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Abstract – This paper describes the relatively unknown genre of the travelogues, travel journals in which a dilettante anthropologist author presents information about unknown cultures and regions. Some of these travelogues contain linguistic information that is overlooked so far. In this paper a Dutch author of printed travel journals, Stephanus Hanewinckel, will be introduced. His early dialectological remarks and data will be presented and analyzed. Moreover the history of the Parable of the Prodigal Son as a sample text for dialect comparison will be discussed. The article ends with an edition of Hanewinckel’s early 19th century version of the Parable of the Prodigal Son in a Dutch dialect from the province of North Brabant.
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1. Introduction

In 1799, four years after French troops invaded the Netherlands, A.B. Saakes, bookseller at Amsterdam, published an anonymous book Reize door de Majory van ’s Hertogenbosch in den Jaare 1798. (In Brieven.) Met Plaaten. (‘Voyage through the Majory of Den Bosch in the year 1798. (In Letters.) With Illustrations.’) The Majory of Den Bosch, better known as the Meierij, is one of the four parts of the old duchy of Brabant in the south of the Netherlands. It is a poor and sandy region in which the Roman Catholic church played a prominent role. ’s-Hertogenbosch (literary the forest of the duke) or Den Bosch, as the town is called normally, is an old and important town in the Dutch part of the old duchy. The other parts belong to Belgium nowadays. ’s-Hertogenbosch received city rights at the end of the 12th century and still is the capital of the Dutch province of North Brabant.

The introduction by the publisher Anthony Bernard Saakes starts with the question why people should go to the Meierij. ‘A voyage through the Majory! This is a weird phenomenon, since there is nothing important to see.’ However, he continues, this is a mistake. A journey through this region may show quite a few remarkable points. For instance how intolerant the Roman Catholic church is towards the former predominant Protestant religion. Saakes claims that a walk through this region would show the visitor how backward and superstitious Roman Catholics are and how primitive their faith is.

1 Marijke van der Wal and Gijsbert Rutten were kind enough to comment upon an earlier draft of this article, which has resulted in quite a few improvements. Moreover, Steve Nagle was kind enough to check my English.
As is well known, the French revolutionary troops brought freedom of religion to the Netherlands. So, in the South where the majority of people were still Roman Catholic their religion finally became equal to the privileged Calvinist church. Apparently this granting of equal rights met with some opposition.

A year later, 1800, a sequel was published by the same liberal bookseller Saakes Tweede Reize door de Majorij van ’s Hertogenbosch in den Jaare 1799 (’second Voyage etc.’), again an anonymously published collection of 24 letters and a long appendix on the religious situation in the villages of the Meierij. The first lines of the introduction by the publisher reveal that the author is the same as that of the first Voyage.

Again a year later the Amsterdam firm of A.B. Saakes, which has become famous for its first printed catalogue on Dutch books in print (Klock and Mijnhardt 2001: 83/4), published a new book on the ‘Meiërij’. This time not a collection of letters but a compilation of anonymous ‘thoughts’, essays on the Meierij and its inhabitants in the beginning of the 19th century: Gedachten over de Meiërij van ’s Hertogenbosch en derzelver inwoners bij het begin der negentiende eeuw door enen Meiërijenaar.

The introduction to this book, which is not a product of publisher Saakes any longer but written by ‘schrijver uit de Meiërij’ (’author from the Meierij’) provides a link to the two ‘Voyages’ of 1798 and 1799. The author, who calls himself an ‘inboorling der Meiërij’ (’a native of the Meierij’), tells the reader that he wants to expand on a few topics discussed in the earlier publications although he is quite happy with the correct way the wickedness which has been committed in the Meierij in the last couple of years has been described in the two earlier books. So the author, who pretends not to be identical with the author of the two previous publications, presents his ideas on religion, superstition, belief and credulity, marriage and education, way of life and social duties.

2. Travelogue as a genre

The author of these three books on the Meierij, who will be identified as Rev. Stephanus Hanewinckel (1766-1856) later, was not the first Dutch author to publish a written account of his journeys that was not meant to be understood as a picaresque novel, but as an informative story about an unknown region, its culture and history. Lindeman, Scherf and Dekker (1994), who made an inventory of travel journals from the Netherlands in manuscript form of the period 1500-1814 list 497 manuscripts. ‘The travel journal is a genre that has flowered in the Netherlands since the Late Middle Ages.’ (Dekker 1995 : 277). ‘The Dutch have a reputation as travelers. (…) Many of them entrusted their travel experiences to paper.’ (Dekker 1995: 277) Also from the southern part of the Low Countries earlier travel journals have survived in manuscript form (cf. De Vriendt 1971). However, most of these early travel journals are reports of pilgrimages or of diplomatic, military and busi-
ness travels. Only 150 years after the Late Middle Ages more anthropologically oriented accounts of unknown regions and countries started to appear.

2.1. Dapper

One of the most famous Dutch authors of this kind of early anthropological descriptions of foreign or remote countries is the Amsterdam physician and historiographer Olfert Dapper (1636-1689). Dapper, who started his career as an author with a history of his native city of Amsterdam (1663) and a translation of The Histories of Herodotus (1665), became interested in foreign countries shortly after he had finished these historical works. Dapper himself did not travel. He worked on the basis of printed sources and manuscripts and letters of people who had visited these foreign countries – some of the unpublished sources had been collected by Isaac Vossius (1618-1689), who apparently must have been a friend of Dapper. The first publication of this kind of geographical, chorographical and cultural study Dapper published was the Naukeurige beschrijvinge der Afrikaensche gewesten, van Egypten, Barbaryen, Libyen, Biledalgerid, Negrolant, Guinea, Ethiopiën, Abyssinië getrokken uit verscheyde hedendaegse lantbeschryvers en geschiften van bereisde onderzoekers, Amsterdam 1668 (‘Accurate description of the African regions, etc., excerpted from the works of several contemporary chorographers and writings of widely travelled scientists’). This book was the first of a long series of country descriptions, in which Dapper portrayed such different countries and regions as Persia, Georgia, China, Syria, Palestine, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Greece, Venice and the Mediterranean Isles. Dapper’s last country description, which dealt with Mediterranean isles, such as Cyprus and Rhodes, appeared in 1688, one year before he passed away. Dapper’s works became rather popular, which explains why his works have been reprinted regularly and translated into French, German and English (Molhuysen and Blok 1927: 354/6). Unfortunately among the multitude of topics that Dapper described he did not include language.

Dapper’s descriptions were so famous and accurate that even a real traveler such as Cornelis de Bruyn (1652-1712), a painter and author who travelled to the Levant, and later to the northern part of Russia, Persia, India and Indonesia, used information from Dapper and others in his own illustrated travel journal about the Eastern Mediterranean (1698, translated into French and English in 1700 and 1702 respectively). Although De Bruyn copied information from several sources in his journal, he was the first to receive copyrights for a book from the authorities. Probably this must have been because of the 200 splendid and expensive illustrations De Bruyn included in this book (Lendering n.d, see also Lommen 2012: 176-179).

2 Dapper’s name and international fame live on in the Parisian Musée Dapper, a museum devoted to the arts and culture of Africa and the Caribbean, 35 bis rue Paul Valéry, 75116 Paris (www.dapper.com.fr)
2.2. Imaginary Voyages

Unlike in Dapper’s work language is a topic in the so called imaginary voyages, a genre which became very popular in the Netherlands especially during the period of the Enlightenment (Hanou 2002: 74/5). The imaginary voyage is a fictional, utopian novel, put into the form of a travel account and in which the author usually describes an allegedly existent but so far undiscovered country with a perfect society that may serve as a mirror to his own society. Best known examples of imaginary voyages are Thomas More’s *Utopia* (1515), Francis Godwin’s *The Man in the Moone* (1638) and Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* (1726).

Since the authors of these novels describe a philosophically ideal world, with ideal social relations, ideal rulers and an ideal religion, the moment they give a sketch of the language used in this society this turns out to be an ideal language automatically. Such an ideal language could resemble Chinese with its presupposed universal real characters or was believed to be a reflection of the language spoken before Babel, the ‘lingua adamica’, the language given by God to mankind in which there was a natural relation between words and things denoted by these words (cf. Cornelius 1965: 2). In the works of French authors Denis Veiras d’Alais, also called Vairasse, and Gabriel de Foigny, published for the first time between 1675 and 1679, one finds examples of ideal languages as they should be spoken on the ‘third continent’, Australia (cf. Knowlson 1963).

The French mathematician Simon Tyssot de Patot (1655-1738), who taught at the Athenaeum Illustre in Deventer in the eastern part of the Netherlands, published his *Voyages et Aventures de Jacques Massé*, Bordeaux 1710 (‘Voyages and Adventures of Jacques Massé’), in which he gave a detailed account of the ideal language his fictional character Massé had come across during his wanderings in and around South Africa (cf. Knowlson 1963). In the same period (1708) Hendrick Smeeks published a novel titled *Beschryvinge van het magtig Koningryk Krinke Kesmes, Zynde een groot, en veele kleindere Eilanden aan horende; Maakende te zamen een gedeelte van het onbekende Zuidland.*, te Amsterdam, By Nicolaas ten Hoorn, 1708 (‘Description of the mighty Kingdom of Krinke Kesmes, being one big (sic!), and many smaller Islands connected with it; together constituting a part of the unknown Southland.’) This novel is ‘one of the few imaginary voyages produced by Holland to have gained a measure of international recognition. This is because of the narrative of the El Ho, which is inserted into it, and which, according to Lucius L. Hubbard, was the model for *Robinson Crusoe*.’ (Hamans 1980: 1225). Smeeks produces word lists of the language of Krinke Kesmes, that suggest a philosophical or logical classification (Hamans 1980: 1226), a system which have been used by artificial language planners of the 17th century more often (cf. the works of Dalgarno, Wilkins and Leibniz (Maat 1999)).

Although imaginary voyages do not describe a real world, the aim of the authors of this kind of fantasy novels is similar to that of Olfert Dapper and other early
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anthropologists. Besides entertainment they offer their public information about different cultures and ideas, more or less real in the case of the Dapper school and utopian in the case of the imaginary voyages, but both groups of authors want to teach their readership that there may be more than one view on the world. These two types of books definitely belong to the times of Enlightenment in which philosophers and authors started to protest against a system of fixed and unchangeable values and promoted a possible multitude of views on the world. Needless to say, this does not imply that the other opinions are necessarily seen as equal to one's own ideas.

2.3. Walks

The travelogue, as it came up around 1800, shares some characteristics with the genres discussed so far – usually the narrative can also be seen as an early anthropological account, since it presents information on the history, the folklore, the mythology, the customs, the nature, the agriculture, the monuments, the national character and the language of the region visited – but one should not underestimate the influence the new Romantic era had on the popularity of the genre. The German Wanderlust, one of the characteristics of the Romantic period, together with the walking habits of the English Lake Poets made walking and the written reports thereof very popular. Because of the maximum walking distances these accounts usually do not deal with foreign and remote countries, but with neighbouring often obscure, rural regions. The countryside is the region to explore, just as Wordsworth (1770-1850) and Coleridge (1777-1834) did in the Lake District. Normally the authors are not scientists or scholars but dilettantes, although the results of their work may have a certain scholarly importance.

Walking and taking notes of one's experiences became a fashion for young men of the leisure classes in the first half of the 19th century. The best known Dutch account of such a walking tour is that of the later lawyer, politician and author Jacob van Lennep (1802-1868). In the summer of 1823 he and his fellow young aristocrat and Leyden student Dirk van Hogendorp (1797-1845) hiked through major swaths of the Netherlands. Both kept a diary. Van Lennep’s has been published long after his death twice (1943 & 2000). His diary finally became popular through a television series ‘De Zomer van 1823’ (‘The summer of 1823’), based on Van Lennep’s account and broadcasted in 2000.

---

3 Olfert Dapper was a contemporary and fellow-townsmen of Spinoza (1632-1677).
4 According to Dekker (1995: 228) the practice of writing travel accounts only became widespread after about 1750.
5 Baggerman (210: 68) describes how military men and ministers of the Dutch Reformed Church were by far the most prolific authors of ego-documents till 1900. Travel journals are seen as a subgenre of ego-documents. Hanewinkel, the author under discussion here, was a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church.
6 For details of this TV series and the book publication see: www.jacobvanlennep.nl
2.4. Published accounts

However, not all travel stories had to wait till the 20th and 21st century before they were published. The Amsterdam Mennonite bookkeeper, preacher and poet Claas Bruin (1671-1732) published two travel books in poetry *Kleefse en Zuid-Hollandsche arcadia* (1714) (‘Arcadia to Cleves and through the province of South-Holland’) and *Noordhollandsche Arkadia* (1732) (‘North Holland Arcadia’). One of the companions of Bruin, Gerrit Schoemaker (1692-1736) and his father Andries Schoemaker (1660-1735) were also very keen on travelling and reported their findings in private unpublished journals that they richly illustrated. (Kolkman n.d.)

Adriaan van Willigen (1766-1841), a revolutionary who became a royalist in the course of his life, travelled to France after he had given up his administrative positions in revolutionary Brabant and published extensive volumes about these trips in 1805 and 1806 *Reize door Frankrijk, in gemeenzame brieven* (‘Journey through France, in familiar letters’) and *Parijs, in den aanvang van de negentiende eeuw* (‘Paris in the beginning of the 19th century’). Later in his life he published travel journals about his trips to Switzerland, Austria and Italy (1811), to England (1824) and Germany (1829) (Vander Heijden and Sanders 2010). Van der Willigen travelled by carriage, whereas Hanewinckel walked.

2.5. Dilettantes

In a recent publication on an estate in the province of Gelderland (Huijser 2011) a few walking dilettantes and their publications have been discussed. For instance the travelogues of Rev. Ottho Gerhard Heldring (1804-1876) (Gietman 2002: 59-61), still known for his campaigns against prostitution and alcoholism, were well received.7 Heldring, who also published texts in his native dialect of the Liemers, a region in south-eastern part of the province of Gelderland, bounded by the German border and the rivers Rhine, Lower Rhine, IJssel and Oude IJssel, in the *Geldersche Volksalmanak* between 1835 and 1847, was a very prolific writer and walker, especially through the countryside of the province Gelderland. His publications include travel and walking stories such as: *De Natuur en de Mensch of levensbesbouwingen van pachter Gerhard op zijne wandelingen met neef Jonas* (1834) (‘The Nature and the Man or philosophies of life by tenant Gerard on his walks with cousin Jonas’), *Wandelingen ter opsporing van Bataafsche en Romeinsche oudheden, legenden enz.* (1838-1848) (‘Walks in order to trace Batavian and Roman antiquities, legends etc.’) and *Opmerkingen op een reis langs den Rijn* (1847) (‘Remarks made on a journey along the Rhine’).

Another walker and writer from the same period is Derk Buddingh (1800-1874). Budding also originated from the Betuwe, likewise in Gelderland, but spent most of his time in the province of Zuid-Holland, where he ended as professor of Ger-

---

7 In Zetten, province of Gelderland and near Hemmen the little place where Rev. Heldring held his incumency, there still is an institution for youth welfare founded by O.G. Heldring and named after him.
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man and geography at the Royal Engineering Academy at Delft, near the Hague (Molhuysen and Blok 1911: 510). Budding, who was one of the first to publish a literary history of the Netherlands (1825) was a very productive author. His bibliography includes more than 100 titles, among which Beschryving van Zuid-Holland (1845) (‘Description of South Holland’), *Wandelingen door de Betuwe ter opsporing van Germaansche, Bataafsche en Romeinse oudheden* (1854-1860) (‘Walks through the Betuwe in order to trace Germanic, Batavian and Roman antiquities’) and *Nieuwe wandelingen in de Betuwe* (1865) (‘New walks in the Betuwe’).

2.6. More walks

Adriaan Walraven Engelen (1804-1890), educator, lawyer, conservative politician and poet, started walking when he was still a student at Groningen University, since he wanted to fight his disposition for corpulence (Huijser 2011: 65). After graduation he continued this habit and traveled through Belgium, France, Germany and his native province Gelderland. The observations made during his walks found their expression in Engelen’s several travelogues, which he decorated with digressions on history, folklore and literature. Among Engelen’s publications one finds (Frederiks and van den Branden 1888-1891: 235/6): *Reisbesteden naar en door een gedeelte van Frankrijk en verblijf in de hoofdstad* (1835) (‘Short journey through a part of France and sojourn in the capital’), *Wandelingen door Brussel en een gedeelte van België* (1836) (‘Walks through Brussels and a part of Belgium’), *Reistafelen, historische herinneringen en volksoverleveringen* (1837) (‘Travel tableaus, historical memories and popular legends’), *Reisbesteden door een gedeelte van Duitschland* (1838) (‘Short journeys through a part of Germany’), *Wandelingen door Gelderland en aangrenzende Noord-Brabantsche, Limburgsche en Pruisische gewesten* (1846) (‘Walks through Gelderland and the neighbouring regions of North Brabant, Limburg and Prussia’), *Wandelingen door Champagne en aangrenzende gewesten in de lente van 1854, met geschiedkundige en letterkundige aantekeningen* (1855) (‘Walks through Champagne and neighbouring regions in the spring of 1854, with historical and literary notes’).

Although some of the titles of Engelen’s travelogues suggest that the books contain touristic information only – in a way this genre may be seen as predecessor of the guide books as made popular by the German publisher Karl Baedeker (1801-1859) – Engelen did not deviate from the main character of the genre. His works, just as those of Buddingh, Heldring, Hanewinckel and many other 19th century traveler authors, may be seen as works of early dilettante anthropologists. The only difference between Hanewinckel8 and his colleagues is that Hanewinckel’s first three travelogues are meant as political pamphlets at the same time. Besides his historical, anthropological, geological, biological and linguistic obser-

---

8 Moreover Hanewinckel was one of the first to publish travelogues in Dutch. His first three books preceded the popularity of the genre by a few decades. His first two book still belong to the popular 18th century genre of the epistolary novels as well.
vations he presents arguments against the granting of equal rights to the Roman Catholics in this province, since they were still very backward according to his opinion. His partisan account tries not only to inform but also to convince the readership. In this respect Hanewinckel’s work resembles the genre of the imaginary voyages, which is also characterized by its persuasiveness.

2.7. Manuscripts

In the year Hanewinckel published his first travelogue, 1799, at least another 13 travel journals were produced. Lindeman, Scherf and Dekker (1994) list two manuscripts written in French, one in French and Dutch, the rest in Dutch only. Popular destinations were Germany, where two people visited Goethe, Brabant, Gelderland, Belgium and the German border region, especially Cleves. Most of these 13 manuscripts are limited in size. However, two manuscripts are voluminous: the one by Rutger Metelerkamp (1772-1836), a politician who was an adversary of the new republican regime and who travelled extensively through the rest of Europe during his exile. His manuscript comprises more than 1450 pages, from which Metelerkamp made a condensed book publication in two volumes later: *De toestand van Nederland in vergelijking gebracht met die van enige andere landen in Europa* (Rotterdam 1805) (‘The state of the Netherlands compared to that of a few other countries in Europe’). The other extensive manuscript is by Jan Hendrik van Swinden (1746-1823), mathematician and philosopher who was sent to Paris by the government to take part in a conference on the standardization of measures and weights.

None of these manuscripts, except in a way Metelerkamp’s, seem to be intended for publication, although the authors sometimes address a readership which is bigger than that of the own eyes only, which is not unusual for ego-documents: ‘most nineteenth-century writers (…) did not choose to write an ego-document ‘for myself alone’ (Baggerman 2002: 163) but for their relatives, friends, principals or even offspring. This makes a difference with Hanewinckel’s writings. He writes for an audience that he wants to inform about a lesser known region and that he wants to convince of his religio-political ideas.

2.8. Outside the Netherlands

Travelogues are not an exclusive Dutch phenomenon. In other cultures and languages one finds informative travel journals as well. To give only two examples: the son of the German-Russian playwright and diplomat August von Kotzebue, Moritz von Kotzebue (1789-1861) kept an illustrated journal when he was on a mission to Persia in the cortège of a Russian ambassador in 1817. He sent the

---

8 Although Cleves did not belong to what became the kingdom of the Netherlands in 1813, the town was not seen as part of a foreign culture. Till the end of the 19th century the language of preaching was Dutch in the churches of Cleves (J.W.Muller 1932: 86).
journal to his father in Germany where the travelogue was published in Weimar in 1819 and again in 1825. Translations into Dutch (1819), French and English (also 1819) and Polish (1821) show how popular the genre was.

The great-grandfather of the linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913), the Swiss aristocrat Horace-Bénédict de Saussure (1740-1799), published a four-volume *Voyages dans les Alpes* (1779-1796) (‘Voyages through the Alps’), the first travel account describing mountains. This work, which was meant for a big audience, ‘is much more than the travel account its title would suggest. It is also the record of his wide-ranging scientific discoveries, and it brought about the aesthetic revolution that led first monied, then the middle classes of all nations to look upon the Alps as the Palaces of Nature and ‘the playground of Europe’(…)’. (Joseph 2012: 16). It was with de Saussure’s *Voyages dans les Alpes* that the interest in the Alps and in alpine sports started.

3. Author

Although the author of the three books on the Meierij remains anonymous, his name has been unveiled. According to the relevant literature the anonymous author of these three books should be Rev. Stephanus Hanewinkel (1766-1856). Recently Meijneke (2009) was even able to prove that Hanewinkel must be the author. He found notebooks, in which Hanewinkel kept records of his walks and of the books he read. Passages from these notebooks turned out to have been used as copy for the three books published by A.B. Saakes (1768-1856) (Meijneke 2009: 63).

Meijneke (2009), whose study consists of an edition of the three books mentioned here preceded by a comprehensive introduction, adds two appendixes by Hanewinkel to his edition; one about the inscriptions on the bell of the village Nuenen in the Meierij where Hanewinkel was born. The other text contains the verses of and commentary upon an anti-Catholic song written by Jews from Tongelre, a village not far from Eindhoven. This text was published in a religious history of the Netherlands in 1844 for the first time and has been contributed to this history ‘by Rev. S. Hanewinkel’.

Moreover, Meijneke (2009) adds a fourth anonymous book publication *Mijne Wandelingen van Vroegere Jaren, ter bevordering van zedelijk nut en godsdienstige stichting uitgegeven* (‘My Walks from Earlier Years, published for the advancement of moral benefit and religious edification’). This booklet was published in 1850 by A.F.G. de Pineda, printer and publisher in Heusden, a small town in the province of North Brabant. This travelogue in letters does not restrict itself to the Meierij. The walking vicar visited other parts of the province of North Brabant as well as some neighbouring and German border regions. Meijneke (2009: 393) has good arguments to claim that Hanewinkel is the author of this book too. The most
convincing argument comes from an inscription by Hanewinckel’s daughter in a copy of this book which has been found in the legacy of Stephanus Hanewinckel. The inscription by Hanewinckel’s daughter Christina says that the book was written by her father.

The last few pages of Meijneke’s study contain an unpublished version of the Parable of the Prodigal Son, ‘translated’ in the dialect of the Meierij by Rev. S. Hanewinckel. Meijneke found the manuscript with the name of the author on top of it in the papers Stephanus Hanewinckel left behind and which were in the hands of the family till recently.10

This ‘translation’ shows Hanewinckel’s interest in the regional dialects of the Meierij clearly and it is this curiosity which will be discussed here. But before turning to Hanewinckel’s linguistic observations a few words should be said about Hanewinckel himself and later on about the fashion of producing dialect versions of the Parable of the Prodigal Son.

3.1. Stephanus Hanewinckel

Hanewinckel (1766-1856) was born in the Meierij in the village of Nuenen as son of a Protestant minister. Stephanus Hanewinckel became a minister himself in 1790 and held several incumbencies, mostly in North Brabant, but also in Oost-Graftdijk, north of Amsterdam, and in the Frisian villages of Warns and Scharl (1811-1818).11 From 1818 till the end of his ecclesiastical career in 1841 he served the congregation of Ravenstein, a small town in the North-east of the province of North Brabant. One of his sons succeeded him as minister of Ravenstein. Hanewinckel died in Ravenstein on the 15th of December 1856. Hanewinckel wrote his first three books on the Meierij when he lived outside North Brabant in Oost Graftdijk, 1798-1802.

When Hanewinckel received his first call as minister in 1790 the Calvinist church was still the privileged church of the Netherlands, also in predominantly Roman Catholic North Brabant. A few years later, 1795, the French revolution arrived in the Netherlands and the egalitarian ideas promoted by the then modern times put an end to the favored position of the Calvinist church. Although it took more than half a century (1853) before the Roman Catholic church was allowed to install bishops in the Netherlands officially, Roman Catholics and Jews were granted equal rights from the new government of the Batavian Republic (1795-1806) almost immediately. These new civil rights for Roman Catholics of course created

---

10 Due to the efforts of Meijneke the documents are now in the Archives of the Province of North Brabant in ’s-Hertogenbosch (BHIC).
11 This fact confirms Baggerman’s conclusion (2010: 68) that most of the authors of ego-documents written before 1900 belonged to the military or clergy.
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serious problems in the cities and villages of North Brabant,\(^\text{12}\) where they had been second-rate citizens so far. Roman Catholic congregations claimed churches back from the Calvinists that had been confiscated in the second half of the 16th century, which was seen by Hanewinckel as evidence for the sneaky character of the Roman Catholics.

In addition, Roman Catholics set their sight on the jobs, official positions and administrative seats which had been reserved for adherents of the established church so far. Moreover, the new Republic stopped paying the salary of the Calvinist ministers. No wonder that the leaders of the Protestants protested and tried to boycott the new rulings.

Furthermore, Protestants such as Hanewinckel looked down at the intellectual level of the majority of Roman Catholics. Since most of the Roman Catholics, especially in the southern provinces of North Brabant and Limburg, belonged to lower social classes, that had no or only very little possibility to receive schooling, the Roman Catholics of these regions were still seen by people such as Hanewinckel as being quite backward. Nevertheless these Roman Catholics claimed their newly granted civil rights and that is why Protestants such as Hanewinckel became anxious and concerned. This may explain why Hanewinckel’s writings are full of vehement anti-papist remarks, for which his works are still well known.

However, Hanewinckel’s books show that he had more than only ideological interests. He notices what one could see and hear while walking through the Meierij. So he reports about the flora and fauna, about monuments, about the trades and handicrafts of the inhabitants, about the history and mythology and about the language of the region. Hanewinckel shows to be an early anthropologist, just as most of his predecessors and colleague-authors of travelogues.

4. Dialect observations

‘The description of the dialects of North Brabant starts with the Reize door de Majorij van ‘s-Hertogenbosch in den Jaare 1798-1799 by Rev. Hanewinckel,’ Swanenberg & Brok (2008: 57) claim. However, what Swanenberg & Brok call one publication from 1798-1799 consists of the two separate books mentioned before, the Reize in den Jaare 1798 (‘Voyage of 1798’) and Tweede Reize door de Majorij van ‘s-Hertogenbosch in den Jaare 1799 (‘second Voyage of 1799’). Hanewinckel does not mention linguistic questions in his third and fourth book on the Meierij or in his numerous other publications.

\(^{12}\) Till 1795 the southern provinces of North Brabant and Limburg were a kind on internal colonies of the Dutch Republic. The two regions were called ‘generaliteitslanden’, regions without an own sovereignty or autonomy as all the other Dutch provinces enjoyed, but under the direct government and jurisdiction of the General States. One of the reason for their inferior status was the overwhelmingly Roman Catholic background of these regions.
Although Hanewinckel is the first to publish dialect phenomena of eastern North Brabant (de Meijerij) and to comment upon the linguistic situation of this region, he is not the first to collect dialect data of this region. That was, as far as we know, Jan Louis Verster, Abrz. (1745-1814) (Weijnen 2009: 1), a lawyer from 's-Hertogenbosch (Van der Aa 1876: 200). Verster collected dialect words from the Meierij for a dictionary planned by a learned literary society from Leiden, Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde. The dictionary never was published, but the two lists drafted by Verster (1776 and 1781) are still in the library of the Maatschappij. In 1968 Heeroma published Verster’s wordlists (Heeroma 1968).

In his ‘Voyages’ Hanewinckel comments upon the different dialects of the Meierij and of neighbouring regions, he presents wordlists and offers expressions, special jargon words and etymologies of place names in the narrative incidentally.

His comments on the language of the Meierij are not very favourable. ‘It is a very rude language and the dialect of Helmond is incomprehensible for someone from the province of Holland.’ (Meijneke 2009: 176, Voyage 1798: 76).

On the other hand, the dialects of the Meierij have certain qualities, according to Hanewinckel: ‘Nowhere one finds more different dialects than in the Meierij. I believe that the study of these dialects may reveal to us many old words, which have become obsolete elsewhere.’ (Meijneke 2009: 176, Voyage 1798: 76).

At the same time, the dialects of the Meierij show the influence of language contact: ‘The language of the Meierij is a mishmash of High German, Dutch and the plain dialect of the Meierij. One even finds French and Latin words in it, such as labeuren ‘to work’: from the Latin Laborare, just as laar meaning home or residence from Latin Lar. Others explain Lar as originating from plain Celtic.’ (Meijneke 2009: 281, Second Voyage 1799: 105).

Especially the dialect of Helmond horrifies Hanewinckel: ‘People call the inhabitants of Helmond Cats mockingly. There is no mistaking that they bear this name because of the ugliness of their language, which resembles meowing very much when one hears a crowd talking from a distance.’ (Meijneke 2009: 265, Second Voyage 1799: 74).

Hanewinckel has a good ear for dialect differences and notices the essential difference between the dialects of the Meierij and the dialect of Budel, in the South-east of the province: ‘the people of Budel have a special pronunciation or accent, which is very different from the other people living in the Meierij.’ (Meijneke 2009: 248, Second Voyage 1799: 43). Hanewinckel is completely right. The dialect of Budel links up with the dialects of Limburg (Weijen 2009: 12/3, Swennenberg & Brok 2008: 7/8) and Hanewinckel was the first to notice this.

---

13 This library is now part of Leiden University Library. Verster’s lists are known as ‘manuscript 130’ Weijnen (2009:1) and Heeroma (1968: 8-10) present a survey of the adventures of this manuscript.
5. Wordlists

Hanewinckel presents four extensive word lists, from which only a very few words made their way into the dialect literature (Weijnen 2009: 1 and Swanenberg & Brok 2008: 57). The first three lists are presented in Appendix 1. In these lists Hanewinckel presents dialect words from the Meijerij and the Dutch equivalents.

The fourth word list is of a different kind. It is a list of ‘High German words which are in use in the Meiereij as well, be it in a corrupted form’ (Meinecke 2009: 280, Second Voyage 1799: 103). This list may be found in Appendix 2. In this list Hanewinckel presents first the ‘original’ High German form, subsequently the ‘loan-word’ as it is in use in the dialects of the Meierij and finally the Dutch equivalent.

From these examples it will be clear that Hanewinckel discussed absolutely anything, without a defined system. He produces for instance phonologically and morphologically interesting examples, words which may have been borrowed from French and words which are typical for eastern Dutch dialects and obsolete forms. A few examples, each followed by an explanation, may show how different Hanewinckel’s observations are.

(a) phonology:

\[\text{docht, ‘virtue’, with vowel shortening from Middle Dutch } \text{duged (German } \text{Tugend)}\]
\[\text{geboert, ‘neighbour’, instead of standard Dutch } \text{(ge)buur, geboort kept the original long [u]}\]
\[\text{bis, ‘hot’, with vowel shortening from Old Dutch } \text{beit (German } \text{heiz)}\]
\[\text{boad, ‘head’, with final cluster simplification from baoft}\]
\[\text{zocht, ‘soft’, for zacht}\]

(b) morphology:

\[\text{geeten, ‘eaten’, instead of standard Dutch gegeten}\]

(c) clitization:

\[\text{dedi, ‘did he’, for deed + bij}\]
\[\text{hadder, ‘had + there’, from bad + er}\]

(d) borrowings from (Old) French

\[\text{aves, ‘false’, from Old French avers, again with final cluster simplification}\]
\[\text{katijvig, ‘awful’, a derivation from the noun katijf, Compare Old French caitiff ‘prisoner of war’}\]
\[\text{telder, ‘plate’, from Old French tailleur}\]

---

14 For historical and etymological data concerning the following words see Philippa a.o. (2003-2009) and www.etymologiebank.nl

15 Vowel shortening is one of the two typical features for these dialects (Swanenberg & Brok 2008: 12/3 and Weijnen 2009:14). The other characteristic feature is i-Umlaut.

16 The symbol oe signifies [a]. This [a] form is remarkable here, since normally [a] has become [e] in these dialects, which changed into a diphthong ui [oy] during the process of Dutch diphthongization, except before -r. So, geboert would have been the expected form.

17 With i-Umlaut, which is one of the characteristic features of the dialects of the Meierij in comparison with the more western dialects of the province of North Brabant (Swanenberg & Brok
(e) typically eastern forms
don, ‘fool’, cf. German Tor
defel, ‘yeast’, cf. German Hefe
klot, ‘clod’, cf. German Kloß
vaaren, ‘drive’, cf. German fahren
veemen, ‘thread’, cf. German noun Faden

(f) obsolete words

goor, ‘swampy’, now only known in place names such as Goor (eastern part of the Netherlands) and Goirle (near Tilburg in the province of North Brabant)

tallen, ‘talk’, verb, cf. English call

luiken, ‘close’, verb, similar to German luchen, with original Middle Dutch long [y] followed by the standard process of Dutch diphthongization

schoer, ‘rain shower’, similar to German Schauer and English shower

scheper, ‘shepherd’, derived from schaap ‘sheep’

vorst, ‘ridge’, related to German First

kuis, ‘club’, from Middle Dutch case, also with original Middle Dutch long [y] and subsequent diphthongization

These data may show already how interesting Hanewinckel’s early linguistic observations are, especially for the study of the dialects of the eastern part of North Brabant, but his most important contribution to Dutch dialectology is his version of the Parable of the Prodigal Son.

6. The Prodigal Son

6.1. Le Brigant

Hanewinckel was not the first to use the Parable of the Prodigal Son for dialect study. In his days it became common practice, just as the Lord’s Prayer used to be the traditional sample text for comparative linguistics till the beginning of the 19th century. The best known collection of the Lord’s Prayer is the linguistic compilation by Conrad Gessner (1516-1565) Mithridate (1555) (Colombat and Peters 2009), in which 130 individual languages are described and 29 translations of the Lord’s Prayer are presented. This practice of comparing languages by means of the Lord’s Prayer culminated in a similar project by Johann Christoph Adelung (1732-1806), finished by Johann Severin Vater (1782-1784), also called
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*Mithridates* and published in four volumes between 1806 and 1817 in which they collected the ‘Vater Unser’ in ‘bey nahe fünfhundert Sprachen und Mundarten’ (‘almost five hundred languages and dialects’) (Kayser 2005: 76).

It was the French lawyer Jacques Le Brigant (1720-1804), one of the first celtomaniacs, who started the new tradition of using the Parable of the Prodigal Son as a sample text for comparative use (Brok 1998: 13 and Scholtmeijer 1999: 35). Le Brigant believed that his mother tongue, Breton, was the protolanguage of all languages and therefore an easy vehicle to understand all languages. A contemporary of Le Brigant and colleague celtophile Nicolas de Bonneville (1791) called him a ‘Bas-Breton qui retrouvait toutes les langues dans sa langue’ (‘person from Lower-Brittany who found back all other languages in his own’) and claimed that Le Brigant’s findings were not far removed from the truth (Guiomar 1992: 64/65).

In 1779 Le Brigant published a booklet in which he presented examples of texts in Breton next to the French version, followed by a Breton-French glossary of seven pages. Among the texts one finds animal fables such as ‘Un Loup et un Agneau’ (‘A Wolf and a Lamb’), ‘Un Lion allant à la chasse avec dautres bêtes’ (‘A Lion going out hunting together with other animals’) and the ‘Parabole de l’Enfant Prodigue’ (‘Parable of the Prodigal Son’) from Luke 15:11-32 (Le Brigant 1779: 45, 47 and 49) and the Breton version of the same text called ‘Ar Mab Prodig’ (1779: 44, 46 and 48).

6.2. Coquebert’s survey

Apparently Le Brigant’s initiative became so well known that Charles Etienne Coquebert de Monbret (1755-1831), the head of the Statistical office of the Ministry of the Interior of the First French Empire, used the same sample text for the survey (1806-1812) he and his son Eugène (1785-1849) conducted by order of the Emperor (Brunot 1927: 525-530).23 The aim of this enquiry was ‘to know the dialects used in their portion of territory and so to be able to draw the limits of French in relationship to different languages, such as Flemish, Breton, Basque, Catalan, Italian, Germanic Alsatian and German’ (Zantedeschi 2010-12: 3). Since Napoleon was interested in the precise demographic and thus linguistic situation of the whole empire, all the 130 prefects and their collaborators had to answer...
the enquiry. The results of the Dutch part of the enquiry were lost till recently and were only published a few years ago (Bakker and Kruijsen 2007). Since North Brabant still belonged to the Batavian Republic and not yet to the French Empire when Coquebert de Montbret commissioned the enquiry, there are no dialect samples of the Meierij in the material of Coquebert. Coquebert’s survey was published by his son Eugène in 1831, in which publication he presented a collection of hundred different versions of the Parable of the Prodigal Son.

Coquebert’s initiative did not stop at the boarders of the French empire. Franz Joseph Stalder (1957-1833), a Roman Catholic priest with an interest in education, felt stimulated by the invitation of the French Ministry of Interior and collected 73 Swiss dialect samples of the Prodigal Son in *Die Landensprache der Schweiz* (‘The Swiss national languages’) (1819) (Kaiser 2005: 76). Jacob Grimm was well informed about Stalder’s work (Bigler n.d.). So his work became noticed outside Switzerland as well. No wonder that Johan Winkler (1874), one of the pioneers of Dutch dialectology, referred to Stalder’s ‘excellent’ work of 1819 and used his work as a model, when he published his collection of 186 Dutch, Low German and Frisian versions of the Parable of the Prodigal Son: *Algemeen Nederduits en Friesch Dialecticon* (‘General Low German and Frisian Dialect Idioticon’). Winkler’s survey became the starting point for the comparative study of Dutch dialects (Brok 1998: 13). That is why the *Dialecticon* inspired later dialectologists to repeat Winkler’s enquiry (Scholtmeijer 1999: 96-132 and The new Winkler). So far 83 new ‘translations’ of the Parable have been collected.

In Flanders Jan Frans Willems (1793-1846), the father of the Flemish Movement, had already used the Parable of the Prodigal Son as a sample text for dialect comparison decades before Winkler. In his journal *Belgisch Museum* he called up his colleagues dilettante linguists to send in dialect versions of the parable shortly after the publication of Coquebert’s survey of 1831 (Willems 1837: 34-37). Willems himself started with a version in the Flemish dialect of Brussels (Willems 1837: 37/38).

Hanewinckel produced his translation of the Prodigal Son when he was minister in the Frisian villages Warns and Scharl, as is written on top of the manuscript. Hanewinckel lived and worked in Friesland from 1811-1818. So it is not unlikely he might have been inspired by the almost simultaneous French dialect enquiry of the Coqueberts.

---

24 18 versions of the Parable of the Prodigal Son from Limburg and the neighbouring Rhineland.

25 According to Swanenberg & Brok (2008: 59) Winkler opted for the Parable since it is one of the few parts of the Bible written in ordinary language.

26 The location of the manuscript is BHIC, Brabants Historisch Informatic Centrum, the archives of the Province of North Brabant, 1820 Collectie Hanewinckel, 32 (BHIC 1820-32).
7. Hanewinckel’s Parable of the Prodigal Son

Meijneke (2009: 453-454) published Hanewinckel’s version for the first time. On the basis of this edition Swanenberg & de Koning (2009: 36-38) published the Parable again. Unfortunately there are some divergences between the manuscript and the published texts. Therefore the text will be edited once more in Appendix 3.

7.1. Remarks

Hanewinckel’s translation of the Parable of the Prodigal Son is an interesting text in which a few peculiarities may attract attention. Some of these forms will be discussed hereafter. First a few striking rules of his orthographic practice, then some text corrections and finally a number of more specific linguistic, especially dialectological features will be analyzed.

7.2. Spelling

As may be clear from this text and the wordlists, Hanewinckel is not always consistent in his spelling.

For instance in the verses 30 and 31 one finds the form húm and hum for the same third person personal pronoun ‘him’. The same in the verses 27 en 31, where Hanewinckel uses toe húm and toe hum ‘to him’ without making any grammatical or lexical difference. Also the spelling bey (vs. 12) and beij (vs. 32) both for ‘he’ show a certain inconsistency, at least in modern eyes.

Another curious spelling is beemel (vs. 18 and 21) ‘heaven’, whereas in the wordlist Hanewinckel writes bemelen ((Meinecke 2009: 204, Voyage 1798: 125), a verb derived from bemel, ‘heaven’. However there may be an explanation for this difference. In the years when Hanewinckel wrote his works there was not yet an official Dutch orthography. There was even quite some discussion about which orthographic rules to use.

In the wordlist Hanewinckel uses the now standard Dutch spelling rule, which says that a tensed vowel in open syllable will be symbolized by one letter only, so e, a and o instead of ee, aa and oo (as in closed syllables). As a consequence there is no doubling of consonants at the syllable boundary, so zomer ‘summer’ and not zommer, since this last consonant spelling would symbolize that the preceding vowel is a lax o [ə]. Another potential rule was not to simplify the symbols for a tensed vowel, so to keep ee etc. Some authors subsequently doubled the symbols for consonants at the syllable boundary in this case. Hanewinckel follows this practice: zeecker (vs. 1) ‘sure’, zeeennen (vs. 16) ‘his’, teeggen (vs. 18) ‘against’. However, non consistently: jene (vs. 15) ‘indefinite article’ opposite leveende (vs. 13) ‘living’. Moreover Hanewinckel uses the symbols òa, óa and even ôa without making any
obvious difference. In Hanewinckel’s orthography æ, ‘æ’, clearly is meant as one vowel symbol, which he even doubles in instances such as gelææyen (vs. 13) ‘situated’ and knæægs (vs. 22 and 26) ‘servants’.

7.3. Crossing-outs

Hanewinckel must have revised the manuscript since he introduced a few systematic corrections.

Where we now find the form taegt ‘father’ as form of address for vader/vajer (vs. 12, 18 and 21) Hanewinckel originally wrote vajer. He thus makes a difference between the normal noun for father and the form of address. As Swanenberg & de Koning (2009: 38) show a similar form taat or tat still exists in a few villages of the Meierij.

Another crossing-out is zoon for zoon ‘son’. Originally Hanewinckel did not make a consequent difference between the singular and the plural. In both cases he used zoon(s). Later on he corrected the singular into zoon. As a consequence the text no shows an exceptionless example of i-Umlaut in the plural.28

A third correction is kallef (vs. 23, 27 and 30) for kalf ‘calf’. Here he consequently inserted the two letters le as to make kallef from kalf. Phonologically this is an instance of ephenthesis of a svarabhakti vowel [a].

7.4. Special dialect features of the Meierij

The dialects of the Meierij show some special features, as said before: Umlaut and vowel shortening are most noticeable (Weijnen 2009: 12-14; Swanenberg & Brok 2008: 12-13; Scholtmeijer 1999: 129). Both characteristics appear quite often in this text.

1. Umlaut (for a map of the different processes of Umlaut in North Brabant see Weijnen (2009: 40/1)

   a. plural formation: zuens (vs. 1) from zoon ‘son’ + plural suffix -s (see also note 27) vuët (vs. 22) from voët ‘foot’ (without a plural suffix)29
   b. diminutive formation: bukske (vs. 29) from bok ‘male goat’
   c. verbal paradigm: tuëksam (vs. 12) instead of Dutch toekomt ‘belong 3p sg’ vungde (vs. 15) instead of Dutch voegde ‘joined 3 p. sg’

28 It is remarkable that Hanewinckel corrected the singular zoon into zoon. Winkler (1874: part 1, 301/2) discusses the dialects of the Meierij and gives a dialect example from the village Oirschot, where the singular form appeared to be zoon. However, in Winkler’s version of the Parable from Helmond (Winkler 1874: part 1, 295) one finds zoon just as in Hanewinckel’s text. Hanewinckel considered the dialect of Helmond as belonging to the dialects of the Meierij, as shown before, although Winkler calls it a dialect from the Peelland, which is a neighbouring region.

29 Theoretically vuët might be singular as well. However, the data for Oirschot and Helmond presented in Winkler (1874: part 1 295 & 302), vœt(ë)te and vœte show that this is unlikely.
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gezondigd (vs. 18 and 21) instead of Dutch gezondigd ‘sinned’
gezondigd (vs. 21) instead of Dutch genoemd ‘named’
d. lexical Umlaut: verkes (vs. 15 and 16) instead of Dutch varken(s) ‘pigs’ errebeiër (vs. 17 and 19) instead of Dutch arbeider ‘worker’.

2. Long vowel shortening

ben (vs. 15) instead of Dutch been ‘away’
gekomen (vs. 17) instead of Dutch gekomen ‘come’, past participle
mennen (vs. 18) instead of Dutch mijn ‘mine’ + case ending
jen (vs. 29) instead of Dutch gen ‘no’
mak (vs. 19) instead of Dutch maak ‘make’.

In Hanewinckel’s Parable one does not find a form such as vadder ‘father’ with a short or lax [a], whereas in the Parable form Helmond recorded in 1871 by Rev. G.J. van Lakerveld vadder is the normal form (text 57 in Winkler 1874: 295-298).

3. sk-

A third notorious feature of the dialects of the Meierij, anlautend sk instead of sch, cannot be found in Hanewinckel’s text. However in Winkler (1874, text 59: 301-305 from Oirschot, recorded in 1870 by Rev. H.M.C. van Oosterzee) one finds skoene (vs. 22) ‘shoes’ where Hanewinckel gives schoën. For Helmond Winkler gives schoewn (1874: 296).

4. Monophthongization

Another well known feature of the dialects of the eastern part of North Brabant is monophthongization of Dutch diphthongs. Examples are:

zee (vs. 12, 21, 27, 29 and 31) for zei ‘said’. However in verse 17 Hanewinckel spells zeej, which suggests a diphthongal final part.

zeenne(n) and zee (vs. 20, 22 and 13, 15, 20, 25, 28 and 31) for zijn ‘his’. Zeenne(n) originates from a form with case ending. In the example zien long vowel shortening must have applied, just as in mennen (vs. 18), discussed above.

5. Diphthongs

5.1. Because of the first letter symbol j in the indefinite article jen (vs. 11) and jene (vs. 15), for Dutch ‘een’ or ‘n’ [ən], one probably has to assume a rising diphthong in the onset, which is exceptional for Dutch dialects and currently is disappearing in the dialects of the Meierij rapidly (Swanenberg & de Koning 2009: 38).

5.2. Falling diphthongs are quite frequent in these dialects, for instance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALECT FORM</th>
<th>DUTCH</th>
<th>DIALECT FORM</th>
<th>DUTCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tweje (vs. 11)</td>
<td>twee ‘two’</td>
<td>vieel (vs. 20)</td>
<td>vied ‘fell’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deijel (vs. 12)</td>
<td>deel ‘part’</td>
<td>wiërd (vs. 21)</td>
<td>waard ‘worthy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goëd (vs. 12)</td>
<td>goed ‘goods’</td>
<td>kljied (vs. 22)</td>
<td>kleed ‘garment’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
gelagen (vs. 13)  gelegen 'situated'
huiss (vs. 28)  boos 'angry'
stuurde (vs. 15)  stuurde 'sent'
diijen (vs. 29)  dien 'serve'
brood (vs. 17)  broöd 'bread'
overtreye (vs. 29)  overtreden 'broken'

This phenomenon is typical for dialects from the Peel or Peelland, somewhat south of the Meierij (Swanenberg & de Koning 2009: 38).

5.3. The same has been said about the open diphthong *aay* instead of the more closed standard Dutch diphthong *ij/εi*, as in verse 13 *weggeraayst* 'left'.

6. Deletion
The dialects of the Peel show deletion of final -t32, which can be found here as well:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>final</th>
<th>heard</th>
<th>overvloe</th>
<th>food</th>
<th>met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-t</td>
<td><em>hu</em> (vs. 11)</td>
<td><em>overtreye</em> (vs. 29)</td>
<td><em>brood</em> (vs. 17)</td>
<td><em>met</em> (vs. 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>hee</em> (vs. 13 and 30)</td>
<td><em>kalk</em> (vs. 17)</td>
<td><em>van</em> (vs. 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1. Final deletion is not restricted to -t. Deletion of -n, -f and -k also appear in the Parable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>final</th>
<th>heard</th>
<th>overvloe</th>
<th>food</th>
<th>met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-n</td>
<td><em>ge</em> (vs. 11 and 22)</td>
<td><em>overvloe</em> (vs. 17)</td>
<td><em>kalk</em> (vs. 17)</td>
<td><em>met</em> (vs. 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-f</td>
<td><em>ra</em> (vs. 17)</td>
<td><em>kalk</em> (vs. 17)</td>
<td><em>van</em> (vs. 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-k</td>
<td><em>kie</em> (vs. 29)</td>
<td><em>kalk</em> (vs. 17)</td>
<td><em>van</em> (vs. 17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Other features
In some Eastern dialects of North Brabant -nk for ng [ŋ] has been attested. Here one finds *rink* (vs. 22) for *ring* and *gink* (vs. 15) or *ginki* (vs. 20) for *ging* and *ging hik* 'went' and 'he went'.

7.1. A typical eastern nominal plural suffix is -er, as in *velder* 'fields' instead of *velden*.

8. Other peculiarities
Hanewinckel’s parable shows a few more peculiarities which are not specific for dialects of the Meierij or the Peelland, but may be considered as characteristics of spoken language such as d-weakening, epenthesis and clitization.

8.1. D-weakening
The forms *vajer* and *Brujer* for standard Dutch *vader* and *broeder* are typical instances of d-weakening.

8.2. Epenthesis
The intentional correction by Hanewinckel from kalf into kalf 'kalf' has been discussed above. Apparently Hanewinckel wanted to mark the disyllabic character of this word explicitly.

---

30 The dialect form shows also d-weakening, a common process in non-standard and spoken Dutch (see 8.1).
31 Swanenberg & de Koning (2009: 37) argue that Hanewinckel intended to record the dialect of the village Zeeland, which is in the south-eastern part of the Meijerij and north of the Peelland. The argument of Swanenberg & de Koning does not stem from dialect data, but from a remark of Hanewinckel about the dialect of Zeeland.
32 Quite often final -t is spelled with -d in Dutch.
In verse 17 he writes *zelf* for *zelf* ‘self’ and *erbeviers* for *arbeiders* ‘workers’. The last example shows that a svarabhakti vowel [ə] may be inserted word internally as well. In the two other cases, *kalf* and *zelf*, insertion took place word finally. Here this kind of cluster simplification appears to happen at a syllable boundary.

8.3. Clitization

Clitization is very common in the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel Cluster</th>
<th>New Vowel Cluster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>vante</em> (vs. 15) van + het ‘of + the’</td>
<td><em>bræængtet</em> (vs. 23) for <em>brengt + het</em> ‘bring + it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>zeji</em> (vs. 17) zei + bij ‘said + he’</td>
<td><em>doegt</em> (vs. 22) for <em>doo + het</em> ‘put + it’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ginki</em> (vs. 20) ging + bij ‘went + he’</td>
<td><em>beey</em> (vs. 25) for <em>bij + het</em> ‘near to + the’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>slagtet</em> (vs. 23) for <em>slaacht + het</em> ‘slaughter + it’</td>
<td><em>ent</em> (vs. 25) for <em>en + het</em> ‘and + it’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Conclusion

From the data presented here and from the analysis given so far it may be clear that Hanewinckel’s version of the Parable of the Prodigal Son most likely represents a dialect version of the Helmond-Peelland region, which is remarkable since Hanewinckel himself did not appreciate this dialect very much, as he testified in his Voyages (Meijneke 2009: 76 & 265, Voyage 1798: 76 and Voyage 1799: 74). The reason might be that this ‘rude’ dialect shows the greatest distance to educated Dutch.

8. Final Conclusion

The data presented so far lead to the conclusion that it may be worthwhile to check travelogues systematically, since they sometimes contain linguistic observations or even specific language and dialect data besides early anthropological remarks.

Moreover sample texts such as the Parable of the Prodigal Son, even though the translations usually go back to a very formal original text with very singular constructions such as reduced clauses with participles, still appear to be useful for early language and early dialect comparison. In particular where there have been found several early versions of this sample text recently, dialectology may acquire a previous history with the help of the Prodigal Son.

References


---

33 For Dutch the original text is the Protestant Authorized Version of the Bible from 1637.


Appendix 1

Lists of words from the dialects of the Meierij collected by Hanewinckel (1798 & 1799)

List 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIALECT OF THE MEIERIJ</th>
<th>HANEWINCKEL’S DUTCH EQUIVALENT</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>al einskens</td>
<td>allens</td>
<td>little by little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>berg en dag</td>
<td>hoog en laag</td>
<td>firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ederikken</td>
<td>herkaauwen</td>
<td>ruminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dedi</td>
<td>deed hij</td>
<td>did he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>killen</td>
<td>koud zijn</td>
<td>to be cold, to chill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flets</td>
<td>laf</td>
<td>cowardly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luiken</td>
<td>sluiten</td>
<td>to close</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gelookken</td>
<td>geslooten</td>
<td>closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lelijk begaaden</td>
<td>vuil maaken</td>
<td>to soil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haer</td>
<td>hier</td>
<td>here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The observations of a voyager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch Equivalent</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hemelen</td>
<td>to die</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op hemelen</td>
<td>to adorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mer</td>
<td>one + there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op en neer</td>
<td>there and back, return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uitsteeken</td>
<td>to exclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaaren</td>
<td>to drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vries</td>
<td>frost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herd</td>
<td>shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hadder</td>
<td>had + there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katijvig</td>
<td>awful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Meinecke 2009: 176, Voyage 1798: 76)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List 2</th>
<th>DIALECT OF THE MEIERIJ</th>
<th>HANEWINKEL'S DUTCH EQUIVALENT</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gaderen</td>
<td>vergaderen</td>
<td>to gather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoeven</td>
<td>behoeven</td>
<td>to need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goor</td>
<td>moerassig</td>
<td>swampy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schoer</td>
<td>regenbui</td>
<td>shower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>door</td>
<td>gek</td>
<td>fool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weet</td>
<td>kennis</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wareit</td>
<td>waarheid</td>
<td>truth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insteeker</td>
<td>oorblaazer</td>
<td>gossipmonger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doe</td>
<td>toen</td>
<td>then</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deder</td>
<td>deed 'er</td>
<td>did + there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>broed</td>
<td>broedsel</td>
<td>clutch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Meinecke 2009: 204, Voyage 1798: 125)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List 3</th>
<th>DIALECT OF THE MEIERIJ</th>
<th>HANEWINKEL'S DUTCH EQUIVALENT</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aves</td>
<td>verkeerd</td>
<td>false, averse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beduiden</td>
<td>verklaaren</td>
<td>to explain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedwank</td>
<td>dwang</td>
<td>duress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bestaden</td>
<td>ten koste leggen</td>
<td>to put at one's expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bezegen</td>
<td>gebruiken</td>
<td>to use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dochten</td>
<td>deugden</td>
<td>virtue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doode</td>
<td>lijk</td>
<td>dead body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geboeren, geboert</td>
<td>dorplieden</td>
<td>villagers, neighbours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gedaan</td>
<td>gemaakt</td>
<td>made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geten</td>
<td>gegeten</td>
<td>eaten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geraadzaam</td>
<td>dat aan te raden is</td>
<td>advisable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gezien</td>
<td>aangenaam</td>
<td>pleasant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heeten liechen</td>
<td>lochenen</td>
<td>to deny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hem vieren</td>
<td>nog vier</td>
<td>four of them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood</td>
<td>hoofd</td>
<td>head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

List of ‘High German words which are in use in the Meierij, be it in a corrupted form’, collected by Hanewinckel (1799)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGH GERMAN</th>
<th>DIALECT MEIERIJ</th>
<th>DUTCH</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ausbedingen</td>
<td>uitbedingen</td>
<td>voorbedingen</td>
<td>conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ausbescheiden</td>
<td>uitbescheiden</td>
<td>uitgezonderd</td>
<td>except</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aus der art schlagen</td>
<td>uit den aart slaan</td>
<td>ontâarten</td>
<td>to deprave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auswintern</td>
<td>uitwinteren</td>
<td>overwinteren</td>
<td>to hibernate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bahr</td>
<td>baar</td>
<td>doodenaar</td>
<td>bir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bommeln</td>
<td>bommelen</td>
<td>slingeren</td>
<td>to swing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dienlich</td>
<td>dienlijk</td>
<td>diestig</td>
<td>useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fädemen</td>
<td>veemen</td>
<td>een draad in de naald doen</td>
<td>to thread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forst</td>
<td>vorst</td>
<td>nok van een huis</td>
<td>ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gelehrig</td>
<td>geelerig</td>
<td>leerzaam</td>
<td>informative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gelispel</td>
<td>gelispel</td>
<td>geruisch</td>
<td>whispering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hämmern</td>
<td>hameren</td>
<td>met den hamer slaan</td>
<td>to hammer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hefel</td>
<td>hevel</td>
<td>zuurdeeg</td>
<td>yeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heisz</td>
<td>his</td>
<td>heet</td>
<td>hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hirt</td>
<td>hert</td>
<td>herder</td>
<td>shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knack</td>
<td>klak</td>
<td>vlek</td>
<td>spot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klettern</td>
<td>kletteren</td>
<td>klimmen</td>
<td>to climb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klos</td>
<td>klot</td>
<td>kluit</td>
<td>clod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knuffeln</td>
<td>knuffelen</td>
<td>drukken, kneuzen</td>
<td>to bruise, bump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knütschen</td>
<td>knutzen</td>
<td>kneuzen</td>
<td>to bruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liederlich</td>
<td>liederlijk</td>
<td>losbandig</td>
<td>loose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luder</td>
<td>loeder</td>
<td>ligtmis, straathoer</td>
<td>rake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lümmel</td>
<td>lummel</td>
<td>slechthoofd</td>
<td>lump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lüle</td>
<td>lul</td>
<td>pijpkan</td>
<td>pipe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lumpenhund</td>
<td>lompendedhond</td>
<td>schobjak</td>
<td>scoundrel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reche  reek  herk, rijf  rake, fork
rechen  reken  herken  to rake
ruck  ruk  hort, stoot  jerk
sabbern  sabberen  zeveren  to drivel
schabssel  schapsel  schaapsel  scrapings
schafer  scheper  schaapherder  shepherd
scharren  scharren  scharrelen  to scrape
schlecht  slecht  eenvoudig  simple
schob  schob  schoof  sheaf
schwetzer  zwetzer  snapper  boaster
sumpfig  sompig  moerassig  boggy
teller  telder  tafelbord  plate
tenne  den  dorschvloer  threshing floor
thor  door  dwaas  fool
triesachen  triezakken  afrossen  to trash
tummelicht  dommelig  duizelig  dizzy
wammes  wammes  wambuis  jerkin
weither  wijer  vijver  pond
winde  wind  dommekracht  jack

(Meinecke 2009: 280/1, Second Voyage 1799: 103-5)

Appendix 3

The Parable of the Prodigal Son in the dialect of the Meierij by Hanewinckel, between 1811-1818

Het vertelsel van de verloore zoon, in het veijftiende kappittel vant evangeli van Lukas, in het Meyjereijs overgezet deur S. Hanewinckel, Dommeni te Warns en te Scharl.

Lukas XV.11-32

11. Jen zeekker mens ha tweeje zeuns
12. En de joongste van heur zee toe de vajer: Taeyt! gee mey ét dejel vant goëëd, dat mey toekúmt. En hey deyldhe heur et goëëd.
13. En nie veul dage er nôâ34, de joongste zoon alles bey me kander vergaiërd hebbende, is weggeraayst in jen wyd geelzeyen land, en hee dôâr zen goëëd deurgebrôâgt, lee vende overdôâdig.
14. En als hey alles vertejërd ha, worder jene grôâtte hong-érnso on detzelfste land, en hey begost gebreit te leyén.
15. En hey gink hen, en vuugde hûm bey jene van De burgers vant zelfsstie land, en die stuëëde hum op zen land, um de verkes te haijen.
16. En hey way zeennen buik vullen me te spuling, die de verkes aëten: mer niemend gaf ze hum.

34 The symbols ō and ā as found in the manuscript have been represented as â and ô here.
17. En tot hum zellefs gekommen zeynde, zeeji: hoe veul erre-
beyer's van min vajer hebben overvloe van broëd, en ik
vrgou van hongër.
18. Ik zel opstóâën, en to menner vajer goôâên, en ik zel
toe hum zeggen: Taeyt ik heb gezundigd teegggen den
heemmel en veur aü.
19. En ik ben nie meer wiërd aü zoon genuûmd te
worde: mak me als jene van auë errebeyer's!
20. En opstóâân den ginki noô zeennen vajer. En als hey nog wyd
van hum wóâs, zag hum zen vajer, en worde me inwend-
ig melleyën beweeëgt; en toelopende vieël hum úm
den hals en kuste hum.
21. En de zoon zee tot húm: Taeyt! Ik heb gezundigd teegg-
gen den heemmel en veur aü, en ben nie meer wiërd
aü zoon genuûmd te worde.
22. Mer de vajer zee toe zeenne knæægs: bræængt hier
vōâët het best klejed, en doeget hum ôân, en gee
hüm jenen rink Ôân zen hand, en schoeën Ôân zen vüet.
23. En brōântget gemest kallef, en slaget: en löat
ons æëten en vrolik zeyn.
24. Want deze min zoon wóâs dooëd, en is weer levend
geworde, en hey wóâs verloorre, en is gevonde. En
ze begoste vrolik te zeyn.
25. En de zoon wóâs in de
velder, en als hey
kwôâm, en digt hey jenzen het
gezing ent gespeul.
26. En hey hum geroupen hebbende jene van de knæægs,
vrôagde: wôa det mogt zeyn.
27. En deze zee toe húm: au brujer is gekommen, en au
vajer heegget gemest kallef geslagt, omdat hey hum ge-
zond weer gekregen hee.
28. Met hey worde beujes, en waü nie ingôân. Zo gink dan
zen vajer en bidde hum.
29. Doch hij antwordde, en zee toe de vajer: kie! Ik diejen
au naú zo veul jóärre, en ik heb noit au ge-
bod overtreyje, en ge het mey noit jen bikske ge-
geve, opdet ik me meyn vriende mogt vrolik zeyn.
30. Mer as deze aü zoon gekommen is, die aü goëëd me
hoerre deurbrôâigt hee, zo het ge hüm et ge-
mesite kallef geslagt.
31. En heij zee toe hum: kynd! ge zeyt altyd bey me,
en al het meyn is het auë.
32. Men beheurde dan vrolik en bleij te zeyn, want
deze aü brujer wóâs dooëd, en is weer levend ge-
worde: en heij wóâs verloorre, en is gevonde.

Eynd.