghmer daghelycks veel t’samenzetten, die gróte cieraet ende ryckheid inbrenghen’). Twe-spraak 1985, pp. 269–271; vgl. p. 522. Parts of this section are explained earlier in Bredero 2011, pp. 56–58.
- ³¹ Twe-spraak 1584, pp. 91–92; Twe-spraak 1985, p. 523.
- ³² Twe-spraak 1584, p. 91; Twe-spraak, 1985, pp. 495–498.
- ³³ Stevin, Uytspraak vande weerdicheyt der Duytsche taal, in: Stevin, 1955. 82. See also Damsteegt, 1978, p. 13. Twe-spraak 1985, p. 523. Rombouts 1933, pp. 32–35.
- ³⁴ Twe-spraak 1584, p. 54; Damsteegt 1978, p. 14.
- ³⁵ In Spiegel’s Hertspeigel, most of the compound words are double, with a single quadripartite, like ‘slang-trek-hobbeldijk’. Damsteegt 1978, p. 17.
- ³⁶ For example, ‘Slaet hand ant rad’ (‘lay hands on wheel’). Damsteegt, 1978, pp. 9–12.
- ³⁷ Damsteegt 1978, p. 5. For the rest we come across in Bredero’s prose (Bredero, 2011): ‘des Konincks reden en voorslagh’ (Rodd’rick ende Alphonsus, ‘Inhoudt’, p. 238); ‘des Hemels gunste’ (Griane, dedication to MPD, p. 142); ‘Int vyfde Deel werden de gevangens angeklaaght van des overlens Neven’ (Griane, Inhoudt, p. 246); ‘des Gevers vrymoedicheyt’ (Lucelle, dedication to Tesselscha, p. 148); ‘des Frans-mans wech’ (p. 150); ‘des Lof-tuyters oor-smeeckerije’ (Lucelle, preface, p. 194); ‘der Sotten ghemoeden’ (ibidem); ‘der Boeren ommeegang’ (Gheestich liedt-boeckken, preface, p. 224); ‘der vreemdelingen boeckken’ (ibidem, p. 226); ‘der Spaanschen hóoghmoedt’ (Moortje, Inhoudt, p. 258); and en ‘der Steden-klock’ (Spaanschen Brabander, Inhoudt, p. 272).
- ³⁸ Examples are: ‘in haer moeders spraack’ (in her mother’s language); ‘haar Vaders Kamerknecht’ (her father’s servant), etc. More examples in Bredero, 2011, pp. 258–260.
- ³⁹ Coornhert 1942, IV.13, par. 3 (p. 295). Kruyskamp in: Bredero, 1973, p. 28. Cf. also Damsteegt 1981, p. 32. ‘Liefde’ (‘love’) has the meaning *vriendschap* (‘friendship’) already in the Middle Ages (Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek i. v. ‘liefde’, sub 2), but Kruyskamp states that this chapter in Coornhert’s *Art of Ethics* has formed the ideas of Bredero in other respects as well, especially regarding the contents of his ideas.
- ⁴⁰ Tve-spraak 1985, pp. 64–65: ‘wy zelve meer ende beter t’huys hadden; derhalven ick voor my nam myn moeders taal weder in haar oude ere te brenghen ende haar kleeed, dat van zelfs ryckelyck was ende cierlyck, vande onnutte lappen ende vuyle brodderyen te zuyveren, na myn klein vermoghen ...’. Cf. Peeters, 1989, pp. 63, 74. Gelderblom, 1989, pp. 103–104.
- ⁴¹ Coornhert 1561, fol. *7^{r-v}: ‘But, in excusing these shortcomings, will one also mutilate these sound limbs then? We are now in such a state that many young writers, understanding a single word of French or Latin, put such strange rags on the coat of our language, for reasons of beauty and graceful embellishment, exactly if it were an important thing to beg without reason for foreign help. This is the reason that many well-bred civilians and farmers, hear the judgment of their cases ...’ (‘... maer salmen dan om dese leemten te verschoonen de gesonde leden ooc mede noch verleenden? Tis nu alsoo verde gecomen dat veel ionge scrijvers een woort Franchoyts oft Latijns verstaende suldcanighe vreemde lappen voor een welstan ende bevallijcke cieraet opten mantel onser spraken brodden, recht oft een heerlijcke ende rijckelijcke saecke waer sonder noot vreemt behulp te bedelen: t welck oorsake is dat menich fijn burgher ende boer het vonnisse zijre saken aenhoorende ...’). Cf. Tve-spraak 1985, p. 512.
- ⁴² Coornhert 1942, p. 5: ‘So much of the language that I have used in this text can bring about, I have been forced in treating new subjects, in Dutch, sometimes to also use new words, like those who, already in my youth, have avoided tinkering with strange rags of beggars on the rich coat of the Dutch language’ (‘Zo vele de tale by my hier inne ghebruyckt magh beroeren, ben ick ghedronghen gheweest int handelen van nieuwe stof, in Neerlandsch, by wylen oock nieuwe woorden te ghebruycken, als die al in myne jonckheyt, daar ick mochte, vermyt hebbe vreemde bedellappen te brodden opten rycken mantele der Neerlandscher talen’).
- ⁴³ Bredero 1984, pp. 115–116: ‘Ick heb so veel van syn onuytsprekelijcke welsprekentheyt ghelesen, dat ick hem beminde eer ick hem sach: maer doen hy my in dat geckelijck gheschockiert Antwerps verscheen, ick stontd in beraadt of ick huylen wouw of lachen, heb g’er lust in, ghy sult hier of daer noch wel een schampeloentje kryghen, dat u mogelyck wel bevallen en een groot vermaken sal geven, indien ghy gedient zijt met redenen vol getappijte of geborduurde woorden,

ghelijck als veel spreeuwen van Hovelinghen en Stadtschrijvers besighen. Hola! besongierende Kooplieden, en andere die haar eyghen spraack verarmen en gewelt doen, en liever met een ghelapte gecks-kap brallen, dan dat sy willen gaan blincken in een onbesproken effene Mantel. Ach! wat een willighe arremodee hoor ick over 'tgantsche Nederlandt?'

⁴⁴ Bredero 2011, p. 200: 'Dan ghy Alderwijste Doctoren, als u immers de moeyten lust, ghy sult mijn barmharticheyt bevinden, want ick heb hem voor sijn doodt op onse wijse en na mijn macht eerlijck, en uyt eenderhandt eenparich ghekleet, niet met een bedel-

rock van hondert duysent snorrepipen, van krommelappen, en ander uytheemsche geleende snipperlingen, gelijk als hy over tsestich Iaren was uytghestreken in Brabant: Hy sacher uyt, met oorlof, anders noch anders als Esopus Raven, sulcx dat, soo yder 'tsijne hadde gheeygent, hy souwder voorseker heel kaal afghekomen hebben'.

⁴⁵ See supra, n. 2.

⁴⁶ As stated by Van der Sijs 2004, p. 580.

⁴⁷ Cf. e.g. Bredero's *Klucht van de koe*, vss. 601–607; and Bredero 1999, p. 217 (Spaanschen Brabander, preface).

Bibliography

- Bonger, Henk. *The Life and Work of Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004).
- Bostoën, Karel. 'Kaars en bril: de oudste Nederlandse grammatica', *Archief van het Koninklijk Zeeuwsch Genootschap der Wetenschappen*, (1984), 1–47.
- Bredero, Gerbrand Adriaensz. *Over-gesette Lucelle*. C. A. Zaalberg (ed.). (Culemborg: Tjeenk Willink-Noorduijn, 1972).
- Bredero, Gerbrand Adriaensz. *Rodd'rick ende Alphonsus*. C. Kruyskamp (ed.). (Culemborg: Tjeenk Willink-Noorduijn, 1973).
- Bredero, Gerbrand Adriaensz. *Boertigh, amoreus, en aendachtigh Groot Lied-Boeck*. Vol. I., G. Stuiveling e.a. (eds.). (Culemborg: Tjeenk Willink-Noorduijn, 1975).
- Bredero, Gerbrand Adriaensz. *Schyn-heylich*. E. K. Grootes (ed.). (The Hague: Tjeenk Willink-Noorduijn, 1979).
- Bredero, Gerbrand Adriaensz. *Groot lied-boeck*. Vol. 2, G. Stuiveling (ed.). (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 1983).
- Bredero, Gerbrand Adriaensz. *Moortje. P. Minderaa*. C.A. Zaalberg (eds.) with cooperation of B. C. Damsteegt, (Leiden, Martinus Nijhoff, 1984).
- Bredero, Gerbrand Adriaensz. *Moortje en Spaanschen Brabander*. E. K. Grootes (ed.). (Amsterdam: Athenaeum, Polak & Van Gennep, 1999).
- Bredero, Gerbrand Adriaensz. *Proza*. J. Jansen (ed.). (Hilversum: Verloren, 2011).
- Buisman, J. F. 'De ethische denkbeelden van Hendrik Laurensz Spiegel' thesis (Utrecht Wageningen: Veenman, 1935).
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Officia Ciceronis [...]* nu eerst vertaelt [...] door Dierick Coornhert (Haarlem: Jan van Zuren, 1561).
- Coornhert, Dirck Volckertszn. *Zedekunst dat is wellevenskunste* B. Becker (ed.). (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1942).
- Dibbets, G. R. W., 'De Twe-spraak en enkele tijdgenoten', *Gramma* 8 (1984), 225–246.
- Damsteegt, B. C., 'T'samenvoeging in de Hertspiegel', *TNTL* 94 (1978), 1–24.
- Damsteegt, B. C., 'Het proza van Gerbrand Adriaensz. Bredero', In: idem. *Van Spiegel tot Leeuwenhoek. Syntaktische en stilistische verschijnselen in 17e-eeuwse teksten*. (Leiden: Repro RU Leiden, 1981), 23–48.
- Van Dixhoorn, A., *Lustige Geesten. Rederijkers in de Noordelijke Nederlanden* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2009), 1480–1650.
- Fleurkens, Anneke C. *Stichtelijke lust: de toneelspelen van D. V. Coornhert (1522–1590) als middelen tot het geven van morele instructie*. (Hilversum: Verloren, 1994).
- Gelderblom, Arie-Jan. 'Nieuwe stof in Neerlandsch. Een karakteristiek van Coornherts proza', In: H. Bongers et al. (eds.), *Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert. Dwars maar recht*. (Zutphen: De Walburg Pers, 1989), 98–114, 177.
- Grootes, E. K., and Schenkeveld-Van der Dussen M. A., 'The Dutch Revolt and the Golden Age, 1560–1700', in: Theo Hermans (ed.), *A literary history of the Low Countries*. (Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2009), 153–291.
- Heinsius, Daniel. *Nederduytsche Poemata, by een vergadert en uytgegeven door P. S.* [Petrus Scriverius]. (Amsterdam: Willem Jansz Blaeu, 1616).
- Heinsius, Daniel. *Bacchus en Christus: Twee lofzangen van Daniel Heinsius*. L. Ph. Rank J. D. P. Warners and F. L. Zwaan (eds.). (Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink, 1965).
- Kalff, Gerrit. *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche letterkunde* Vol. 4. (Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1909).
- Jansen, Jeroen, 'Purity and the Language of the Court in the Late-Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Netherlands', in: Fiona Somerset, Nicholas Watson (eds.), *The Vulgar Tongue: Medieval and Postmedieval Vernacularity*, (Penn State Press, 2003a), 166–176.

- Jansen, Jeroen. 'Dichtkunst en schilderkunst als (stief)zusters. Iets over literair en picturaal realisme', In: Marc van Vaeck, Hugo Brems, Geert H. M. Claassens (eds.). *De steen van Alciato. Literatuur en visuele cultuur in de Nederlanden*. Opstellen voor prof. dr. Karel Porteman bij zijn emeritaat. (Leuven: Peeters, 2003b), 211–227.
- Jansen, Jeroen. *Imitatio, Literaire navolging in de Europese letterkunde van de renaissance*. (Hilversum: Verloren, 2008).
- Jansen, Jeroen. 'Gerbrand Bredero's handling of Antiquity. Transfer of classical knowledge into seventeenth century vernacular culture'. In: Bettina Noak (eds.). *Wissenstransfer und Auctoritas in der frühneuzeitlichen niederländischsprachigen Literatur*. (Reihe Berliner Mittelalter- und Frühneuezeitforschung. Göttingen: V & R – unipress, 2014), 211–226.
- Koppenol, Johan. *Leids heeld. Het Loterijspel (1596) van Jan van Hout*. (Hilversum: Verloren, 1998).
- Peeters, Leopold, 'Taalopvattingen van D. V. Coornhert (1522–1590)', In: G. R. W. Dibbets, J. Noordegraaf, M. J. van der Wal (eds.). *Taalopbouw als Renaissance-ideaal: studies over taalopvattingen en taalpraktijk in de zestiende en zeventiende eeuw*. (Amsterdam: Buijten & Schipperheijn, 1989), 58–78 [published earlier in 1984].
- Porteman, Karel, and Mieke Barbara Smits-Veldt. *Een nieuw vaderland voor de Muzen*. (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2008).
- Rombouts, J., Simon Stevin. *Taalstrijd - taalzuivering*. (Brussel: Standaard, 1933).
- Spiegel, Hendrik Laurensz. *Twe-spraack. Ruygh-Bewerp. Kort Begrip. Rederijck-kunst*. W. J. H. Caron (ed.), (Groningen: J. B. Wolters, 1962).
- Spies, Marijke. 'Developments in Sixteenth-Century Dutch Poetics', In: Henk Duits Ton van Strien (eds.). *Rhetoric, Rhetoricians and Poets. Studies in Renaissance Poetry and Poetics*, (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999a) 37–50.
- Spies, Marijke. 'The Amsterdam Chamber De Eglentier and the Ideals of Erasmian Humanism', In: Henk Duits, Ton van Strien (eds.). *Rhetoric, Rhetoricians and Poets. Studies in Renaissance Poetry and Poetics*, (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1999b), 51–56.
- Stevin, Simon. *The principal works of Simon Stevin*, Vol. 1. E. J. Dijksterhuis (ed.). (Amsterdam: C. V. Swets and Zeitlinger, 1955).
- Sijs, Noline van der. *Taal als mensenwerk: het ontstaan van het ABN*. (Den Haag: Sdu, 2004).
- Tuynman, Pierre, 'Petrus Scriverius. 12 January 1576–30 April 1660', *Quaerendo* 7 (1977), 4–45.
- Tuynman, Pierre, 'De const van rhetorike en Hoofs vroege poezie', In E. K. Grootes et al. (eds.). *Uyt liefde geschreven. Studies over Hooft*. (Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1981), 11–27.
- Twe-spraack. *Twe-spraack vande Nederduitsche letterkunst, ofte vant spellen ende eyghenscap des Nederduitschen taals, uytghegheven by de Kamer In liefde bloeyende, t'Amstelredam*. Leiden: Christoffel Plantijn, 1584.
- Twe-spraack. *Twe-spraack vande Nederduitsche letterkunst (1584)*, G. R. W. Dibbets (ed.). (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1985).
- Vaeck, Marc van. 'Bredero's liedboek', In: D. de Geest, M. van Vaeck (eds.). *Brekende spiegels. Beeldveranderingen in de Nederlandse literatuur*. (Leuven: Afdeling Nederlandse Literatuur en Volkskunde. K. U. Leuven, 1992), 59–71.
- Veen, Mirjam van. *Dirck Volckertszn Coornhert*. (Kampen: Kok, 2009).
- Verdenius A. A. *Bredero's Dialectkunst als Hollandse reactie tegen Zuidnederlandse taalhegemonie*. (Groningen: Noordhoff, 1933).
- Witstein, S. F. *Bredero's ridder Rodderick* (Groningen: Tjeenk Willink, 1975).

Notes on contributor

Jeroen Jansen is an assistant professor at the Department of Dutch studies of the University of Amsterdam and teaches early modern Dutch literature. He is currently leading the project 'Pretextual Strategies. The Rhetoric of Ethos, Literary Authority and (Con)Textual Identity in Renaissance Preliminary Texts'.

Correspondence to: Dr Jeroen Jansen, Neerlandistiek, Spuistraat 134, 1012 VB Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Email: j.jansen@uva.nl