



# THE REPRESENTATION OF THE SCANDINAVIAN LANGUAGES BY GERMAN, FLEMISH AND DUTCH HUMANISTS (1555–1723)

By Luc de Grauwe

*European humanists took a great interest, not only in the origins of their own mother tongues, but also in the classification of cognate languages. Amongst other things, this led scholars from the Continental West Germanic area (i.e. the territory of present-day German and Dutch-Flemish) to study the place and characteristics of the Scandinavian languages within the Germanic language family. The present article presents and discusses the views of C. Gessner, J.G. Becanus, B. Vulcanius, J.J. Scaliger, F. Junius, J. Vlitius and L. ten Kate with regard to this topic. Covering the period from 1555 to 1723, their work displays a gradual improvement in scientific quality and even prefigures many insights of modern linguistics. Not only did these scholars recognize the individuality of the different Scandinavian languages (with the exception of Faroese), they also referred to them as separate *linguae*, thus reflecting, or at least foreshadowing, the Nordic varieties' own ongoing development into distinct standard languages.*

In this contribution I would like to give an overview of the attention paid to the Nordic, or Scandinavian, languages and their classification by a series of renowned humanist scholars from the “Continental West Germanic” area, that is, the area where German and Dutch, including Flemish, are spoken nowadays. They are, in chronological order, Conrad Gessner (1555, 1561), Goropius Becanus (1569), Bonaventura Vulcanius (1597), Josephus Justus Scaliger (1599), Franciscus Junius (1655, 1665), Janus Vlitius (1664), and Lambert ten Kate (1723).

European humanists in general – including those in Scandinavia – took an interest in investigating their own mother tongue and classifying cognate languages. The first to demonstrate a basic understanding of the relationship among genetically related languages or dialects was Dante Alighieri (1265–

1321) in his famous work *De vulgari eloquentia* (1303–1304). As Rischel explains,

It became increasingly desirable to bolster the status of one's own country. One way was to make claims about the great age of the national language by tracing it back to Hebrew or explicitly to the language of Adam. The latter could be supported by the assumption that Noah's son Japheth [sic] had escaped the confusion of Babel so that his descendants had simply inherited the original language.<sup>1</sup>

In Sweden, for example, Olaus Rudbeck identified his own country in his large-scale work *Atlant eller Manheim* (1679–1702) “as the cradle of civilisation (i.e., Atlantis, where the language of Adam was spoken).”<sup>2</sup> As we shall see, his most famous counterpart in this respect on the West Germanic part of the European continent was Goropius Becanus. Gradually, scientific quality improved. In the course of the centuries, even within decades, we witness a relatively rapid evolution towards the modern insights of linguistic science, not least in matters concerning the origin and classification of the various Germanic languages.

As is well-known too, the humanist period in European history was also the age when the (West) European vernaculars were successfully raised to the level of the classical languages, with even some outstanding features of the former being discovered vis à vis the latter. The codification of classical Latin by humanists in Italy, where it was anything but a dead language until at least 1500, gave rise to similar efforts regarding Tuscan (*lingua Toscana*).<sup>3</sup> In France, the *Pléiade* poet Joachim du Bellay published his treatise *La deffence et illustration de la langue françoise* in 1549, and one year earlier, the Zurich printer Christoph Froschauer had brought out a *Dictionarium puerorum tribus linguis, Latina, Gallica et Germanica conscriptum ... Latinogallicam nuper ediderat Rob. Stephanus Parisiis, cui Germanicam translationem Johannes Frisius Tigurinus ... adiecit* (Children's Dictionary Written in Three Languages, Latin, French and German. A Latin–French One has Been Recently Published by Rob. Stephanus [Estienne] in Paris, to Which Johannes Fries from Zurich has Added a German Translation) (1548). In its preface, the Zurich canon, philologist and school headmaster Johannes Fries praised the *praestantia* of the (still developing) German language, and emphasized the patriotic duty “ut ea quae ad nostrae gentis, simul et linguae, vel defensionem vel illustrationem pertinere videntur, pro virili tueamur et defendamus” (to protect and defend what appears to con-

---

<sup>1</sup> Rischel 2002, 108a.

<sup>2</sup> Rischel 2002, 109b.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Krefeld 1988, 755, art. 280.

cern the defence or illustration of our people and also our language as much as we can).<sup>4</sup>

Fries had been a student in Bourges and Paris alongside **Conrad Gessner** (1516–1565), who became a polyhistor, universal scholar, expert on languages, doctor of medicine, connoisseur of books, editor, author of works on physics, and founder of general bibliography. Two of Gessner's publications were printed by Froschauer. The first (Zurich 1555) was entitled *Mithridates. De differentiis linguarum tum veterum tum quae hodie apud diversas nationes in toto orbe terrarum in usu sunt* (*Mithridates. On the Differences between/within Languages, Both Ancient Ones, and those which are Now in Use with Various Nations All Over the World*), and constituted no less than the first summary of linguistic science ever.<sup>5</sup> This was followed six years later by his preface to the then apogee of German lexicography, Josua Maaler's *Die Teütsch spraach, Dictionarium Germanicolatinum novum* (*The German Language. A New German-Latin Dictionary*) (Zurich, 1561). Maaler's work was the first extensive alphabetical dictionary to translate German into Latin, rather than vice versa.<sup>6</sup> It was published at the behest of Gessner himself, who wanted it to emphasize the richness of the German language and to contribute to its cultivation and promotion.<sup>7</sup> Gessner was an industrious collector of words, and Maaler followed him by integrating heteronyms from all over the German language area.<sup>8</sup> This is reflected in the *incipit* of his dictionary's long title: *Dictionarium Germanicolatinum novum. Hoc est, Linguae teutonicae, superioris praesertim, thesaurus: in quo omnes ferè Germanicae dictiones atque locutiones ordine Alphabeti enumerantur* (*A New German–Latin Dictionary. That is, a "Thesaurus" of the Teutonic Language, Especially of High German, in which Almost All German Words and Idioms are Listed in Alphabetical Order*).<sup>9</sup> In the course of the "Preface", Gessner referred to his *Mithridates* on several occasions,

---

<sup>4</sup> Gilbert de Smet 1971, "Einführung" to Josua Maaler, *Die Teütsch spraach. Dictionarium Germanicolatinum novum*, facs. ed., ix\*–x\*. I borrow more interesting information from de Smet's "Einführung" in the course of this article.

<sup>5</sup> See Konrad Gessner 1555 (1974), *Mithridates*.

<sup>6</sup> De Smet, "Einführung," x\*.

<sup>7</sup> De Smet, "Einführung," xii\*.

<sup>8</sup> De Smet, "Einführung," xxii\*.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. de Smet, "Einführung," xiii\*–xiv\*. The medieval and humanist term *teutonicus* referred, in fact, to the entire Continental West Germanic continuum of dialects, regiolects and written linguistic varieties (*Schreibsprachen*), covering the surface area of the present-day standard languages German and Dutch (thus including the Low German and Flemish regions) and corresponding to the older, Carolingian term *theodiscus/theotiscus* (which survives in *Deutsch* and *Dutch*). For the topic at large, see de Grauwe 2002, de Grauwe 2003, de Grauwe 2006.

and this is hardly surprising, given the similarity of theme between the two works, that is, affinities among languages.

The Scandinavian languages – the specific object of our investigation – are mentioned in both Gessner’s “Preface” and *Mithridates*; in the latter within the wider framework of a section entitled *De lingua Germanica*, which covers the entire Germanic language family, and takes up one fifth of the whole work (27r–44r). Although Gessner did not mention the Finnish language, he incorporated the *Fenni* into the “Cimbric” branch of Germanic, just like the Germanic Scandinavians and the Goths: “Cimbrorum partes sunt Dani, Scandia, Selandia, Scandinauia: ubi Nordouici & Nordmanni, Suiones qui & Suesij, & Suedi, Fenni, Goti” (The parts of the “Cimbri” are the Danes, Skåne, Sjælland, and Scandinavia, where Norwegians and Norsemen, Sviar, also called Suesi and Swedes, Finns, and Goths live) (31r).<sup>10</sup> The other branch is that of the “Teutons” (nowadays West-Germanic); this bifurcation was postulated by many humanists.

In his *Mithridates*, Gessner has restricted himself to two short remarks about Icelandic. The first refers to “Oratio Domini Iesu in lingua Islandica, quam puto eandem aut proximam esse Gothorum linguae in Scandinauia: ‘Vader vor ...’” (The Lord’s Prayer in the Icelandic language, which I believe to be identical with, or close to, the language of the Goths in Scandinavia: “Vader vor ...”) (40r), followed by the complete text. According to Metcalf, *Scandinauia* might be Götaland in Southern Sweden; in fact, the theory of the origin of the Goths in Scandinavia is involved, as will appear in our discussion of Lambert ten Kate below.<sup>11</sup> The second remark concerning Icelandic refers to “inferioris Germaniæ dialectum ... à qua Islandica quoque minus differt quàm ab alijs plerisque Germaniæ dialectis” (the dialect of “Lower Germany” from which the Icelandic [language or “dialect”] also differs less than from most other dialects of Germany) (41v–42r).<sup>12</sup> In Gessner’s work, as in that of most of his contemporaries’, the term *lingua* is polysemous: Sometimes it means “language group or family” (as in *Germanica lingua*, the title of the section in question in his work), sometimes “language in its own right” (as is probably the case here), but also “dialect, local or regional speech” in its modern sense. *Dialectus*, on the other hand,

---

<sup>10</sup> See also Metcalf 1963a, 156 n. 17.

<sup>11</sup> Metcalf 1963a, 156 n. 22.

<sup>12</sup> The *inferioris Germaniæ dialectum* includes, in fact, not only present-day Northern Germany but the Dutch–Flemish linguistic area as well, both of which are characterised by the lack of the High German consonant shift. Here, as in many other instances, the two are treated as a unit. It is quite possible that *Islandica* is an ellipsis for *lingua Islandica* here; it is interpreted as such by Metcalf, 1963b, 22. Cf. Sophie van Romburgh 2004, 972–73, esp. n. 108, and on Gessner, 936 n. 14, 1007 n. 2.

mostly means “dialect, local or regional speech”, but also (as, again, it does here) “branch of a language family.”

In a longer passage, Gessner then refers to the *Noruegiae lingua*:

De Gothis hactenus sparsim in Germanicae linguae mentione. Loquuntur aut(em) Germanicè hi quoque Gothi, qui Schondię seu Scandinaviae partem incolunt.<sup>13</sup> Eorum uocabula quaedam in præcedentibus, & in Islandica lingua (quam Gothorum in Scandinavia proxima esse reor) orationem Dominicam exhibui. Similis etiam fuerit in eodem tractu Noruegiae lingua, cuius dictiones paucas adscribam.

(Mention of the Goths has hitherto occasionally been made in (the section on) the Germanic language (family). Those Goths who live in a part of Skåne or Scandinavia speak Germanic, too. In the foregoing, I have offered some of their words, and the Lord’s Prayer in the Icelandic language (which I believe to be closest to that of the Goths in Scandinavia). In the same region, the language of Norway will have been similar, from which I add a few words:)

Noruegice	Germanice	Latine
Gete	Geiß	Capra
Oel	Bier	Cerevissia
Broe	Brot	Panis
Stuhr	Groß	Magnus
Speck	Fleisch	Caro
Picke	Magt	Ancilla
Hußbund	Hußvatter	Paterfamilias (43r–44v)

And he continues, referring to the Swedish cartographer and historiographer Olaus Magnus (1490–1557), “[i]n aliis quidem & remotioribus earundem ad Septentrionem regionum locis, linguam à communi Germanica multum uariare puto. Nam ut Olaus Magnus scribit, ... uocant ... Diabolum, Trol ...” (in other and more remote places in the same regions towards the North, I consider that the language differs greatly from common Germanic, because, as Olaus Magnus writes, they call the devil “Trol”).

Immediately afterwards, the following passage occurs: “Septentrionales & maritimi Germani quos inferiores uocamus, s. mutant in t. & b. in f. & z. quoque in t. quare à superioribus Germanis non facile intelligi possunt, Munsterus” (The Northern and North Sea Germans, whom we call “inferiores”, shift *s* into *t*, and *b* into *f*, and *z* also into *t*, which is why they cannot

---

<sup>13</sup> Again, southern Sweden is likely to be meant; cf. notes 11 and 60–62.

be easily understood by the “superiores;” [Sebastian] Münster).<sup>14</sup> This Protestant professor in Basel (from 1529 to 1552), who was an important source for Gessner, had been the first editor of the entire Hebrew Bible (1534–1535) and the author of a very successful *Cosmographia* (1544), in which he described especially the regions and cities in the Holy Roman Empire of his day. Gessner’s statement expresses clearly in what respect all other Germanic peoples (Northern ones, the speakers of Dutch/Flemish and Low German in present-day Northern Germany, as well as the Anglo-Saxons) differ from the “superiores” (High Germans): They lack the Second or High German Consonant Shift.<sup>15</sup> He has, however, stated the actual rules governing the difference from a southern point of view, as if it were the *inferiores* who had shifted their sounds vis à vis the *superiores*, instead of vice versa.

In the “Preface” to Maaler’s *Dictionarium*, Gessner describes the Germanic-speaking area of Northern Europe as follows:

Quin ad Continentem quoque oppositam, (quae ueluti altera quaedam Europa, regna aliquot includit, nondum exploratis eius ad Gronlandiam & extremum Septentrionem terminis,) ut suis eam redderet sonis uocalem, transiuit, Gothiam dico, Sueciam, Nortuegiam, & coniunctas eius regiones. Islandia quoque, insula ut maxima, ita ad Septentrionem remotissima omnium, (cuius populi ichthyophagi sunt, quamque Thylen eruditi plerique interpretantur,) Germanos habet incolas; & Daniae regi, teste Munstero subijcitur. (\*4v, lines 1-8)<sup>16</sup>

((The Germanic language) even crossed over into the opposite continent (which, as if it were another Europe, includes a number of realms; its borders towards Greenland and the extreme North have not yet been explored), in order to give it a voice with its sounds, and by this I mean *Gothia*, Sweden, Norway and regions adjacent to these. Also Iceland, an island both the largest and the most remote of all towards the North (whose people are fish-eaters, and which is considered to be Thule by most scholars) has Germanic inhabitants and is subject to the Danish king, according to Münster).

A little further in the text, the North Germanic languages are listed one by one, together with Gothic, and said to be cognate:

---

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Gessner, *Mithridates*, 21r, and comments by Peters in Gessner, Konrad 1974 (1555), 36 and Metcalf 1963a, 151. On Münster, see Borst 1960, 1083ff. and Burmeister 1969.

<sup>15</sup> Gessner, *Mithridates*, 30v, includes *Saxones (à quibus originem ducunt, Picti, Anglij, qui Britanniam incolunt)* (the Saxons (from whom Picts and the Anglians who live in Britain derive their origins)). In recent times, this idea has been brought to new life in the controversial bifurcation theory of Theo Vennemann (Vennemann 1984).

<sup>16</sup> Note that Scandinavia is being treated as a continent in its own right here.

Islandica, Nortuegica, Gothica, Suetica, & Danica linguae, similes inter se sunt, atque Saxonica non alienae, dialectis nonnihil discrepant. Suecicae specimen in oratione Dominica hîc subijcere uolui, (nam Islandicè scriptam huic in plerisque similem, in Mithridate dedi:) Ea huiusmodi est. *Fader war ...* (\*4v)<sup>17</sup>

(The Icelandic, Norwegian, Gothic, Swedish and Danish languages are similar among themselves, and, not very different from Saxon, but they differ considerably in their dialects.<sup>18</sup> I would like to present here a specimen of Swedish from the Lord's Prayer (because I gave one written in Icelandic, similar to this one in most respects, in *Mithridates*). It goes as follows: "*Fader war ...*").

And again, Münster's testimony is evoked:

Munsterus etiam locuples testis est, Scoticum, Danicum, imò Islandicum sermonem, plurimùm differre à Sueuico & Heluetico: in fundamento tamen, ut ipse loquitur, eos conuenire idque plurimis uocabulis, quae hisce nationibus communia sunt, probari. (\*4v)

(Münster is also a reliable witness for the fact that the Scottish, Danish, and even the Icelandic language differ much from Swabian and Swiss. Fundamentally, however, as he says, they correspond to each other, which is proved by most of the words common to these nations).

The mention of Scots may have been prompted by an awareness of the strong Scandinavian influence on this variety of English ever since the Viking period, although Gessner is not explicit about this.<sup>19</sup> In a separate entry (*Mithridates* [67r]) *De Scotica lingua* (On the Scottish language), Gessner says, "Scoticam linguam communiorem audio parum differre ab Anglica" (I heard that the commoner Scottish language differs only little from the English one). He could, however, have had in mind Norn, the variety of Old Norse spoken in the Shetlands and Orkneys as well as in mainland Caithness,<sup>20</sup> or even Scots Gaelic as spoken in the Highlands and Hebrides, which contains numerous Scandinavian loan words.<sup>21</sup> According to Gessner (67r), Gaelic is spoken by the "Scoti (sylvestres & insulani) ... (inquit Munsterus)" (Scots living in the forest and on the islands, says Münster).

---

<sup>17</sup> The text of the entire Lord's Prayer follows.

<sup>18</sup> Here, "dialect" means a local or regional variety.

<sup>19</sup> See, for instance, "The Scandinavian Settlement in Britain and its Linguistic Effects," in Nielsen 1998, 165–88.

<sup>20</sup> See Barnes 1989, Rendboe 2002. Ten Kate (see below) calls this language "Orcadisch."

<sup>21</sup> See the list in Peder Gammeltoft 2004, 75–84, and bibliography, 87–90.

It is worth noting that Gessner's compatriot and contemporary Renward Cysat (1545–1614), town clerk (*Stadtschreiber*) and literary and artistic director (*Dramaturg*) of Luzern, has a passage in his posthumous *Collectanea* which describes the regional variants and their mutual (un)intelligibility in the German–Dutch–Flemish continuum. To this Cysat adds:

Noch vil grosseren vnderscheid vnd beschwärligkeit hatt es jm verstand der sprachen mit den Schweden, Denmarcken, Nordwegen, Lyfflandern, Gottlandern vnd andern mittnächtigen lendern, die glychwol ouch sich gern vnder die Tüttschen vermischend vnd zellend. Möchte ouch sin, dz jr sprach mitt der tüttschen participierte vnd ein verwandtschafft hette; jst aber so vil vß wäg, das es wenig, vßgnommen die handelslüt vnd die sich vff solche ding vß wundergebe legent, verstan könnent.

(Still greater difference and difficulty lies in understanding the languages of the Swedes, Danes, Norwegians, inhabitants of Livonia, (the isle of) Gotland and other northern countries, who, nevertheless, liked to mix with and be counted among the Germans. It might be the case that their language was used together with German and was related to it, but it has drifted so far apart that few people can understand it, except for merchants and those who study it because they have a great talent).<sup>22</sup>

Many of the views expressed by **Johannes Goropius Becanus** (Jan van Gorp/Gorop, born in Hilvarenbeek, hence his name, in North Brabant in 1518; died in Maastricht in 1573) now strike us as abstruse and unscientific, yet he has rightly been regarded as the father of the study of those Germanic languages which are spoken in about two thirds of the Low Countries, the XVII Provinces.<sup>23</sup> His voluminous study *Origines Antwerpianae*, published in 1569 by the prestigious Antwerp *officina* of Christopher Plantin, and striving to identify Low German/Dutch as the most ancient and perfect remnant of the *lingua Adamica*, incorporates remarks on the North Germanic languages, especially in Chapter VII, which is entitled *Gotodanica* (673–798). There, Becanus compares Gothic with the *lingua Suedanica*, that is, Old Norse, the language he believes the Goths had used first:<sup>24</sup> “Inter has prior est Suedanica, quae eadem est cum ea, qua in peninsula illa huius temporis Goti loquuntur; in qua Munsterus orationem Dominicam legendam dedit” (Among them, the first is *Suedanica*, which is identical to the language the Goths spoke in that peninsula at the time, and in which language

---

<sup>22</sup> Quoted by Sonderegger 1985, 101.

<sup>23</sup> See Van de Velde 1966, 35, Borst 1960, 1215–1219, Dekker 1999, esp. 46–47, Jones 2001, 1105b.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Van de Velde 1966, 27.



Münster gave us the Lord's Prayer to read) (738). Again, as with Gessner, the ancient Goths are situated in southern Sweden.

The first real attempt to develop a historical-comparative method for the investigation of the Germanic languages and their mutual relationships was made by **Bonaventura Vulcanius** (De Smet; Bruges 1538–Leiden 1614),<sup>25</sup> in his treatise *De literis et lingua Getarum sive Gothorum* (Leiden 1597).<sup>26</sup> The treatise indeed deals with the Goths, although its title reflects the centuries-old confusion with the Thracian tribe of the *Getae*, who also settled at the Lower Danube.<sup>27</sup> In its first part, it contains two discussions on Gothic, which had been incorporated by Vulcanius from the work of a *Vir anonymus* together with some other *Gothica* and other passages. This anonymous person is probably the Flemish theologian Cornelis Gualtherus (Wouters; died 1582), who rediscovered the famous *Codex argenteus* together with his compatriot and colleague Georgius Cassander in 1534.<sup>28</sup> But Vulcanius' main merit rests on having demonstrated the relationship between Gothic and the other Germanic languages, especially ancient and contemporary "Teutonic", the precursor of present-day Dutch. In his preliminary pages, he says that "Geticae ... huius linguae ... magna sit cum veteri Teutonica affinitas" (the affinity of this Gothic language with old "Teutonic" is great) (\*5r), and "etiam hoc quidquid est opellae illustrandae linguae Geticae hactenus ignotae à me impensum, unà cum Specimine variarum linguarum quae cum Gotica, vel cum Teutonica nostra aliquid affinitatis habent" (I have also produced a modest little work to illustrate the Gothic language, which has hitherto been unknown, together with a specimen of several languages that have an affinity with Gothic or with our "Teutonic") (\*7v). North Germanic is represented by some runic alphabets, erroneously called "Alphabeticum Gothicum" in part I, and by an "Initium Geneseos CAP. I lingua Islandica: Iupphacht skapade Gud" (etc.) (99v), that is, the simple beginning of Genesis, Chapter 1, in Icelandic, which now reads "Í upphafi skapaði Guð."<sup>29</sup>

The eminent scholar **Josephus Justus Scaliger**, born in 1540, in Agen (Aquitaine/Gascogne) to an ancient Italian (Veronese) family, della Scala, became professor of Classical languages in Leiden in 1593 (where he died in 1609) and, while in the Low Countries, devoted himself to the study of

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Van de Velde 1966, esp. 66–70, Sanders 1978, 10b–12a, de Smet 1995, 31–33.

<sup>26</sup> The treatise (in 8°) comprises no more than 8 + 109 + 1 pages.

<sup>27</sup> See J. Engels 1998, 563b–68b, esp. 66b–67b.

<sup>28</sup> See Van de Velde 1966, 17–19, Dekker 1999, 21–22.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Van de Velde 1966, Sanders 1978, Dekker 1999. 41 n. 146.

the Germanic languages, among other things.<sup>30</sup> He was in possession of some Gothic text fragments, studied Nordic Runes and the Runic alphabet, and in 1599 wrote a *Diatriba de Europaeorum linguis*, posthumously published in his *Opuscula varia antehac non edita* (Various little works hitherto unedited) (Paris 1610). In the *Diatriba*, Scaliger distinguishes European languages according to the principle of “unum verbum Matricis” (the sole mother word), that is, the word for “God”, instantiated differently in the European languages, thus breaks them up into the *Deus*-languages (Latin–Romance), *Θεος*-language (Greek), *Godt*-languages (Germanic) and *Boge*-languages (Slavonic). The third group is subdivided as follows:

Matricis GODT, propagine siue idiomata, præcipua sunt tria Teutonismus, Saxonismus, & Danismus. Rursus Teutonismi idiomata duo, superior Teutonismus, quæ est lingua Wasser; inferior Teutonismus siue lingua Water: Reliqua duo idiomata & ipsa quidem sunt linguæ Water. Sed Saxonismi propagine sunt Nord-Albingorum & Frisiorum, item Anglorum dialectus: quæ tamen veterum Nord-Albingorum & Turingiorum dialecti sunt Anglismus & Scotismus. Danismi tria discrimina sunt, lingua scilicet Danorum Limitaneorum, quos Denemarkos vocant; Danorum Australium: qui Suedan, Suedi & Sueones ab Austro dicti: denique Danorum Septentrionalium. Qui Nordan, Normanni, & Noruegi vocantur; a quorum Idiomate propagatum est Islandicum hodiernum, quod ita intelligitur à Noruegis, vt Hollandica, lingua à Germanis (120–21).<sup>31</sup>

(Of the *GOD* mother language, the principal offsprings or “idioms” are the three “Teutonic”, Saxon and Danish. “Teutonic”, in turn, has two “idioms”, “High Teutonic”, which is the *wasser*-language, and “Low Teutonic”, or *water*-language; the two remaining “idioms” are themselves *water*-languages. The offsprings of Saxon are the dialects of the North Albingians and Frisians, and of the Anglians; those of the ancient North Albingians and the Thuringians are English and Scots. The Danish (dialects) are three different ones, viz. the language of the Border Danes, who are called *Denemarki*; (that of the) Southern Danes, who are called *Swedan*, *Swedi* and *Sweones* from (the word for) “South;” finally (that of the) Northern Danes, who are called *Nordan*, *Normanni* and *Norwegi*, from whose “idiom” present-day Icelandic has developed, which is understood by Norwegians in the same way as the Dutch (“Hollandish”) language is by Germans).

---

<sup>30</sup> For the following, see Sanders 1978, 21a–22b; Van de Velde 1966, 80–84, Van de Velde 1964, 313ff.

<sup>31</sup> Given in German translation by Arens 1955, 59–61. Sanders 1978, 22 quotes part of Arens’ translation.

This compact passage reveals various valuable and accurate insights. First, the speakers of all North Germanic languages are called “Danes.” This corresponds to the designation *dǫnsk tunga*, which was indeed used for that group in the Middle Ages. This common designation was found as early as 1014–15 in a Scaldic poem by the Icelander Sigvatr Þórðarson; only almost two centuries later (first in 1192), a separate name for Norwegian–Icelandic, “norrønt mál” (the northern language), became a rival to *dǫnsk tunga* and confirmed the perceived distinctness of West Nordic. But throughout the whole Middle Ages the latter remained in use too, even in Iceland and Norway.<sup>32</sup> Second, Norwegians understand Icelandic. They will comprise essentially those Norwegians who had not been Danicized after the Kalmar Union (1397), that is, speakers of present-day *Nynorsk* varieties. Third, the (High) Germans understand the Dutch (including Flemish).

As with Gessner, the High German or Second Consonant Shift has been implicitly indicated by the opposition in the words *Wasser* and *Water* here.<sup>33</sup> This reference word or shibboleth was also the first of the three words Gessner mentioned in his *Mithridates* (21r). It is striking and rather puzzling that Scaliger, even though he knew some Gothic, appeared unable to place it correctly; hence, it is missing from his classification.<sup>34</sup> He did, however, conclude his *Diatriba* with the words: “& ipsi veteres Gotthi Characteres habent, sacra alioquin Greco ritu celebrantes, lingua veteri Gotthica: in vsu autem cotidiano magna ex parte Teutonissant” (also the Goths themselves have ancient letters to celebrate the sacred [offices] in the old Gothic language, and for the rest in accordance with the Greek rite; but in daily usage, they Teutonicize to a great extent) (122).<sup>35</sup> Scaliger’s manuscripts contain at three occasions the Wulfila alphabet in uncial script and some transcriptions.<sup>36</sup> Note that next to the four mother languages, Scaliger distinguishes “reliquiae septem minores” (seven minor groups), under which “Quarta Finnonica, cuius propago est Laponica, in Septemtrionalibus Scandinaviae Suedorum” (the fourth the Finnish [mother language], whose offspring is Lappish, north of the Swedes of Scandinavia) (121).

---

<sup>32</sup> See, for instance, Kjartan Ottosson 2005, 789b–90a, Sandøy 2000, 867ff., Haugen 1976, 135.

<sup>33</sup> Gessner 1555 (1974), “Preface,” \*5v, also calls “Niderlendisch//Flemmisch ... oder Batavisch Tütsch” (Dutch/ Flemish or Batavian “Tütsch”) “Watlendisch,” after the word “wat” (vs. High German “was;” English “what”). Gessner borrowed the term from the Swiss humanist Aegidius Tschudi (1505–1572). See Sonderegger 1998, 423b, Sonderegger 1985, 94–100.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *supra* and our note 30.

<sup>35</sup> On Scaliger’s erroneous beliefs concerning the Goths, see Van de Velde 1966, 81, and Burdach 1924, 301.

<sup>36</sup> See in detail Van de Velde 1966, 93ff.

To **Franciscus Junius** jr. (1591–1677), who was probably a pupil of Vulcanius in Leiden,<sup>37</sup> Germanic philology not only owes the first edition of the Gothic *Codex argenteus* with Wulfila’s Bible, among other things, but also the definitive inclusion of the Scandinavian languages in the study of the Germanic language family.<sup>38</sup> An important statement in this regard reads as follows: “Ex Gothicâ certè profluxit vetus Cimbrica, monumentis Runarum posteris tradita, nec non moderna Suecica, Danica, Norvagica, Islandica” (From Gothic, for sure, has proceeded ancient Cimbric, transmitted by Runic monuments to posterity, as well as modern Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, and Icelandic).<sup>39</sup> Thus, in this statement, Junius “believed in a close linear relationship between Gothic and Cimbric which was the ancestor of the Scandinavian languages.”<sup>40</sup> The relationship with the other Germanic languages (which, in Junius’ 1655 view, comprise Anglo-Saxon, from which Dutch and Old Frisian emerged, and High German, a mixture of Gothic and Anglo-Saxon) is not clear. This “Cimbric”, or Proto-Old Norse, was placed on the same level as the other branches (*Frisica*, *Anglo-Saxonica*, and *Francica* and *Alamannica*).<sup>41</sup> The latter two brought forth *superior Germanica*. Present-day Dutch (including Flemish), however, was derived by Junius from *Anglo-Saxonica*. This is partly right, considering that Dutch is known to contain a strong Ingveonic, coastal component.<sup>42</sup> It is a very modern insight indeed! Unfortunately, on the other hand, and in contrast to our next author, Janus Vlitius, Junius apparently denied the existence of a Franconian (i.e., non-Ingveonic, inland) component in Dutch.<sup>43</sup> And unfortunately, too, the “father of Germanic comparative philology” had initially confused “Cimbric” with “Gothic”, as he confessed:<sup>44</sup> “[I]pse olim confundebam Gothica cum Cimbricis, usque dum ex arg(entei) codicis frequentiore lectione didici plurimum a vetere Gothico discrepare dialectum

---

<sup>37</sup> Van Romburgh 2004, 804 n. 3. Junius was aware of his work, see Van de Velde 1966, 153.

<sup>38</sup> See Van de Velde 1966, 145ff.; Van de Velde 1964, 317. On Junius’ varying opinions, see Dekker 1999, 257–63; on his preoccupation with Old Norse, van Romburgh 2004, 23, 26, 28, 1029 n. 4; van Romburgh 2001, 5–36, at 10.

<sup>39</sup> Junius, “Ad lectorem,” in *Observationes in Willeramii Abbatis Francicam Paraphrasin Cantici Cantorum* (Amsterdam 1655), quoted by van Romburgh 2004, 858 n. 8, and Dekker 1999, 258.

<sup>40</sup> Dekker 1999, 258. In 1665, in the dedicatory letter to Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie preceding his *Gothicum glossarium quo pleraque Argentei Codicis vocabula explicantur* (Dordrecht 1665), Junius himself refuted a Gothic origin for Franconian (i.e., High German) and Anglo-Saxon. See Dekker 1999, 259.

<sup>41</sup> See, for instance, Junius’ letter to his German colleague Johann Clauberg from Duisburg, August 1660, quoted and trans. by van Romburgh 2004, 934–37.

<sup>42</sup> See van Loey 1970, par. 9, van Bree 1997, Nielsen 2000.

<sup>43</sup> Dekker 1999, 258; van Romburgh 2001, 18ff., 33 n. 73.

<sup>44</sup> Van Romburgh 2004, 762 n. 8.

Cimbricam” (I myself formerly confused Gothic with Cimbric, until I learnt from repeated reading of the *Codex argenteus* that the Cimbric dialect differs greatly from ancient Gothic).<sup>45</sup> Thus, the closer study of the Gothic Bible fragments appeared to be of great importance for a better classification of all Germanic languages.

Junius’ preparatory work became the foundation on which **Janus Vlitius** (Jan van Vliet; Middelburg 1620 – Breda 1666) built in an anonymously published treatise entitled *’t Vader ons in XX oude Duytse en Noordse talen* (The Lord’s Prayer in Twenty Ancient “Teutonic” and Nordic Languages) (Dordrecht, 1664).<sup>46</sup> In this publication, Vlitius offers, beside a Finnish version, specimens in *Deens*, *Sweeds*, *Nordweegs*, *Iislands*, and Simeon’s hymn (Luke 2:25–35) in *Sweeds* and *Deens*.<sup>47</sup> For Vlitius, Gothic was the *moedertael* (mother language) of all of Germanic. Even more emphatically than Junius, Vlitius claimed that *onse* (our) language, that is, Dutch, belonged to *Engels–Sax* (Anglo-Saxon), but only *ten deele* (partly); Vlitius added that it *ten deele* originated from the *Oude Teutse* [Old “Teutonic”]. Taken in its entirety, his classification reads as follows:<sup>48</sup>

Gotse Moedertael		
De Runisse	Engels-Saxe	Oude Teutse
↓	↓	↓
Islandse } Noorse	De oude Friese	onse ten deele
Sweedse }	Engelse	die der oude Francken
Deense } taelen	onse ten deele	Theodiske

<sup>45</sup> Junius, *Etymologicum anglicanum* (1743, s.v. *owndie*), quoted and trans. by van Romburgh 2004, 787 n. 15; cf. 788 n. 16, 763 n. 9; van Romburgh 2001, 10.

<sup>46</sup> See Van de Velde 1964, 115ff., Van de Velde 1966, 119ff., Dekker 1999, esp. 151–58, and on ‘Runic’, 224ff.; on Junius’ relationship with Vlitius, see van Romburgh 2004, 984 n. 16, 1016–1018.

<sup>47</sup> Dekker 1999, 153–57, not the author himself, numbers them as follows: *In’t Finlands* (Finnish, no. 27), *Deens* (Danish, no. 17), *Oud Sweeds* (Old Swedish, no. 18), *Sweeds* (Swedish), [which is,] in fact, Gotlandic (no. 19), *Nordweegs* (Norwegian, no. 20), *Iislands* (Icelandic, no. 21); Simeon’s hymn in *Sweeds* (Swedish, no. 32), and *Deens* (Danish, no. 33).

<sup>48</sup> Based on Van de Velde 1964, 316. *Theotiske* is Upper or South High German, comprising the Bavarian and Alemannic regiolects; cf. the diagram in Dekker 1999, 162.

	Gothic language	mother
Runic	Anglo-Saxon	Old Teutonic
↓	↓	↓
Icelandic } Nordic	Old Frisian	partly ours
Swedish }	English	that of the Old Fran- conians
Danish } languages	partly ours	Theodisc

Concerning the *Noordse taelen* (Nordic languages), Vlitius said that “[v]an de Runisse zijn gesprooten de Iislandse, Sweedse en Deense, die men te samen de Noordse taelen, en kinds-kinderen van de Gotse kan noemen” (from Runic have branched off Icelandic, Swedish and Danish, which together can be named the Nordic languages, and grandchildren of Gothic).<sup>49</sup> The term *Runis(se)* came from the Danish polymath Ole Worm (Olaus Wormius, 1588–1654), who as a student lived in Leiden for a while, the same town where we have already met Vulcanius, Scaliger and Junius.<sup>50</sup> According to Dekker, “[v]an Vliet did not possess a detailed knowledge of the synchronic and diachronic diversity of the Scandinavian languages, but their relationship was nevertheless often noted in his work.”<sup>51</sup> On such occasions, Vlitius noted *Sued.*, *Isl(andis)*, *Dan.*, but made no reference to *Noors* (Norwegian); perhaps the latter was subsumed under Danish, as a precursor of present-day *Bokmål* (and, as far as *Nynorsk* is concerned, under Icelandic).<sup>52</sup>

In his enthusiasm for the old “Danish” language (*dønsk tunga*), the aforementioned Worm had transliterated the Late Old Norse–Icelandic poem *Krákumál* into runes.<sup>53</sup> This very poem drew the attention of two Dutch scholars as well: Vlitius, who possessed both editions of Worm’s *Runer, seu*

<sup>49</sup> Vlitius, *’t Vader ons*, a3v, quoted and trans. by Dekker 1999, 244.

<sup>50</sup> The Leiden humanists were all acquainted with each other’s work, either first-handedly or second-handedly, and Junius knew Worm’s work; see van Romburgh 2004, 762ff., 838 n. 8, 854 n. 10, 975 n. 10, 980–82 (section c), Dekker 1999, 236–38.

<sup>51</sup> Dekker 1999, 244.

<sup>52</sup> On Vlitius’ further work on the Scandinavian languages, see Dekker 1999, 118 (Danish, Icelandic), 119 (Danish, Swedish), 124 (‘Runic’), 126 (Icelandic), 149 (‘Runic’); also 146 (*Dan.*, *Sued.*, *Isl.*).

<sup>53</sup> Junius mentions the poem in a letter to Clauberg; see van Romburgh 2004, 966; cf. 838 n. 8. On the poem, see H.-P. Neumann 2001.

*Danica literatura antiquissima* (Amsterdam 1636, and Copenhagen 1651, which included the poem),<sup>54</sup> and, sixty years later, our last author to be dealt with, the Amsterdam merchant-scholar **Lambert ten Kate** (1674–1731), who integrated it into a voluminous work that is considered to have laid the foundations of historical-comparative linguistics: the monumental, two-volume study *Aenleiding tot de Kennisse van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche Sprake* (Introduction to the exalted part of the Dutch language) (Amsterdam 1723).<sup>55</sup> There, in the *Europische Tael-boom* (European Language-Tree [stemma]), ten Kate subdivided the Germanic languages into two groups (1:60). Group II, *Oud-Theutonisch of Oud-Duitsch* (Old “Teutonic”) corresponds to the West Germanic subfamily; group I represents the North Germanic ones:

- I. KIMBRISCH of *Oud-Noordsch*, ook *Runisch* genaemt, als  
DANO-GOTTHISCH of Oud-Deensch } zijnde het Tegenwoordige  
SCANO-GOTTHISCH } of Oud-Zweedsch } met eenig *Duitsch*  
en SVECO-GOTTHISCH } } vermengt  
NOORWEEGSCH } zijnde deze twee  
YSLANDSCH } nog minst verbastert  
en ORCADISCH

- [II. Cimbric or Old Norse, also called Runic:  
Dano-Gothic or Old Danish } being the modern ones,  
Scano-Gothic } or Old Swedish } mixed with some  
and Sveco-Gothic } } “Teutonic”  
Norwegian } those two being  
Icelandic } least corrupted  
(the language of the) Orkneys.]

---

<sup>54</sup> Dekker 1999, 130–31; Vlitius, in turn, transliterated Worm’s runic version into Roman characters.

<sup>55</sup> Now published in facsimile with an introduction by Jan Noordegraaf and Marijke van der Wal (ten Kate 1723 (2001)). On ten Kate, see also Igor van de Bilt’s and Jan Noordegraaf’s introduction to Lambert ten Kate’s *Gemeenschap tussen de Gottische Spraeke en de Nederduitsche*, facs. ed. 2002, 6–48 (ten Kate 1710 (2002)); Van de Velde 1966, part 4, 211–88, esp. 211–38 and 275–77; Dekker 1999, 342–46. In *Bijlage N° II* to volume 1 of his *Aenleiding* (79–108), ten Kate integrated the *Oud-Noords Gedigt van Regner Lodbrog* (Old Norse poem about Ragnar Lodbrók), which he called a *konstig gedigt in Deensche of Kimbrische Sprake ... dat in Runische of Oud-Kimbrische Letteren gedrukt staet* [an elegant poem in the Danish or Cimbric language that has been printed in Runic or Old Cimbric characters], in *Aenleiding* 1:51. Ten Kate’s primary aim was to demonstrate the relationship between the two Germanic languages Old Norse and Dutch; see J.U. Terpstra 1960, 141.

What ten Kate calls the language of the Orkneys is, of course, Norn.<sup>56</sup> Remarkably, the *Tael-boom* traced modern Danish and Swedish back to *Gothisch*, but distinguished it from *Moeso-Gothisch*, the language of bishop Wulfila and his *Gothi minores* in Lower Moesia (now the northern part of Bulgaria). And then ten Kate took a wider view again: “Het Moeso-Gottisch heeft meer gemeenschap met het Oud-Duitsch dan met het Kimbrisch of Oud-Noordsch, gelijk klaer blijkt uit het Evangelium Gothicum, dat ook Codex Argenteus genaemt word” (Moeso-Gothic has more in common with “Old Teutonic” than with “Cimbric” or Old Norse, as appears clearly from the *Evangelium Gothicum*, also called *Codex Argenteus*) (1:55).<sup>57</sup> *Moeso-Gothisch* was listed among the languages of the *Theutonische* group, specifically in the subgroup comprising *Angel-Saxisch* and *Oud-Friesch* (Old Frisian), both of which we now regard as Ingvæonic.<sup>58</sup>

According to ten Kate, this distinction also corresponded to differences in script:

De *Runische Letteren*, die van oude tijden af in 't Noorden onder de Scano-Gotten en Upsalers (nu Zweden genaemt), en onder de Denen, Noorwegers en Yslanders in zwang gingen, verschilden vrij veel van de *Moeso-Gotthise* van Ulphilas. (1:54)

(The Runic characters, which had, since old times, come in use in the North among the Scano-Goths and Uppsalians (now called Swedes), and among the Danes, Norwegians and Icelanders, differed quite a lot from the Moeso-Gothic of Wulfila).

Ten Kate thus denied the well-known, but not generally accepted, Gotho-Nordic (or East and North Germanic) linguistic unity.<sup>59</sup> Indirectly, he also denied the “Gothic myth” so enthusiastically adopted by the Swedes ever since the fifteenth century, with which they claimed and celebrated a glorious past and so justified expansionist tendencies.<sup>60</sup> Ten Kate’s element *Gothisch* in *Dano-*, *Scano-*, and *Sveco-Gothisch* (thus naming the present-day East Scandinavian languages) could rather have referred to the tribe of the *gøtar* (Old Norse *gautar*) in Götaland (South Sweden).<sup>61</sup> Junius, for instance, mentioned the term *Sveogothi* in the King of Sweden’s title.<sup>62</sup> In any case, in so doing, ten Kate abandoned the “gothica-genetrix theory”, accord-

---

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Barnes 1989, Rendboe 2002 (cfr. our note 20).

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Van de Velde 1966, 275ff.

<sup>58</sup> Ten Kate 1723 (2001), *Aenleiding* 1:60; on the West Germanic languages, see 1:57ff.; on the Frisians, 49ff.

<sup>59</sup> For an overview of all positions, see, for instance, Scardigli 2005.

<sup>60</sup> For an overview, see F. Paul 1998, Pohl 1998, esp. §§ 10ff.

<sup>61</sup> For the discussion as a whole, see esp. Andersson 1998, Andersson 1996, Holm 2002, 165. Cf. our notes 11 and 13.

<sup>62</sup> See van Romburgh 2004, 1014 n. 22.



ing to which Gothic would have been the mother of all other Germanic languages, as many humanists (not so Junius) had claimed.<sup>63</sup> George Hickes (1642-1715) drew up a stemma in which *Gothica* springs from *Cimbrica* or *Cimbro-Gothica*, and *Islandica*, *Norwegica*, *Suedica*, *Danica* from *Gotica* in turn.

Like his precursors Gessner, Vulcanius and Vlitius,<sup>64</sup> ten Kate presents us in “Bijlage No. I” with the Lord's Prayer, though in contrast to the other three authors he only cites the very first line. The version he quotes, is the one he had found in the treatise *The Lord's Prayer in Above a Hundred Languages ...* (London 1700).<sup>65</sup> The languages are among others “Runisch of Oud-Noordsch, ook Kimbrisch genaemt; Deensch, Zweedsch, Noorweegsch, Yslandsch, Orcadisch” (Runic or Old Norse, also called Cimbric; Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Icelandic, the Orkney language), all of them *Spruyten Van den Kimbrischen Tak* (offsprings of the Cimbric branch) (1:63). Note, by the way, that in his *Tael-boom*, ten Kate also recognized the relationship between *Estonisch*, *Finnisch en Laplandsch* (Estonic, Finnish and Lappish), and remarked that “[d]eze verschillen onderling slegts in Dialect. Men vind' er ook vrij wat Kimbrische en ook Duitsche woorden onder” (these differ mutually only in terms of “dialect.” One also finds quite a lot of Cimbric and “Teutonic” words in them) (1:62).<sup>66</sup> Thus, he referred to North Germanic, and hence, indirectly, also to German, specifically Hanseatic, influences.<sup>67</sup> In addition, he mentioned Slavonic languages: “Eindeling, eer ik sluite heb ik nog te zeggen van de Tael der afgelegene Finnen en Lappen, dat deze vrij meer van 't Slavoens of Russisch dan van 't Kimbrisch, en eenige overeenkomst met het Estonisch en Lyflandsch heeft” (Finally, before concluding, about the language of the remote *Fins* and *Laps* I must say that it has rather more in common with *Slavonic* or *Russian* than with *Cimbric*, and some correspondences with *Estonian* and *Livonian*) (1:55). As is well known, Finnish, Lappish and Estonian are cognates; only loan words

---

<sup>63</sup> On ten Kate's teacher Adriaen Verwer, and on ten Kate himself, see Van de Bilt's and Noordegraaf's introduction to ten Kate's *Gemeenschap 1710* (2002), 16–21 and 21–23, respectively; on Junius and George Hickes, see Dekker 1999, 258 and 339–42, respectively; cf. our note 43.

<sup>64</sup> Ten Kate knew the latter only indirectly as a certain distinguished acquaintance and friend of Junius; see ten Kate 1723 (2001), *Aenleiding* 1:56 n. (col. b): *zeker voornamelijk Kennis en Vriend van gemelden Junius in zijn Boekje in 8: dat onder den Tijtel van 'T VADER ONS in XX Oud-Duitsche en Noordse TAELEN met de Uitleggingen enz., A. 1664, is uitgegeven, om een Voorloper te verstrekken van 't gemelde Werk van Junius*; cf. Dekker 1999, 343ff.

<sup>65</sup> Ten Kate 1723 (2001), *Aenleiding* 1:63 and 59; on this comparative tradition, which culminates in J.C. Adelung's *Mithridates ... in bey nahe fünf-hundert Sprachen und Mundarten*, 5 vols. (1806–1817), cf. Dekker 1999, 348ff.

<sup>66</sup> For the meaning of “dialect” in ten Kate, see below.

<sup>67</sup> For the latter, see Robert Hinderling and Cornelius Hasselblatt 1998-2004, 3269–82.

can be considered as originating from Slavonic/Russian and the Baltic language Livonian.<sup>68</sup>

Retrospectively, humanists from the “Teutonic” or “Theodisk” area recognized the different Scandinavian languages, and subdivided them as we do today; only Faeroese is missing. As we have seen, already in the middle of the sixteenth century Gessner listed the *Islandica, Nortuegica, Suetica, & Danica linguae*, and almost two centuries later these four are also named by ten Kate (*Deensch, Zweedsch, Noorweegsch, Yslandsch*). It is not surprising that the independent states of Denmark and Sweden were considered each to have an autonomous standardized language. Norway and Iceland, however, which politically belonged to Denmark since the end of the fourteenth century, were perceived as having – each! – a language of their own, because of noticeable characteristics in their respective linguistic systems. Only Vlitius seems to have ignored Norwegian. It is noteworthy that possibly Gessner, and at any rate ten Kate were aware of still another Scandinavian language, Norn, which they called *Orcadisch*. Indeed, this language seems to have persisted in Orkney till about the end of the eighteenth century.<sup>69</sup> The status of Gothic was rather confused. On the one hand, its archaic structure and recording suggested (not to Junius!) that it was the mother of all Germanic languages. On the other hand, on the assumption that the Goths first settled in southern Sweden, for a long time their language was considered to be a Nordic one; only by Junius’ first edition of the *Codex argenteus*, the insight was gradually winning through that Wulfilan “Moeso-Gothic” (ten Kate) was in some respects related to, yet not really part of the Nordic languages.

Interestingly, our humanists referred to the various North Germanic offsprings as *linguae*, a word which they (so e.g. Junius) omitted altogether in some cases. With Gessner, this usage is particularly striking, for it contrasts sharply with his approach to Continental West Germanic, which he treated as a continuum of *dialecti* (*Schreibsprachen*).<sup>70</sup> Vlitius and ten Kate, too, referred to each of the Scandinavian varieties individually by the Dutch term for *lingua*, *tael* or *spra[e]ke*. The humanists thus all indicated, or at least foreshadowed, the Nordic varieties’ ongoing development towards standardization. At the same time, it is clear, that when ten Kate used “dialect”, as he did with reference to Estonian, Finnish and Lappish, he certainly did not mean what we understand by the term today, a local or regional mainly spoken variety that is subordinate to a standard language. Instead, ten Kate

---

<sup>68</sup> See J. Koivulehto 1995 and Larsson 2001.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Barnes 1989 and Rendboe 2002 (cfr. our note 20)

<sup>70</sup> See de Grauwe 2006, nn. 13, 18.

used “dialect” in the sense often given to it by scholars during the nineteenth century, that is, an offspring of a common basic or source language, such as Germanic.<sup>71</sup> The individual identity of each Scandinavian language is by no means under discussion.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> See Jo Daan 1992, esp. 156–60.

<sup>72</sup> I wish to thank very specially Kees Dekker (Groningen) for his book (Dekker 1999), Sophie van Romburgh (Leiden) for relevant fragments from her edition of Junius’ correspondence (2004) and for her 2001 article, and Torsten Leuschner (Gent) for valuable linguistic advice.

### Bibliography

- Andersson, Thorsten 1996, "Götär, goter, gutar", *Namn och Bygd* 84, 5–21.
- Andersson, Thorsten 1998, "Götär", *Reallexikon*, ed. Beck, vol. 12, 278b–283b.
- Arens, Hans 1955, *Sprachwissenschaft. Der Gang ihrer Entwicklung von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, Freiburg and Munich.
- Bandle, Oskar, et al. ed. 2002–2005, *The Nordic Languages. An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*, vol. 1–2, Berlin and New York.
- Barnes, Michael P. 1989, "The Death of Norn", *Germanistische Rest- und Trümmersprachen*, ed. H. Beck, Berlin and New York, 21–43.
- Becanus, Johannes Goropius 1569, *Origines Antwerpianae ...* Antwerp.
- Beck, Heinrich, Dieter Geuenich, and Heiko Steuer, edd. 1973–2007, *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde*. 2nd ed., 34 vols., Berlin and New York.
- Besch, W. et al., edd. 1998–2004, *Sprachgeschichte. Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung*, 2nd ed., 4 vols., Berlin and New York.
- Bilt, Igor van de, and Jan Noordegraaf. *See* ten Kate, Lambert
- Borst, Arno 1960, *Der Turmbau von Babel. Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*, vol. 3:1, Stuttgart.
- Burdach, Konrad 1924, "Die nationale Aneignung der Bibel und die Anfänge der germanischen Philologie", *Festschrift Eugen Mogk zum 70. Geburtstag*, Halle an der Saale, 1–14 and 231–334.
- Burmeister, Karl Heinz 1969, *Sebastian Münster: Versuch eines biographischen Gesamtbildes*, Basel and Stuttgart.
- Daan, Jo 1992, "Wat is een dialect? De betekenisnuances van dit woord in Nederland, bij Lambert ten Kate en in latere eeuwen", *Taal en Tongval* 44, 156–187.
- de Grauwe Luc 2002, "Emerging Mother-Tongue Awareness: The Special Case of Dutch and German in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period", *Standardisation. Studies from the Germanic Languages. Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* 235, ed. A. Linn and N. McLelland, Amsterdam, 99–115.
- de Grauwe Luc 2003, "Theodistik. Zur Begründung eines Faches und ein Plädoyer für eine kontinentalwestgermanische Sicht auf die neuzeitliche Bifurkation Deutsch/Niederländisch", *Die deutsche Sprache und die Regionen. Entstehungsgeschichtliche Fragen in neuer Sicht*, ed. R. Berthele, H. Christen, S. Germann and I. Hove, Berlin and New York, 127–156.
- de Grauwe Luc 2006, "Einheit und Vielfalt der germanischen Sprachen nach Conrad Gessner (1555, 1561) in Lichte der 'Theodistik'", *Acta*

- Conventus Neo-Latini Bonnensis: Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*, Tempe, 269-276 (*Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies V.* 315).
- Dekker, Kees 1999, *The Origins of Old Germanic Studies in the Low Countries*, Leiden, Boston and Cologne (*Brill's Studies in Intellectual History* 92).
- de Smet, Gilbert 1971, *See*, Maaler, Josua 1971.
- de Smet, Gilbert 1995, "Brugse humanisten aan de wieg van de Germaanse filologie", *Academiae Analecta. Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België*. Klasse der Letteren 57, no. 1, 23–36.
- Engels, J. 1998, "Geten", *Reallexikon*, ed. Beck, vol. 11, 563b–568b.
- Gammeltoft, Peter 2004, "Scandinavian–Gaelic Contacts. Can Place-Names and Place-Name Elements Be Used as a Source for Contact-Linguistic Research?" *Nowele* 44, March, 51–90.
- Gessner, Konrad 1974, *Mithridates. De differentiis linguarum tum veterum tum quae hodie apud diversas nationes in toto orbe terrarum in usu sunt*. A facsimile of the edition Zürich 1555, ed.: Manfred Peters, Aalen.
- Haugen, Einar 1976, *The Scandinavian Languages. An Introduction to their History*, London.
- Hinderling, Robert and Cornelius Hasselblatt 1998-2004, "Baltisch/Deutsch", *Sprachgeschichte*, ed. Besch, vol. 4, 3269–3282.
- Holm, Gösta 2002, "Gutar og goter", *Nam och Bygd* 90, 165.
- Jones, William J. 2001, "Early Dialectology, Etymology and Language History in German-Speaking Countries", *History of the Language Sciences. An International Handbook on the Evolution to the Study of Language from the Beginning to the Present*, ed. S. Auroux et al., Berlin and New York, 2:1105–1115.
- Junius, Franciscus 1655, *Observationes in Willeramii Abbatis Francicam Paraphrasin Cantici Cantorum*, Amsterdam.
- Koivulehto, J. 1995, "Finnisch. I. Sprachliches", *Reallexikon*, ed. Beck, vol. 9, 77b–89b.
- Krefeld, Thomas 1988, "Italienisch: Periodisierung", *Lexikon der Romanistischen Linguistik*, ed. G. Holtus, M. Metzeltin and Chr. Schmitt, Tübingen, 4:748–762.
- Larsson, Lars-Gunnar 2001, "Baltic influences on Finnic languages", *Past and Present*, ed.: Östen Dahl and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (vol. 1 of *Circum-Baltic Languages*), Amsterdam and Philadelphia, 237–253.
- Maaler, Josua 1971, *Die Teütsch Spraach, Dictionarium Germanicolatinum novum*. A facsimile of the edition Zürich, 1561, ed.: Gilbert de Smet, Hildesheim and New York.

- Metcalf, George J. 1963a, "Konrad Gesner's Views on the Germanic languages", *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht, deutsche Sprache und Literatur* 55, no. 4, 149–156.
- Metcalf, George J. 1963b, "The Views of Konrad Gesner on Language", *Studies in Germanic Languages and Literatures in Memory of Fred O. Nolte*, ed. Erich Hofacker and Liselotte Dieckmann, St. Louis.
- Neumann, H.-P. 2001, "Krákumál", *Reallexikon*, ed. Beck, vol. 17, 299b–302a.
- Nielsen, Hans Frede 1998, *The Continental Backgrounds of English and its Insular Development until 1154*, Odense.
- Nielsen, Hans Frede 2000, "Ingwäonisch", *Reallexikon*, ed. Beck, vol. 15, 432b–439b.
- Noordegraaf, Jan, and Marijke van der Wal. See ten Kate, Lambert Ottosson, Kjørtan 2005, "Old Nordic: A Definition and Delimitation of the Period", Bandle, *Nordic Languages II*, 787-793.
- Peters, Manfred, see Gessner, Konrad 1974 .
- Paul, F. 1998, "Gotizismus", *Reallexikon*, ed. Beck, vol. 12, 461b–466a.
- Pohl, W. 1998, "Goten. III. Historisches", *Reallexikon*, ed. Beck, vol. 12, 427–443.
- Rendboe, L. 2002, "Norn", *Reallexikon*, ed. Beck, vol. 21, 383b–388b.
- Rischel, Jørgen, "Perspectives in Research History II: The Contribution of Nordic Research to Historical Linguistics (Until 1950)", Bandle 2002-2005, 108-115.
- Sanders, Willy 1978, *Leidener Humanisten und die Anfänge der Germanistik*, Bonn (*Nachbarn* 22).
- Sandøy, Helge 2000, "Nation und Sprache: das Norwegische", *Nation und Sprache. Die Diskussion ihres Verhältnisses in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. A. Gardt, Berlin and New York, 865–904.
- Scaliger, Josephus Justus 1610, "Diatriba de Europeorum linguis", *Opuscula varia antehac non edita*, Paris.
- Scardigli, Piergiuseppe 2005, "Nordic–Gothic Linguistic Relations", In Bandle, *Nordic Languages*, 553–558.
- Sonderegger, Stefan 1985, "Die niederländische Sprache aus der Sicht der schweizerischen Gelehrten des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts", *Niederlandistik in Entwicklung. Vorträge und Arbeiten an der Universität Zürich*, ed. S. Sonderegger and J. Stegeman, Leiden and Antwerpen, 93–105.
- Sonderegger, Stefan 1998, "Ansätze zu einer deutschen Sprachgeschichtsschreibung bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts", Besch, 1998-2004 , vol. 1: 417–442.
- ten Kate, Lambert 1723 (2001), *Aenleiding Tot de Kennisse van het Verhevene Deel der Nederduitsche Sprake ... 1723*. A facsimile edition by Jan Noordegraaf and Marijke van der Wal. Alphen aan den Rijn.

HUMANIST DISCOVERIES OF THE SCANDINAVIAN PAST  
*Renæssanceforum 5 • 2008 • www.renaessanceforum.dk*  
*Luc de Grauwe: The Representation*

- ten Kate, Lambert 1710 (2002), *Gemeenschap tussen de Gottische Spraeke en de Nederduytsche*. A facsimile edition by Igor van de Bilt and Jan Noordegraaf, 2nd ed., Amsterdam (*Cahiers voor taalkunde* 19).
- Terpstra, J.U. 1960, "Ten Kate's Übersetzung von Ragnar Lodbroks Sterbelied (*Krákumál*) und ihre literarhistorische Bedeutung." *Neophilologus* 44, 135–146.
- van Bree, Cor 1997, *Een oud onderwerp opnieuw bekeken; het Ingweoons*, Leiden.
- Van de Velde, Roger 1964, "Taalgenetische opvattingen en komparatisme bij de studie der Germaanse talen." *Handelingen der Koninklijke Zuidnederlandse Maatschappij voor Taal- en Letterkunde en Geschiedenis* 18, 309–322.
- Van de Velde, Roger 1966, *De studie van het Gotisch in de Nederlanden. Bijdrage tot een status quaestionis over de studie van het Gotisch en het Krimgotisch*, Gent (*Koninklijke Vlaamsche Academie voor Taal- en Letterkunde Reeks VI, Bekroonde werken* 97).
- van Loey, A. 1970, *Schönfelds Historische Grammatica van het Nederlands*. 8h ed. Zutphen.
- van Romburgh, Sophie 2001, "Why Francis Junius (1591–1677) Became and Anglo-Sax-onist, Or, The Study of Old English for the Elevation of Dutch", *Appropriating the Middle Ages. Scholarship, Politics, Fraud*, ed. T.A. Shippey and M. Arnold, Cambridge, 5-36 (*Studies in Medievalism* 11).
- van Romburgh, Sophie 2004, "For my Worthy Freind Mr Franciscus Junius." *An Edition of the Correspondence of Francis Junius F.F. (1591–1667)*, Leiden and Boston (*Brill's Studies in Intellectual History* 121).
- Vennemann, Theo 1984, "Hochgermanisch und Niedergermanisch. Die Verzweigungstheorie der germanisch-deutschen Lautverschiebung." *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 106, 1–45.
- Vlitius, Janus 1664, *'t Vader ons in XX oude Duytse en Noordse talen, met d'uytleggingen ....* [Dordrecht: Johan and Hendrik van Esch].
- Vulcanius, Bonaventura 1597, *De Literis & Lingua Getarum, Siue Gothorum ...* Leiden.