

# The *Thesaurus Theutonicae linguae* (1573): dictionary as a grammar

Elizaveta ZIMONT<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Université de Reims Champagne-Ardenne (URCA), Reims, France ; Université de Liège (ULiège), Liège, Belgique ;  
| elizaveta.zimont@univ-reims.fr | <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6170-8908>

**DOI:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.21165/gel.v21i3.3790>

**Abstract:** Advocating for a more extensive use of dictionaries in the history of grammaticography, this case study focuses on the earliest alphabetical dictionary explicitly tailored to the needs of non-native speakers of Flemish. The *Thesaurus Theutonicae linguae* (1573), which predates by a decade the earliest known grammars of Flemish, contains many metalinguistic labels and comments addressing aspects of Flemish grammar. Judging by the extent and the detail of metalinguistic information, this dictionary constitutes a remarkable step forward in Flemish grammar writing. Based on the analysis of metalinguistic labels and comments that accompany Flemish entries in this dictionary, this paper aims to reconstruct the authors' assumptions about the grammatical structure of Flemish and to identify the strategies adopted so as to come to terms with Flemish grammatical features. The analysis shows that, while inspired by the classical (Latin) framework, the authors' description of Flemish also benefits from the Renaissance interest in Greek and explores the partial parallelism between Flemish and French. The dictionary's foremost originality lies in the earliest known attempt to describe separable complex verbs, a Germanic grammatical feature that is alien to all three languages which served as grammatical models at the time (Latin, Greek, French).

**Keywords:** Flemish. Dutch. Lexicography. Grammar. Renaissance. History of linguistic ideas. History of language learning. Separable complex verbs.

---

## **Le *Thesaurus Theutonicae linguae* (1573) : dictionnaire comme grammaire**

**Résumé:** Partant du cas particulier qui est celui du plus ancien dictionnaire alphabétique conçu explicitement pour les apprenants du flamand langue étrangère, cet article plaide en faveur d'une meilleure prise en compte des dictionnaires dans l'histoire de la grammaticographie. Le *Thesaurus Theutonicae linguae* (1573), dont la publication est antérieure de 11 ans aux premières grammaires connues du flamand, contient de nombreuses étiquettes et commentaires métalinguistiques portant sur divers aspects de la grammaire flamande. L'étendue et le détail de ces informations métalinguistiques font de ce dictionnaire une étape importante dans la grammatisation du flamand. S'appuyant sur l'analyse des étiquettes et commentaires métalinguistiques qui accompagnent les entrées flamandes, cette contribution vise à reconstruire les hypothèses sous-jacentes des auteurs et à cerner les principales stratégies adoptées pour décrire les structures grammaticales du flamand. L'analyse montre que, tout en s'inspirant du cadre grammatical latin, la description

métalinguistique présentée dans ce dictionnaire bénéficie également de l'intérêt renaissant pour le grec et convoque le témoignage du français pour asseoir les règles de la grammaire du flamand. La description des verbes à particule séparable (une caractéristique grammaticale germanique inconnue du latin, du grec et du français), première de son genre, constitue sans doute l'un des traits les plus originaux de cet ouvrage.

**Mots-clés :** Flamand. Néerlandais. Lexicographie. Grammaire. Renaissance. Histoire des idées linguistiques. Histoire de l'apprentissage des langues. Verbes à particule séparable.

## **| Introduction**

Hausmann (1990, p. 219) pointed out some 35 years ago that dictionaries, in particular bilingual and multilingual ones, tend to be overlooked in the history of linguistic ideas<sup>2</sup>. The situation has greatly improved since, but it is safe to say that the analysis of lexicographical works usually revolves around vocabulary-related issues. By contrast, elements of grammatical description present in dictionaries are often dismissed as second-hand products, assumed to be derived from actual grammars. The case study on the *Thesaurus Theutonicae linguae* (1573) published in Antwerp in 1573 by the famous printer Christophe Plantin (ca. 1520–1589) serves as an illustration to support the view that dictionaries can also constitute valuable sources for the history of grammar writing and that, in the field of grammar, their contribution is not always merely derived from existing grammars.

A brief discussion of the genesis of this dictionary and an overview of its macro- and microstructure will be followed by a detailed account of metalinguistic labels and comments in the *Thesaurus Theutonicae linguae* (henceforth *TTL*) that address language aspects typically covered in grammars. Four of these aspects are discussed in this article: (i) graphemics and pronunciation; (ii) parts of speech; (iii) verb morphology and verbal morphosyntax; (iv) prefixed and separable complex verbs. The analysis of metalinguistic annotations dealing with these aspects allows us to reconstruct the underlying assumptions about the grammatical structure of Flemish<sup>3</sup> and to highlight the main strategies the

---

2 In standard reference works, it is not unusual for history of lexicography to be treated in a more concise way than grammars and treatises. Cf. Tavoni's overview of Western European Renaissance linguistics in which lexicography takes up only two pages (Tavoni, 1994-1998, p. 66-67). Similarly, in the second edition of the *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, the section History of Linguistics does not include a chapter on lexicography (Brown, 2006).

3 In this paper, I consistently use the term *Flemish* to refer to Germanic language varieties that were spoken in the Southern Low Countries (today's Flanders) during the 16th century as opposed to Dutch referring to

authors adopt to come to terms with a language that was not yet fully described in grammars in 1573.

## **| The genesis of the *TTL***

As with many European vernacular languages, the first dictionaries in which Flemish became the object of description date back to the Renaissance. However, before Pieter Weiland's *Nederduitsch taalkundig Woordenboek* (1799–1811), the lexicography of Flemish and/or Dutch was, like the *TTL*, almost exclusively bi- or multilingual (De Tollenaere, 1977; Van Sterkenburg, 2011)<sup>4</sup>. Although the *TTL* is far from being the first dictionary with a Flemish word list<sup>5</sup>, this trilingual Flemish–French–Latin dictionary can be considered a milestone in Flemish lexicography because it is the first dictionary to be designed from the outset as a tool to aid non-native learners of Flemish<sup>6</sup>. According to the original printing privilege delivered in 1564, the work targeted above all the young people from the Low Countries<sup>7</sup>, especially Antwerp, an important trade center in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, which was at the time also famous for its multilingualism. The preface of the dictionary (*TTL*, 1573, f. §2<sup>R</sup>–§4<sup>R</sup>) is dedicated to the members of the guild of St. Ambrose that brought together Antwerp schoolmasters, suggesting that the dictionary could be used by local language teachers in their schools<sup>8</sup>.

In this dedicatory preface, Christophe Plantin recalls that the idea of publishing a dictionary with Flemish entries came to him when he first established himself as a printer in Antwerp in the mid-1550s<sup>9</sup>. To master the language of his new hometown, Plantin, who was born in France and came to Antwerp in 1548, started writing down Flemish words and expressions. He soon abandoned these notes when he learned that Antwerp-based language teacher Gabriel Meurier

---

the varieties of the Northern Low Countries and to the modern-day standardized language spoken mainly in the Netherlands and in Flanders.

4 An exception should be made for early lexicographical works focusing on specific areas of Flemish and/or Dutch vocabulary like loanwords and technical terms, which can be seen as subcategories of difficult vocabulary; see Claes (1977, p. 207) and Van Sterkenburg (2011, p. 103–105). Such works are typically monolingual (cf. Auroux, 1994, p. 117).

5 For an overview of earlier 16th-century lexicographical works with Flemish and/or Dutch entries, see Claes (1970, p. 30–37; 1977, p. 205–210).

6 In earlier bi- and multilingual lexicographical works, Flemish entries were mainly used as a means to give access to other target languages (French or Latin).

7 In the original: “servir à la jeunesse par deçà”, quoted in Claes (1970, p. 164).

8 On the guild of St. Ambrose, see Bourland (1951).

9 On Plantin and his *Officina Plantiniana*, see Voet (1968–1972).

had already been compiling bilingual dictionaries with French and Dutch<sup>10</sup>. However, Meurier's dictionaries fell short of Plantin's expectations<sup>11</sup>. After waiting 20 years in vain, Plantin finally decided to take the initiative and to produce a large dictionary with a comprehensive Flemish word list himself. Accordingly, one of the main objectives of the *TTL* was to meet the needs of non-native speakers who wished to enhance their knowledge of Flemish. The title of the *TTL*, which is a direct allusion to the *Dictionarium seu Latinae linguae Thesaurus* first published in 1531 by Robert Estienne<sup>12</sup> (Claes, 1973, p. 114-115), reveals the ambitious scope of Plantin's initial lexicographical plan<sup>13</sup>.

The dictionary-making process proceeded in two stages. Too busy with his other publishing projects, Plantin entrusted the task of compiling an entry list to four people of his choice, each following a different strategy. The first one (presumably Plantin's proof-reader Cornelis Kiliaan) translated into Flemish all the words and some examples from Robert Estienne's Latin-to-French *Dictionarium Latinogallicum* (edition not specified, probably 1561) and then rearranged these translations according to the Flemish alphabetical order (Claes, 1970, p. 161). The second did the same with a French-to-Latin dictionary (most probably Robert Estienne's *Dictionnaire Françoislatin*, 1564) while the third (identified as André Madoets, another of Plantin's proof-readers) excerpted and translated into Latin entries from a dozen Flemish and German dictionaries that were available at Plantin's printing shop (Claes, 1970, p. 175-176). Finally, the fourth compiler received a *carte blanche* (Claes, 1970, p. 150; 1972, p. 9).

According to the preface, when the compilations<sup>14</sup> were finally submitted, Plantin and his collaborators decided to compare them so as to choose the best copy<sup>15</sup> to form the basis of the future dictionary. The contributors were then asked to add to this copy any missing lexical material, while Plantin simultaneously

---

10 In 1557, Plantin published three of Meurier's pioneering works: *Vocabulaire François-Flameng* (a French-to-Dutch alphabetical dictionary), *La Grammaire Française* (a French grammar) and *Colloques ou nouvelle invention de propos familiers* (a book of bilingual French-Flemish dialogues for language learners). On Meurier, see De Clercq (1997).

11 Meurier's dictionaries were mainly designed for Dutch-speaking learners of French.

12 On Robert Estienne and his innovative monolingual *Thesaurus*, see Armstrong (1954), Brandon (1967) and Furno (1999; 2019).

13 In 1562, Plantin had already published a multilingual *Dictionarium tetraglotton* (Latin-Greek-French-Flemish). One of the aims of this work was to provide the Low Countries with a lexicographical tool that could be used by both French- and Flemish-speaking young learners of Latin and Greek.

14 As Claes (1970, p. 151; 1972, p. 10) points out, the draft version of Plantin's preface to the *TTL* seems to imply that at least one of the four collaborators did not submit his work.

15 According to Claes (1970, p. 153), this turned out to be André Madoets' compilation.

began printing the dictionary (Claes, 1970, p. 153). In 1567, when, after some delay<sup>16</sup>, the first twelve folios came off the press, Plantin felt obliged to postpone the printing because of the time-consuming *Antwerp Polyglot* that was being completed in parallel<sup>17</sup> (Claes, 1970, p. 163). When the printing process was at last resumed in June 1572, Plantin decided to ignore any new amendments his collaborators might make from then, out of fear that the dictionary would otherwise never be delivered<sup>18</sup>.

In addition to providing insights into the dictionary-making process, Plantin's account shows that the final manuscript version of the dictionary dates back to 1567 at the least, if not earlier. Consequently, the *TTL* predates the first grammars of Dutch and/or Flemish (ca. 1568, 1584)<sup>19</sup>. It also precedes the first grammars of (High) German (1573, 1574)<sup>20</sup>, the grammaticography and lexicography of which had tangible influence on Flemish/Dutch linguistic ideas in the Early Modern period<sup>21</sup>. Therefore, the description of Flemish grammatical features found in the *TTL* can reasonably be considered the original work of Plantin's collaborators, until proven otherwise.

## **| Macrostructure and microstructure of the *TTL***

The *TTL* was published anonymously in early 1573<sup>22</sup>: the compilers' names are mentioned neither on the title page nor in Plantin's foreword. The dictionary

---

16 The frustratingly huge number of additions that came in continuously made Plantin reconsider his initial plan. He first delayed the printing process, hoping to create a better and more comprehensive copy, but soon realized that perfection was the enemy of progress and resumed printing after the amended "best copy" (*TTL*, 1573, f. §3R).

17 The *Biblia regia*, Plantin's masterpiece also known as the *Antwerp Polyglot*, is a Bible edition in eight volumes and five languages that was produced by the Plantin Press between 1568 and 1573 (IMHOF, 2017).

18 For a detailed analysis of Plantin's preface complemented by data from his books of account, see Claes (1970).

19 The first printed grammar of Dutch is *Twe-spraack vande Nederduitsche letterkunst* 'Dialogue on Dutch grammar' from 1584 (Dibbets, 1977, p. 26): published anonymously, this work is often attributed to Dirck Volckertsz. Coornhert (1522–1590) or to Hendrik Laurensz. Spieg(h)el (1549–1612). However, it was preceded by two earlier attempts. Around 1568, Coornhert himself drafted a Dutch grammar, of which no trace has so far been found. Another draft of a Flemish grammar dating from the same year (1568) has survived in handwritten form (autograph) and is now believed to be the work of Johan Radermacher (1538–1617), a Flemish merchant born in Aachen (Bostoen, 1985). This unfinished work was written in London and had only limited circulation among Flemish refugees with no proven impact on later grammaticography.

20 Laurentius Albertus' *Teutsch Grammatick oder Sprach-Kunst* (1573) and Albert Ölinger's *Grammatica seu Institutio Verae Germanicae linguae* (1574), both in Latin; see references in McLelland (2001).

21 On (mutual) lexicographical influences, see De Smet (1966), Claes (1992).

22 The colophon on f. &3V is dated January 29, 1573, but according to Plantin's accounting books, the printing was only completed by January 31, 1573; the preface is dated February 13, 1573 (*TTL*, 1573, f. §4R; CLAES, 1970, p. 163).

contains between 40,000 and 45,000 entries<sup>23</sup> spread across 557 pages without pagination (Claes, 1972, p. 7; Lindemann, 1982, p. 33). Of the many lexicographical sources brought to light by Claes (1970) and Lindemann (1982), two can be considered the most important<sup>24</sup>: Josua Maaler's *Die Teütsch spraach* (1561), which provides most Flemish entries (adapted from German) and their Latin equivalents (Claes, 1970, p. 208-214), and Robert Estienne's *Dictionnaire François-Latin* (1564), from which most French equivalents are borrowed (Lindemann, 1982).

The overall alphabetical macrostructure of the *TTL* is divided into 24 letter sections, within which lemmata made of individual words are sometimes followed by usage examples (sample phrases and sentences) as well as derivations and compositions. Together, they form word-family clusters that can occasionally deviate from strict alphabetical order; e.g., the word-family cluster *lijm* 'glue' from the letter run *L* in (1).

- (1)    **Lijm.** Colle forte, ou glu. *Colla, gluten, glutinum.*  
       Mondt lijm. Colle à bouche. *Ichthyocolla.*  
       Schrijnwerckers lijm. Colle à menuisier. *Fabrile glutinum.*  
       Goudtlijm / oft soudeersel. Colle à or. *Chrysocolla, santerna.*  
       Steenlijm. Colle à pierre, tyras. *Lithocolla, bitumen.*  
       Uogel lijm. Glu à prendre oiseaux &c. *Viscus.*  
       Lijmachtich. Gluant, glueux. *Glutinosus, viscosus.*  
       Lijmachtich werden. Deuenir gluant ou glueux. *Lentescere.*  
       Dat niet lijmachtich en is. Qui n'est point gluant. *Fluxus.*  
       Lijmen. Coller, gluer. *Glutinare, inuiscare, agglutinare.*  
       Lijmer. Colleur, glueur. *Glutinator.*  
       Lijminge. Collement, gluement. *Glutinamentum, glutinatio, coagmentatio.*  
       Lijmhalm / lijmroede. Vn gluon, ou gluot, festu glué. *Calamus viscatus, virga vel festuca viscata.*

As illustrated by (1), the basic microstructure comprises a Flemish entry, printed in a gothic bold-looking font, French equivalent(s) in roman font, and Latin equivalent(s) in italics; in some entries, cross-references are added<sup>25</sup>. The

23 On the different count methods yielding different results, see Lindemann (1994, p. 185-186).

24 Some of Claes' conclusions on this matter are called into question by Lindemann (1982; 1994, p. 290-292). An in-depth analysis based on a fine-grained count method and on more extensive samples of the dictionary would settle the issue.

25 In keeping with Plantin's account, the typographic design of the first eleven gatherings is slightly different from the rest of the dictionary. In gatherings A to L, homonymous Flemish entries are printed in different fonts: the first one in gothic, the other(s) in roman small capitals (Lindemann, 1982, p. 34).

Flemish lemma may be accompanied by synonyms, as in (1) s.v. *goudtlijm*, or by a variant (orthographic, phonetic, or derivational). All lexical units are typically treated as separate entries; usage examples within an entry are exceptional<sup>26</sup>. Several entries include metalinguistic labels or more elaborate notes that address a large range of linguistic issues such as: derivation, like in (2) and (3); (pseudo-)etymology as in (4); semantics as in (5); pragmatics (connotations) as in (6); and variation, as in (7), (8), (9): normative usage label s.v. *gebiedt*, indication of frequency s.v. *togen*, diatopic information s.v. *schocken*. Set expressions are often signalled by the label *adag.* meaning ‘adage; set expression’ (e.g., s.v. *den dach met manden wtdraghen*).

- (2) Boerken. Diminutif. *Rusticulus*.
- (3) experimenteren [...] *Et sic de aliis eiusdem generis, quia verba sunt Latina aut Gallica: vt Exerцер, infinit. Gallicum, adde en, fit infinitiuum Teutonicum Exerceren [...]*.
- (4) Gemelick / *quasi dicas Kemelick: Camelinus. nam cameli sunt morosi. [...]*
- (5) Lijf. Le corps, & communement se prend depuis la teste iusques an dessoubs du ventre. *Corpus, oris. caro. Et accipitur vulgariter Teutonicè pro trunco hominis. vide etiam Lichaem.*
- (6) Beslapen. Dormir avec aucun. *Condormire, in bonam partem: Byslapen / in malam accipitur.*
- (7) Gebiedt / *melius gebot. Vide gebot.*
- (8) Togen / *non est in vsu, sed Trecken.*
- (9) Schocken / oft dyen. Certaine bruslure de fiente de vache seiche, en Frise. *Fumus bouis siccus, ad ardendum in Frisia aptus.*

Finally, in keeping with Plantin’s initial objectives, the *TTL* provides a considerable amount of grammatical information serving the needs of foreign language learners of Flemish (Lindemann, 1982, p. 33–34). In the following sections I discuss metalinguistic indications that deal with four grammatical aspects: (i) Flemish graphemics and pronunciation; (ii) classification of parts of speech; (iii) verb morphology and verbal morphosyntax; (iv) separable complex verbs.

## **| Graphemics and pronunciation**

According to Claes (1970, p. 253), comparison with earlier didactic works on Flemish orthography and pronunciation<sup>27</sup> does not reveal any direct influence,

26 E.g., s.v. *gekrielt*, s.v. *geraden*. Some articles include subentries that are grouped under the headword based on (phonemic and/or semantic) similarity, e.g., *trouwen* ‘to get engaged or engage (in view of a marriage)’ is a subentry under its quasi-synonym *houwen* ‘to marry’; *onderdanich* ‘submissive’ is a subentry under *gehoorsaem* ‘obedient’, etc.

27 In particular, Joos Lambrecht’s *Néderlandsche spellinghe* (1550) and Gabriel Meurier’s *Breue Instruction contenant la maniere de bien prononcer et lire le François, Italien, Espagnol et Flamen* (1558).



suggesting that these phonetic and spelling annotations can be ascribed to the authors of the *TTL*. Pronunciation indications in the *TTL* are limited to a subordinate function of distinguishing between homographs. Pronunciation details are given only when they help clarify the phonemic value of an ambiguous Flemish grapheme or graphemic sequence. Scattered across the dictionary<sup>28</sup>, such information can be found either within individual entries (10) or, more frequently, as a notice positioned in the middle of a dictionary column and not attached to a specific entry (11). Pronunciation information may have a bearing either on a specific lexical unit, e.g., *besien* in (10), or on a class of lexical units that share the same feature. For instance, the notice in (11), taken from the letter *D*, applies to all entries starting with <doe> that follow the notice (i.e., *doe*, *doen*, *doeck*, *doel*, *doemen*, etc.).

- (10) Besie / oft besien, *trisyllab*. Grain, ou grains de tout menu fruict, comme cherises, raisins, groselles, meures, fraises, franchbuses, &c. *Acinus, acini, bacca, arum*.
- (11) Doddich. Tournoyant.  
De hoofden zijn doddich. Les testes tournent. *Vertunt capita*.  
Doe se lict, comme Dou en François.  
Doe / dho / doen. Alors, adonc. *Tunc, tum*.  
Doe ghy daert waert / doen was ick hier. Alors que vous estiez là, adonc estoy-ie icy. *Dum ibi eras, tunc hic eram: cùm esses illic, ego eram hic*.
- (12) Je diphtonge, se lict comme l simple en François, en sonnante vn peu le vocal E.

Pronunciation indications in the *TTL* can be divided into two types. Most seek to explain how a Flemish grapheme should be pronounced by comparing it with a French grapheme representing a similar sound. Comparison with Latin is made on one occasion to comment on the value of the letter *Z*. In (11), the Flemish <oe> is compared to French <ou>, as both represent what is considered by the authors to be the same sound [u]. The bulk of “loose” general notices, like that in (11), relate to <oe> ([u] or [ø]) and <eu>: the latter can be either one grapheme referring to [ø] or a sequence of two graphemes in which <u> has a consonant value (as in <deuoot> where <u> stands for [v]). Two notices deal with the homographic sequence <ie>, which can correspond either to a diphthong ([iə] as in *iemandt*), as in (12), or a CV sequence ([je:], [jə], and even [jø]). Similarly, syllabification issues are dealt with when the graphemic sequence lends itself to alternative interpretations (s.v. *besien*; s.v. *dies*, etc.). In (10), <besien> can be

---

28 The earliest attempt at a systematic description of the Flemish writing system is Joos Lambrecht's *Néderlandsche spellinghe* from 1550. It should be noted, however, that Lambrecht's innovative spelling treatise builds upon writing system varieties that were typical of the western part of today's Flanders, in particular areas where East Flemish and West Flemish dialects were spoken. By contrast, the writing system used in the *TTL* reflects phonetic features typical of Brabant: both Antwerp and Brussels, where André Madoets was originally from (Claes, 1970, p. 176), are located in Brabant.

understood as a two-syllable verb meaning ‘to regard, to consider’ or as a three-syllable plural noun ‘berries’. The italicized labels *trissyllab.* and *dissyllab.* added to the two homonymous entries help to remove this ambiguity. As illustrated by the examples above, the metalanguage used in indications dealing with the phonemic value of graphemes is French or Latin: general notices in the middle of a column are always formulated in French whereas labels indicating the number of syllables are in Latin.

Several other ad hoc comments address spelling problems that could affect users’ search strategies given the alphabetical arrangement of the word list. Indications given s.v. *fal* and s.v. *fijn* as well as two general notices comment on the relative usage frequency of letters *C ~ K*, *F ~ V*, *S ~ Z* and provide explanations as to why *C*, *S* and *F* are less common in the Flemish (Brabantian) writing system. A series of articles illustrating the use of the pronoun *gy* ends with a note on spelling variants (e.g., *ghe*, *ghi*, *ghy*) and the pronunciation of the word. Comments dealing with spelling issues are formulated in Latin and only occasionally translated into Flemish and/or French.

## **| Parts of speech in the *TTL***

Metalinguistic annotations are not systematic and overall, quite rare. Nevertheless, they allow us to reconstruct a system of parts of speech used in the *TTL*. In many cases, the annotations are added to distinguish between homoforms or homonyms. For instance, when the entry *maer* ‘only; not much’ is labelled as an adverb (LAT. *adverb.*), the label serves to distinguish between the adverbial restrictive use of *maer* and the conjunction *maer* ‘but’. The choice of the metalanguage depends on the form in which the information is provided. Labels are generally abbreviations of Latin terms and printed in italics, whereas longer metalinguistic notes may be formulated in one, two or all three languages of the *TTL*, as in (13).

- (13) weder / oft wederom. Derechef. *Iterum, rursus, denuò, ab integro, de integro, ex integro.*  
 Ende werdt by de Verba gestelt / hem scheydende in de coniugatie voer ofte na. Et se  
 compose avec les Verbes, se separant en sa coniugation, deuant & apres. *Componitur*  
*cum verbis Teutonicis, separatur in coniugatione.*

However, even when a note is available in Flemish, the authors do not always seek to introduce Flemish grammatical terminology. Instead, Latin terms are simply used inside Flemish sentences, as is the case in (13) with LAT. *verba* ‘verbs’ inserted into the Flemish part of the metalinguistic comment. Table 1 provides an overview of the terms used in the Flemish text of the *TTL* to refer to parts of speech.

**Table 1.** Names of parts of speech in the Flemish text of the *TTL*

Part of speech	Entry	Grammatical term in the Flemish text	Folio
adjective	s.v. <i>zeer wijslick</i>	<i>adiectiua</i>	f. &2 <sup>v</sup>
preposition	s.v. <i>by</i>	<i>voorstellinghe</i>	f. I2 <sup>R</sup>
verb	s.v. <i>achter</i>	<i>Verba ofte woorden</i>	f. A1 <sup>R</sup>
	s.v. <i>be</i>	<i>des woordts oft verborum</i>	f. D2 <sup>R</sup>
	s.v. <i>by</i>	<i>Verba</i>	f. I2 <sup>R</sup>
	s.v. <i>doerwrijuen</i>	<i>Verba</i>	f. M1 <sup>v</sup>
	s.v. <i>ge oft ghe</i>	<i>verba [...] oft woirden</i>	f. O3 <sup>v</sup> -O4 <sup>R</sup>
	s.v. <i>t'samen / oft te samen</i>	<i>verba oft woorden</i>	f. Hh1 <sup>v</sup>
	s.v. <i>weder / oft wederom</i>	<i>Verba</i>	f. Tt3 <sup>v</sup>

**Source:** Own elaboration

Nine parts of speech are explicitly mentioned in the *TTL*, all languages combined: article<sup>29</sup>, adjective<sup>30</sup>, adverb<sup>31</sup>, interjection<sup>32</sup>, noun<sup>33</sup>, particle<sup>34</sup>, preposition<sup>35</sup>, pronoun<sup>36</sup>, and verb<sup>37</sup> (including participles). Thus, while dispersed, these metalinguistic indications make for a list of parts of speech that is remarkably complete for the 16<sup>th</sup> century and includes classes that are marginal (*particle*) or alien to Latin grammar (*article*). Compared to other parts of speech, verbs are labelled more frequently. The 19 entries, in which verbs are explicitly mentioned,

29 Cf. s.v. *den* 'the', form of the definite article, with a comparison to the Greek article. It should be noticed that article is a heterogeneous class in the *TTL* as it also comprises derivational and inflectional affixes (prefixes *her-*, *ge-*, *ver-*); see below in the section on separable complex verbs.

30 Cf. s.v. *te* 'too', s.v. *zeer* 'very' (both lemmata are said to be often combined with adjectives), s.v. *zeer wijslijck* 'very reasonable'.

31 Cf. s.v. *lichemelick*, s.v. *lieflick / oft lieflicken*, s.v. *lieuer*, s.v. *maer / voor niet veel / oft weynich*.

32 Cf. s.v. *och* 'oh'.

33 Cf. s.v. *om / vmme / vm*, s.v. *onder / vnder*, s.v. *toe / oft tho*; see below on the separable complex verbs.

34 Cf. s.v. *aenghewaeyt* in which *aen* is labelled as a particle; see below on the separable complex verbs.

35 Cf. s.v. *by*, s.v. *weest by mi / oft zijt by mi*, s.v. *toe / oft tho*; see below on the separable complex verbs.

36 Cf. s.v. *de*, form of the definite article, s.v. *die*, demonstrative determiner or pronoun.

37 Cf. s.v. *achter*, s.v. *aen*, s.v. *aenghewaeyt*, s.v. *af*, s.v. *an*, s.v. *be*, s.v. *by*, s.v. *weest by mi / oft zijt by mi*, s.v. *dor / doer*, s.v. *doerwrijuen*, s.v. *ge oft ghe*, s.v. *in / inne*, s.v. *om / vmme / vm*, s.v. *onder / vnder*, s.v. *op*, s.v. *te*, s.v. *toe / oft tho*, s.v. *t'samen / oft te samen*, s.v. *weder / oft wederom*; see below on the separable complex verbs.

show the great attention the authors pay to this part of speech, to which I turn now<sup>38</sup>.

## | Verb morphology and verbal morphosyntax in the *TTL*

The *TTL* displays a large variety of verb entries. Verbal inflection and dependencies are illustrated by sample phrases and sentences presented as separate entries after the infinitive. Besides the infinitives, the word list includes past participles and a considerable number of inflected verb forms, including irregular (or strong) forms: 1p. sg. Pres., 2p. sg. Pres., 1&3p. sg. Simple Past, 1-2-3p. pl. Simple Past. Although, as we have seen, the macrostructure of the *TTL* is based on the principle of word families, the dictionary treats past participles as well as irregular and strong inflected forms as independent headwords, listed alphabetically. Thus, the letter run *G* contains numerous past participles of unprefixing verbs that begin with the inflectional prefix *ge-*, as in (14), while their infinitives are listed under the first letter of the stem, for instance, under the letter *D* for *gedanst* ‘danced’. Some of the forms are linked to their infinitives via a cross-reference, as in (15). Moreover, irregular and strong forms are often provided with a metalinguistic comment which specifies the grammatical status of the inflected form, as in (16), (17), and (18). Such indications are clearly aimed at foreign learners of Flemish who might struggle to link irregular or unusual forms to their infinitives<sup>39</sup>.

- (14) Gedanst. Dansé. *Tripudiatum, saltatum, a, um*.  
Gedauert. Branslé, brandillé. *Mobilitatum, vacillatum*.  
Gedauwet. Mouillé de la rosee, rosiné. *Roratum*.
- (15) Gedisputeert. Disputé. *Argumentatum, disputatum*. vide Disputeren.
- (16) Bekeuen. Tansé. *Obiurgatum, increpatum, præt. de Bekyuen*.
- (17) ick Sanck / oft ick sonck daer neder. l'enfonsoye, l'escouloye en bas. *Delabebat, abibam vel abiueram pessum. Præt. imperfect. de Sincken*.
- (18) ick Sage gerne. le verroy voutontiers. *Libenter viderem. Optat. de Sien*.

The metalinguistic terminology used in these entries enables the reconstruction of the main morphosyntactic verb categories in the *TTL*. The entry *moeten*

---

38 Next to parts of speech, the *TTL* has indications on morphosyntactic categories of some lemmata. For instance, s.v. *der* ‘the’, the Flemish lemma is identified as the genitive plural (of the definite article); s.v. *hanen* ‘cocks (birds)’, the lemma is identified as a plural form and accompanied by a cross-reference to the singular noun *haen*, etc.

39 On one occasion, the label *præterit.* is used to distinguish between the homofoms *begrauen* ‘buried’ and *begrauen* ‘to bury’ (*TTL*, 1573, f. D4V). One regular past participle (*getroetelt* ‘coddled’) is also provided with a label.

‘must; to have to’ is of particular interest in this respect, as it is followed by a conjugation table for this verb, reproduced here in (19)<sup>40</sup>.

- (19) Moeten. Falloir. *Debere*.  
*Indicat.* Ick moet. Il me fault. *Debeo*.  
 Ghy moet. Il te fault. *Debes, vel oportet te*.  
 Hy moet. Il luy fault. *Debet, vel oportet illum*.  
*Plur.* Wy moeten. Il nous fault. *Debemus, vel oportet vos*.  
 Sy moeten. Il leur fault. *Debent, oportet illos*.  
*Præteritum imperfect.*  
*Sing.* Ick moeste. Il me falloit. *Debebam, oportebat me, &c.*  
*Plur.* Wy moesten. Il nous falloit. *Debebamus, oportebat nos, &c.*  
*Præteritum perfect.*  
*Sing.* Ick heb moeten. Il m’a fallu. *Debui, oportuit me, &c.*  
*Plur.* Wy hebben moeten. Il nous a fallu. *Debuimus, oportuit nos, &c.*  
*Præterit. plusquàm perfectum.*  
*Sing.* Ick hadde moeten. Il m’eust fallu. *Debueram, vel debuissem, &c.*  
*Plur.* Wy hadden moeten. Il nous eust fallu. *Debueramus, vel debuissemus, &c.*  
*Futurum.*  
*Sing.* Ick sal moeten. Il me fauldra. *Debebo*.  
 Ghy sult moeten / oft du sulst moeten. Il te fauldra. *Debebis*.  
 Hy sal moeten. Il luy fauldra. *Debebit*.  
*Plur.* Wy sullen moeten. Il nous fauldra. *Debebimus, &c.*  
*Optatiuus modus.*  
*Sing.* Och oft ick moeste. Pleust à Dieu qu’il me falloit ou fallut. *Vtinam deberem, &c.*  
*Plur.* Och oft wy moesten. O s’il nous falloit. *Vtinam deberemus, &c.*  
*Coniunctiuus modus.*  
*Sing.* Als ick soude moeten. Quand il me fauldroit. *Cùm deberem, &c.*  
*Plur.* Als wy soudén moeten. Quand il nous fauldroit. *Cùm deberemus, &c.*

This table shows that the authors distinguish between three *moods*: the indicative (*Indicat.*), the optative (*Optatiuus modus*) and the conjunctive (*Coniunctiuus modus*)<sup>41</sup>. The indicative mood includes five tenses. The present tense is never labelled and is therefore evidently considered to be the unmarked set of forms. The other four tenses are explicitly named as *Præteritum imperfect.* (Simple Past as in *Ick moeste* ‘I had to’), *Præteritum perfect.* (Present Perfect with

40 It should be noted that *moeten* and *sal/sullen* are the only verbs with conjugation tables in the TTL. On *sal/sullen*, see below. In addition to being a Preterite-Present verb (similar to English *must*), *moeten* is also one of the verbs that exhibit an unusual pattern in perfect tenses: the so-called infinitivus pro participio construction; see Van der Horst (2008, p. 441, 914).

41 The conjunctive mood forms are problematic when put in correspondence with Latin: while the Flemish *Als ick soude moeten* ‘If I had had to’, etc. has a hypothetical value, the Latin *Cùm deberem* cannot be interpreted in the same way. Furthermore, while Latin has both Present and Past conjunctive, the TTL’s table includes only past tense. The Present conjunctive is left out likely because its Flemish equivalent with the verb *moeten* is infrequent. The same explanation goes for the imperative mood, also lacking in this table.

past tense meaning as in *ick heb moeten* ‘I have had to’), *Præterit. plusquàm perfectum* (Past Perfect as in *ick hadde moeten* ‘I had had to’)<sup>42</sup> and *Futurum* (Future as in *ick sal moeten* ‘I will have to’)<sup>43</sup>. Further, singular and plural forms are signalled by the abbreviations *Sing.* or *Singul.* and *Plur.* In addition to this list of categories, the verb person is referred to in connection with the verb *beteekenen* ‘to mean; to signify’ which is said to be used in Flemish only in the third person<sup>44</sup> (TTL, 1573, f. F4<sup>v</sup>).

The future tense formation is further detailed s.v. *sal / sullen* and s.v. *sullen / oft solen* (TTL, 1573, f. x2<sup>r</sup>, Ee4<sup>v</sup>). The authors equate the Latin and French synthetic future tense forms with the Flemish periphrastic construction, formed using the present tense of the auxiliary verb *sullen* followed by the infinitive of the lexical verb<sup>45</sup>. The two entries related to the verb *sullen* are followed by a series of entries that serve as usage examples for singular and/or plural future forms involving a variety of lexical infinitives. The brief explanation on the formation of future tense displays two interesting features. First, in both entries *sullen* is described as a *word* (FR. *mot*, *dictions*, LAT. *dictiones*): although a short conjugation table is provided s.v. *sal / sullen*, the authors do not recognize a verb in this defective paradigm, most likely due to its auxiliary function. In this respect, the treatment of *sullen* differs from that of the modal verb *moeten*. Secondly, s.v. *sal / sullen* the explanation mentions an alternative periphrastic construction with the verb *werden* which betrays the influence of High German sources<sup>46</sup>. The authors draw attention to this geographical broadening by referring to *Germani* and *dictiones Germanicæ* instead of *dictiones Teutonicæ*, which they use elsewhere to specifically denote Flemish words (20).

- (20) *Sal / sullen. Mots ou dictions qui seruent & se mettent tousiours au temps futur de tous Verbes en bas & en hault Alman, asçauoir avec l’infinitif, comme Gaen / staen / slapen / waken / maken. & generalmente à tous les autres Verbes. Sal / sullen / wirdt / werden / Dictiones Germanicæ quæ præponitur verbis infinitiuis ad formandum futurum tempus apud Germanos. [...]*

42 TTL’s forms of Present Perfect and Past Perfect display the *infinitivum pro participium* construction. This construction is normally used when *moeten* is head to another infinitive, but this is not the case in the TTL’s conjugation table.

43 This distinction between five tenses is in line with the analysis provided in classical grammars, e.g., in Thrax, Donatus, or Priscian (Dibbets, 1995, p. 260).

44 In the original: “ick Beteeckene *non dicitur Teutonicè nisi in tertia persona*”.

45 The periphrastic construction with *gaen* ‘to go’ is not identified as a form of future tense and the TTL does not provide sample phrases in which *gaen* + *infinitive* would clearly have future tense value.

46 The verb *werden* (meaning ‘to become’ in Flemish, cf. modern Dutch *worden*) is used to form future tense in German, but never in Dutch.

The formation of past participles and past tenses is discussed at length in the entry *ge oft ghe* which runs through an entire dictionary column and includes three metalinguistic passages in Flemish, French and Latin that are not exactly identical (TTL, 1573, f. O3<sup>V</sup>-O4<sup>R</sup>). The lemma *ge*, corresponding to the modern Dutch inflectional prefix used to form past participles from unprefixated verbs, is described as an *article* (FL. *artijckel oft lidt*, FR. *article*, LAT. *articulus*) placed before Flemish verbs to form *verba præterita*, also called *participia*, which means past participles (21).

- (21) Ge oft ghe / is een artijckel oft lidt datmen voor de Duytsche *verba præterita* oft *participia* / ofte woorden settet beteeckenende voorleden tijt [...]. Ghe ou ghe, est vn article qu'on met deuant les verbes Allemans qui signifient le temps passé [...]. Ge / vel / ghe / *articulus est qui præponitur verbis Teutonicis in tempore præterito* [...].

Further, the entry introduces a distinction between active and passive voice. The past participles or *præterita* are said to be all passive, which in reality is not always correct, as shown below. The authors also provide details on how to form active and passive past tense forms. In all three parts of the entry (Flemish, French and Latin), the examples of past tense forms in Flemish are provided with French translations, bringing to light the parallelism between the two languages. Since Latin lacks analytical active past tense forms, French serves as a model to justify the analysis of the Flemish forms, cf. this passage on the auxiliary of the active past tense: “in this case *Ick heb* is used, the same way as in French is used *J'ay*” (TTL, 1573, f. O4<sup>R</sup>, my translation from Flemish<sup>47</sup>). The remainder of the metalinguistic note deals in detail with past participles of separable complex verbs (see next section).

The treatment of past tense active paradigms is incomplete in this explanatory note as only third-person singular examples are given. Further, the active paradigm is limited to the *præteritum perfectum*, whereas *plusquàm perfectum* is omitted. The so-called passive forms raise several difficulties. First, the list of examples includes cases in which no passive interpretation is possible as in *Hy is gegaen* ‘He went’ or ‘He has left’ (literally ‘He is gone’). Evidently, any verb form constructed with the auxiliary verb *zijn* ‘to be’ is seen as passive regardless of its meaning. Secondly, the set of examples with their French and Latin translations creates confusion as to the tense to which passive forms belong. At the outset of the note, all verb forms constructed with *præterita*, i.e., past participles, are said to belong to the past tense. The examples of passive voice that are given in the Flemish and French parts of the note support this

---

47 In the original: “so stelt men daer by / Ick heb / gelijk oock int Fransois gestelt wert l'ay”.



point of view, insofar as they can be interpreted as resultative and on that basis considered as belonging to past tense, cf. *Het is gedaen* ‘It is done’, *Het is gescreuen* ‘It is written’. However, in the Latin part of the entry, other examples with the lexical verb *achten* ‘to esteem; to appreciate’ are added in which the passive construction is obviously stative and cannot be seen as a past tense form, cf. *Ick ben geacht* ‘I am appreciated/admired’. Finally, the note omits to mention the progressive passive forms requiring the same past participle, e.g., modern Dutch *Het wordt gelezen* ‘It is being read’ and *Het werd gelezen* ‘It was being read’. An overview of Flemish mode, tense and voice categories in the *TTL* can be seen in Table 2<sup>48</sup>.

**Table 2.** Verb modes, tenses and voices in the *TTL*

Mode	Tense	Voice	Example from the <i>TTL</i>	Folio
LAT. <i>Indicat.</i>	—	—	<i>Ick moet.</i>	f. h3R
	LAT. <i>Præteritum imperfect.</i>	—	<i>Ick moeste. Wy lasen. ick Sanck / oft ick sonck daer neder. Sy songen.</i>	f. h3R f. c3V f. x2V f. x2V
	LAT. <i>Præteritum perfect.</i>	FL. <i>doende wijse</i> LAT. <i>actium</i>	<i>Ick heb moeten. Ick heb gedaen. Ick heb gescreuen.</i>	f. h3 <sup>R</sup> f. O4 <sup>V</sup> f. O4 <sup>V</sup>
		<i>passium</i>	<i>Het is gedaen. Het is gescreuen. Hy is gegaen. Ick ben geacht.</i>	f. O4 <sup>V</sup> f. O4 <sup>V</sup> f. O4 <sup>V</sup> f. O4 <sup>V</sup>
	LAT. <i>Præterit. plusquàm perfectum</i>	—	<i>Ick hadde moeten.</i>	f. h3 <sup>R</sup>
	LAT. <i>Futurum</i>	—	<i>Ick sal moeten. Ick sal gaen. Sy sullen kommen.</i>	f. h3 <sup>R</sup> f. x2 <sup>R</sup> f. Ee4 <sup>V</sup>
LAT. <i>Optatiuus modus</i>	—	—	<i>Och oft ick moeste. ick Sage gerne.</i>	f. h3 <sup>R</sup> f. x2 <sup>R</sup>

48 A dash in the mode and tense columns indicates that the *TTL* provides no specific term to the category in question. In the voice column, a dash indicates that no term is given in combination with the respective tense and/or mode. The categories of person and number receive a standard treatment in the *TTL*, and so are not included in Table 2.



LAT. <i>Coniunctiuus modus</i>	—	—	<i>Als ick soude moeten.</i>	f. h3 <sup>R</sup>
—	FR. <i>infinitif</i> LAT. <i>verbi infinitui, infinituum</i>	—	<i>Gaen / staen / slapen / waken / maken</i>	f. x2 <sup>R</sup>
—	FR. <i>preterits</i> LAT. <i>verba præterita, præterita, participium, participia</i>	—	<i>Afgeworpen. Verloren.</i>	f. B3 <sup>R</sup> f. Mm2 <sup>V</sup>

**Source:** Own elaboration

Although the explanations are sometimes given in three languages (cf. s.v. *ge oft ghe*), the terminology shows a direct influence of Latin grammar. Synthetic and analytical Flemish verb forms are distributed, with variable success, between pre-existing inflectional and semantic (cf. optative) categories of traditional Latin grammar: as shown in Table 2, most metalinguistic terms are given in Latin. However, *TTL*'s terminology displays some original features in connection with the term *præteritum*. Whereas in the conjugation table of *moeten*, *præteritum* is used as a generic term which comprises three past tenses (*imperfect.*, *perfect.*, *plusquàm perfectum*), in the remainder of the *TTL* the term *præterita* refers not to a tense, but rather only to the past participle forms. Overall, past participles receive greater attention and are more often labelled in this dictionary than any other verb form<sup>49</sup>. The close attention paid to past participles must be seen in correlation with the difficulties they cause to foreign language learners because, as will become clear in the next section, their morphological formation depends on the verb's derivational type: unprefixing, prefixing, or complex separable.

## Prefixing and separable complex verbs in the *TTL*

*Separable complex verbs* (SCVs) are a combination of a verb and a non-verbal element that form together a semantic unit and should be distinguished from prepositional verbs (Booij, 2001, p. 59; Dehé, 2015, p. 611). Although SCVs exist in all present-day Germanic languages, this phenomenon goes by various names; in English linguistics, it is better known as *phrasal verb* (Thim, 2012, p. 3). Examples of SCVs in Dutch are *opgeven* 'to give up', *schoonmaken* 'to clean', or *wegsturen* 'send away'. In current studies, the non-verbal element is

49 There are 34 lemmata labelled as *præterita* against 6 *præterita imperfecta* and 1 *optativum*.

called *particle* or *preverb*. The particle may be homonymous with a preposition (cf. *op* ‘on, upon’ in *opgeven*), an adjective (cf. *schoon* ‘clean’ in *schoonmaken*), an adverb (cf. *weg* ‘away’ in *wegsturen*), a noun and even a lexicalized phrase (Booij, 2001, p. 59). Unlike prefixes and prepositions, particles are prosodically strong, i.e., they always receive main stress (Stiebels; Wunderlich, 1994, p. 921; Dehé, 2015, p. 612).

As their name suggests, SCVs can separate in syntax depending on the verb’s form (tense, participle, infinitive, etc.) and the clause type (main or subordinate, in connection with the verb position). The particle may either precede or follow the verb and may display either joined or split order with its verb. The following examples illustrate some of the possibilities: in (22), the verb *opgeven* ‘to give up’ shows a split order with a postverbal particle; in (23), the past participle of the same verb shows a split order with a preverbal particle; in (24), the simple past tense form used in a subordinate clause displays a joined order<sup>50</sup>.

(22) Hij gaf op. *He gave Part-up.* ‘He gave up.’

(23) opgegeven *Part-op GE given* ‘given up’

(24) [...] dat hij het plan opgeeft. [...] *that he the plan Part-up abandons.* ‘that he abandons the plan.’

In the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the peculiar morphosyntactic behaviour of SCVs gave rise to a debate on their syntactic nature. The major theoretical challenge arises from the fact that SCVs display “phrasal properties in the syntax but behave as morphological units at the same time” (Dehé, 2015, p. 612). Within this debate, terminological issues have an important place (cf. Thim, 2012, p. 49). In particular, the traditional term *separable prefix* with reference to particles (or preverbs) has been criticised because it leads to a contradictory analysis whereby a bound morpheme can be moved according to syntactic rules (cf. Booij, 2002, p. 206). It appears, however, that the reasons and the history of this traditional term have not yet been studied in detail<sup>51</sup>.

The authors of the *TTL* acknowledge the semantic unity of separable verbs since many of them are listed in the macrostructure as independent headwords, e.g., *afspoelen* ‘to rinse; to wash down’, *bystaen* ‘to help; to assist’, *wederkeeren* ‘to come back; to return’, etc. The authors are fully aware of the peculiar

50 For a general overview, see Dehé (2015, p. 613–617).

51 For German, Scaglione (1981) constitutes an important contribution to the history of SCVs and their treatment in (High) German grammaticography.

syntactic behaviour of SCVs, and they even state that there are no comparable constructions in Latin.

*By* [...] is a preposition put before Flemish verbs as in *Bystaen* ‘to stay close’, etc. and it splits from the verb when conjugated (with a few exceptions) as in *Ick sta by* ‘I stay close to’, *Ick ben by* ‘I am at’, etc. but this does not occur in Latin (TTL, 1573, f. O4<sup>R</sup>, my translation from Latin<sup>52</sup>).

Perhaps aware of the difficulties that Flemish SCVs raise for foreign language learners, the authors offer ad hoc explanations on some prefixed and separable complex verbs. Since the phenomenon does not exist in Latin, this subgroup of metalinguistic notes constitutes the most original grammatical contribution of the *TTL*.

SCVs are designated with the Latin term *verba composita* ‘compound verbs’ (FR. *composition*)<sup>53</sup>, since they are made up of two independent words<sup>54</sup>. For instance, in *bystaen* the verbal element *staen* ‘to stand’ is a word by itself and can be used independently. The same goes for *by*, which can be used as a preposition or an adverb (cf. ENG. *by*). Therefore, *bystaen* is understood as a combination of two words, not of two morphological bases.

There are 18 metalinguistic notes concerned with the phenomenon of separability. Only one of those notes is appended to a verb entry (past participle *aenghewaeyt*). The other 17 headwords are: the inflectional affix *ge-*, 3 derivational prefixes (*be-*, *her-*, *ver-*), and 13 syntactically and morphologically ambiguous entries<sup>55</sup> (*achter*, *aen*, *af*, *by*, *dor*, *in*, *om*, *onder*, *op*, *toe*, *t’samen*, *voer*, *weder*). From a modern perspective all 13 ambiguous lemmata may function as separable particles. The *TTL*’s translation of these ambiguous entries into French and Latin shows that entries *achter*, *aen*, *dor*, *in*, *om*, *onder*, *op*, *toe*, *voer* are understood by the

---

52 In the original: “By, prope, iuxta, penes, apud, secus, vel ad. Estque præpositio quae præponitur Verbis Teutonicis: vt, Bystaen. Adstare, &c. & separatur in sua conjugatione, paucis exceptis: vt, Ick sta by. Sto ad. Ick ben by. Sum ad, &c. sed hoc apud Latinos non fit”.

53 E.g., s.v. *by*, s.v. *ge oft ghe*, etc.

54 On this viewpoint, see a brief discussion in Dibbets (1981, p. XLIII).

55 For instance, *achter* can be a preposition (*achter het huis* ‘behind the house’), an adverb (*Zij is achter in de tuin* ‘She is in the back of the garden’), a derivational prefix with main stress on the verbal base (*Zo achterhaal je wat de doelgroep verwacht* ‘In this way you can find out what are the expectations of the target group’) and a separable particle with the main stress on the particle (*Hij houdt belangrijke informatie achter* ‘He holds back important information’).

authors as prepositions and adverbs at the same time<sup>56</sup>; *af* is only a preposition; *t'samen* and *weder* are adverbs.

The authors make a clear terminological distinction between the separable elements and the non-separable affixes. Derivational prefixes and the inflectional affix *ge-*, are normally referred to as *articles*<sup>57</sup>; only the prefix *be-* is designated by the term *syllable*<sup>58</sup>. The authors postulate that *articles*, i.e., affixes, cannot be separated from the verb when it is conjugated. The separable non-verbal element is referred to as a *particle*<sup>59</sup>, or, more frequently, as a *preposition*<sup>60</sup>. Additionally, the Flemish term *bysettinghe* (literally: 'adposition') is used as a synonym of LAT. *compositum* (employed only in plural) and illustrated by separable particles *achter*, *aen*, *by*, *dor*, *in*<sup>61</sup>. In all 13 ambiguous entries, the authors indicate that this element is separated from the verb when the verb is conjugated. The separability therefore depends on the verb form, not on the type of clause the verb is used in, and is considered as a property of the particle, which moves around the verb. For example, the entry *by* lists the following verbal forms that can trigger particle movement: 1) *præteritum tempus*, i.e., Simple Past tense; 2) *infinitivus*; 3) *participium*, i.e., past participle; 4) *nomen verbale*, verbal noun, probably meaning a nominalized infinitive. Under *weder*, the authors mention that there are two possible positions for the separable element: before and after the verb. In the entries *aenghewaeyt* and *ge oft ghe*, they also discuss the formation of past participles from separable verbs. The authors formulate the rule according to which the inflectional affix *ge-* inserts itself in past participles between the particle and the verb (cf. s.v. *aenghewaeyt*). However, no explicit general rule is given as to how the particle position is determined by the verb form. Two entries (*achter*, *by*) add that the separation does not apply with all verbs and that there are a few exceptions to the rule: sometimes the particle remains adjacent, regardless of the verb form.

---

56 For example, *achter* is translated into French as "derriere" and into Latin as "post, retro". All three lexical units (*derriere*, *post*, *retro*) can serve both as a preposition and as an adverb. Compare examples given in the TTL: *qui est derriere* '(one) that is behind' (adverb) and *derriere le temple* 'behind the temple' (preposition).

57 FL. *artijckel*, FR. *article*, LAT. *articulus*; e.g., s.v. *ge oft ghe*, s.v. *her*, s.v. *ver*; see also footnote 30.

58 FL. *syllabe*, FR. *syllabe*, LAT. *syllaba*; cf. s.v. *be*.

59 FR. *particule*, LAT. *particula(m)*; cf. s.v. *aenghewaeyt*.

60 FL. *voorstellinghe*, FR. *preposition*, LAT. *præpositio*; cf. s.v. *by*, s.v. *weest by mi / oft zijt by mi*, s.v. *toe / oft tho*.

61 Cf. s.v. *ge oft ghe*.

The *TTL* provides rich illustrative material that accompanies this metalinguistic description of the SCVs. Seven metalinguistic notes<sup>62</sup> include examples, six of which contrast the infinitive with the 1p. sg. present tense, as in this example:

*Af*. Below something. [...] And it forms compositions with the Flemish verbs, separating itself from the verb in the conjugation: [...] like, *Afdoen* / *Ick doe af*. ‘to put down / I put down’. See below. (*TTL*, 1573, f. B2<sup>R</sup>, my translation<sup>63</sup>).

Another verb form that is frequently cited to reveal the separability of the particle is the past participle. Finally, sample phrases and sentences implicitly convey important information of the syntactic pattern of a separable verb, often also whether it is intransitive or transitive and whether it takes specific prepositions. For instance, when *aensteken* ‘to put; to fix’ is illustrated by the sentence *Steeckt dijnen rock aen* ‘Put on your coat’, the user can observe that the verb *aensteken* has a direct transitive construction (25).

- (25) *Aensteken*. ‘to put, to fix’  
Ick steke an. ‘I put or fix.’  
Vier aensteken. ‘to light the fire; to start the fire’  
Een huys aensteken. ‘to set the house on fire’  
Eenen rinck aen den vingher steken. ‘to put a ring on the finger’  
Steeckt dijnen rock aen. ‘Put on your coat.’  
Dat ghebraet aensteken. ‘to spit roast; to put roast on a spit’

However, the lists of sample phrases and sentences often include other phenomena. For instance, the entry cluster beginning with *aensteken* comprises examples which illustrate the SCV *aensteken*, but also one example that illustrates the prepositional verb *steken aen* + NP. In the sample phrase *eenen rinck aen den vingher steken*, *aen* is not a separable particle, but a preposition ‘on’ that governs the noun group *den vingher* ‘the finger’. Despite the difference in construction, the authors of the *TTL* consider that both examples illustrate the lemma *aensteken*. Consequently, their understanding of the phenomenon does not take into account the different syntactic functions that *aen* has in these examples, neither does it pay attention to prosodic differences: while the separable particle receives the main stress, this is not the case with the preposition *aen*. Simultaneous treatment of SCVs and prepositional verbs in

---

62 See *s.v. achter*, *s.v. aen*, *s.v. af*, *s.v. by*, *s.v. ge oft ghe*, *s.v. om*, *s.v. op*.

63 In the original: “Af. Jus de quelque chose. De. Et se compose avec les Verbes de bas Alman, se separant en la conjugaison. *Et componitur cum Verbis Teutonicis, et separatur in conjugatione: vt, Afdoen / Ick doe af. Je mets jus. Depono. Vide infra.*”

one and the same cluster is common in the *TTL*. In extreme cases, a SCV headentry may have as its sole illustration examples with look-alike prepositional constructions. For instance, the SCV *byleven* is only illustrated by *Ick leve by de ghenade Godes* ‘I live by God’s mercy’, *Hi leeft by den broode* ‘He lives by/on bread’. Both sentences display the verb *leven* with its preposition *by* ‘to live by/on smth’. It appears then that the authors make no clear distinction between separable particles and the look-alike prepositions, the two being considered as manifestations of one and the same linguistic unit.

A possible clue to this conception lies in the term of *preposition*, which is applied to the separable particles in the *TTL*. In Latin grammar, prepositions are seen as a composite class including both prepositions as free morphemes and (verb) prefixes as bound morphemes<sup>64</sup>. The description of separable particles delivered by the authors of the *TTL* can be considered consistent within the limits of this traditional Latin framework. Within this conception, the separable particle and the genuine preposition form one morphosyntactic category whose most prominent feature is to be alternatively joined and split.

Although incomplete, the *TTL*’s description of verbal morphology and morphosyntax, in particular of SCVs, appears to be one of the earliest attempts to formulate the rules that guide the syntactic behaviour of verb particles. In any case, the earlier Flemish and German dictionaries identified by Claes (1970) as *TTL*’s sources do not include any metalinguistic comments of the sort<sup>65</sup>. The innovative aspect of the work did not go unnoticed with contemporary language teachers and enthusiasts.

## **Reception**

As can be gathered from the preface to *The Honourable Reputation of a Souldier* (1586), a bilingual English–Dutch reading book for English language learners, the *TTL* was considered by some contemporaries as a landmark in vernacular lexicography.

---

64 According to Donatus, there are three types of *praepositiones*: those that can be either split or joined, those that are always joined and those that are always split (Padley, 1976, p. 50, 129; Dibbets, 1985, p. 479). Priscian, on the other hand, makes a distinction between *praepositiones* that are always joined (*adpositio*) and those that can be split (*compositio*); he then adds that with verbs, *praepositiones* occur only in *compositio* (Baratin *et al.*, 2005, p. 16; Baratin, 2010, p. 187, 189). Whereas *TTL*’s use of *compositio* in regard to SCVs is in line with Priscian’s analysis, the use of *bysettinghe*, which seems to be a calque from LAT. *adpositio*, is not compatible with Priscian’s definition.

65 For German, I have checked the following works and editions: Petrus Dasypodius’ *Dictionarium Germanicolatinum* (1537, 1554), Johannes Frisius’ *Novum dictionariolum puerorum* (1556, 1568), and Josua Maaler’s *Die Teütsch spraach* (1561). For Flemish, see Zimont (2022).

Because certainly, if someone wanted to undertake the task of providing us with *A Treasure of The English Tongue*, as Ch. Plantin did for the Low Dutch language, and they would add to it an English and Dutch version of the small book called *De recta & emendata Anglicæ linguæ pronuntiacione*, which was written some time ago in England by the scholar and knight Sir Thomas Smith, they would truly deserve to be crowned [for this feat] in the hearts of all [language] enthusiasts from the bottom of their hearts [...] (Whetstone; Walraven, 1586, p. 12, my translation<sup>66</sup>).

In this passage, the editor (and translator of the book) Jacob Walraven<sup>67</sup> deplores the lack of an English dictionary that would be comparable to Plantin's *TTL*<sup>68</sup> and makes an appeal to the scholarly public in the hope that someone might undertake the challenge. The title suggested by Walraven (*Een Schat der Engelscher spraken*) is a direct allusion to the Flemish title of the *TTL* (*Schat der Neder-duytscher spraken*).

Although the *TTL* never had a second edition<sup>69</sup>, it exerted significant influence on later lexicography with Flemish. In particular, the 1576 Flemish–French dictionary compiled by Mat(t)hias Sasbout (*fl.* 1572–1586) draws heavily on the *TTL* (Riemens, 1921, p. 17-18; CLAES, 2000, p. 230)<sup>70</sup>. Sasbout's dictionary served as a main source for the Flemish–French dictionary by Elcie Edouard Leon Mellema (1544 – ca. 1591/1596) which, in turn, passed *TTL*'s word list on to the first Dutch–English dictionary of Henry Hexham (Osselton, 1969)<sup>71</sup>. An abridged version of the *TTL*, in which the initial order of the languages was inverted to Flemish–Latin–French, came out in Franeker in 1595 under the

---

66 In the original: “Want zekerlick, zo ons yemant wilde beneerstigen, *Een Schat der Engelscher spraken*, even als Ch. Plantijn int Nederduytsch ons heeft verschaft: oock mede int Engelsch ende Nederduytsch ons wilden t'zamen voegen het Boexken, *de recta & emendata Anglicæ linguæ pronuntiacione*, eertijts by den geleerden Heere ende Ridder Syr Thomas Smith in Engelandt gemaect: die waren waerlix waerdich, om van alle Liefhebberen int hert hertelic gecroont te zijn [...]”.

67 On Walraven and his didactic bilingual edition of Whetstone's book, see Loonen (1990, p. 25-26, 66-67, 94-95).

68 On the state of English lexicography at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, see Considine (2022).

69 As a dictionary of Flemish, the *TTL* was soon superseded by a *Dictionarium Teutonico-Latinum* (1574) which was the work of Plantin's corrector Cornelis Kiliaan. Despite its smaller word list (only ca. 12,000 entries), Kiliaan's Flemish-to-Latin dictionary had great success and was followed by two enlarged and revised editions (1588 and 1599) that surpassed by far the *TTL* in both quantitative and qualitative respects; see Claes (1970, 1977), Van Sterkenburg (2011) and references there.

70 About 70% of Sasbout's articles are borrowed from the *TTL* (Zimont, 2022, p. 129).

71 Lindemann (1982, p. 39) also identified influence of the *TTL* on an anonymous Flemish–French dictionary published by Jan (I) van Waesberghe in 1577.



title *Trium Linguarum Dictionarium* (Lindemann, 1994, p. 294-295)<sup>72</sup>. Although *TTL*'s grammatical annotations are only rarely reproduced in these dictionaries, their entry lists invariably adopt the same treatment of SCVs and look-alike prepositional verbs as in the *TTL*.

*TTL*'s impact on Flemish and/or Dutch grammaticography appears to be more limited. In the case of SCVs, 16<sup>th</sup>- and 17<sup>th</sup>-century grammars adopt an analysis that is very close to that found in the *TTL*: the anonymous author(s) of *Twe-spraak* (1584), Christiaen Van Heule (1625), Allardus Kók (1649), Petrus Leupenius (1653), and Philippe la Grue (1688) regard the separable particle as a peculiar subtype of *prepositions*. On a terminological level, however, no tangible traces of *TTL*'s influence have yet been identified. On the contrary, *TTL*'s sparse Flemish terminology displays several original features that are not found in later grammatical writings. For instance, the term *bysettinghe* used in the *TTL* to refer to the separable particle, appears in Van Heule's grammar (1625), but with a different meaning: 'paragoge' (Ruijsendaal, 1989, p. 10; cf. Dibbets, 1995, p. 307-316). In other instances, the *TTL* provides us with attestations of grammatical terms much earlier than those found in grammars, e.g., *artijckel* 'article', whose first attestation Ruijsendaal (1989) dates to 1638. Finally, the terms *doende wijze* 'active voice' and *voorstellinghe* 'preposition', absent from reference works on the history of Dutch grammatical terminology (Ruijsendaal, 1989, p. 9, 245-248; cf. Dibbets, 1995, p. 240-245), constitute new valuable additions to this field of study.

## **Conclusion**

The *TTL*, designed as a learner's dictionary for non-native speakers of Flemish, provides various types of grammatical information on Flemish that are absent from earlier dictionaries of Dutch. Scattered across the dictionary's columns and entries, metalinguistic labels and notes allow a reconstruction of the grammatical framework within which the *TTL*'s authors undertook their description of Flemish. Despite the atomized presentation of the matter, the inventory of grammatical categories, classes, and rules in the *TTL* is sufficiently elaborate to be comparable with the contents of the earliest grammars of Flemish and/or Dutch. While the strategy adopted by the *TTL*'s authors is overall typical for the 16<sup>th</sup> century and consists in adapting Latin or Greek (cf. on articles) grammatical concepts to a vernacular language, the description of

---

<sup>72</sup> *Trium Linguarum Dictionarium Teutonicæ, Latinæ, Gallicæ. Omnibus aliis, hujus formæ Dictionariis multò locupletius, & majori quàm hactenus diligentia castigatum & correctum.* Franekeræ: apud Ægidium Radæum Ordinum Frisiæ typographum, 1595. It should be noted that the editor and compiler Gilles van den Rade, *alias* Ægidius Radæus (ca. 1545 – ca. 1615) does not explicitly acknowledge the *TTL* as his source.



Flemish in this work is also inspired and supported by the existence of similar forms and constructions in French (especially in phonetics, graphemics, and the analysis of analytical past tense forms). Further, in the case of SCVs, an area which does not have parallels in French, Latin or Greek, the *TTL*'s authors develop unprecedented insights. Although the terms used in this case are inherited from Latin grammar, their meaning is broadened to describe Flemish grammatical features (also common to other Germanic languages), and those Latin terms are sometimes also glossed through new or, at least, previously unattested Flemish terms, specifically *doende wijze* and *voorstellinghe*. The degree of detail and the number of grammatical indications included in the *TTL* constitute a telling example of how lexicographical practice can show evidence of insights into grammatical reflection. They suggest that greater attention to dictionaries in the history of (Dutch) grammaticography would be rewarding.

## References

ANONYMOUS. 1573. **THESAURVS THEVTONICÆ LINGVÆ. Schat der Nederduytscher spraken. Inhoudende niet alleene de Nederduytsche woorden / maer oock verscheyden redenen en manieren van spreken / vertaelt ende ouergeset int Fransois ende Latijn. Thresor du langage Bas-alman, dict vulgairemeñt Flameng, traduit en François & en Latin.** Antverpiæ: Ex officina Christophori Plantini Prototypographi Regij, 1573.

ARMSTRONG, E. **Robert Estienne Royal Printer. An Historical Study of the Elder Stephanus.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.

AUROUX, S. **La révolution technologique de la grammatisation.** Liège: Mardaga, 1994.

BARATIN, M. **Priscianus Caesariensis. Grammaire. Livre XVII – Syntaxe, 1 ;** texte latin, traduction introduite et annotée par le Groupe Ars Grammatica. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 2010.

BARATIN, M.; BIVILLE, F.; BONNET, G.; CHAMBON, L.; COLOMBAT, B.; CONDUCHÉ, C.; GARCEA, A.; HOLTZ, L.; KELLER, M.; MARCHAND, D. Le *De aduerbio* de Priscien. **Histoire Épistémologie Langage**, Paris, v. 27, n. 2, p. 7-91, 2005. Available at: <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-01171031v1>. Accessed at : 24 jul. 2024.

BOOIJ, G. **The Morphology of Dutch.** Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

BOOIJ, G. From syntax to morphology: Separable complex verbs. *In*: SCHANER-WOLLES, Ch.; RENNISON, J.; NEUBARTH, F. **Naturally! Linguistic Studies in Honour of Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler Presented on the Occasion of his 60<sup>th</sup> Birthday**. Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier, 2001. p. 59-64.

BOSTOEN, K. J. **Kaars en bril. De oudste Nederlandse grammatica**. Middelburg: Koninklijk Zeeuwsch genootschap der wetenschappen, 1985.

BOURLAND, C. **The Guild of St.-Ambrose, or Schoolmasters' Guild of Antwerp: 1529–1579**. Northampton (Massachusetts): Smith college – Department of history, 1951.

BRANDON, E.E. **Robert Estienne et le dictionnaire français au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle**. Genève: Slatkine Reprints, 1967 [1904].

BROWN, K. **Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics**. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006.

CLAES, F. s.j. Vocabulaires et livres de conversation pour apprendre le français aux Pays-Bas espagnols entre 1550 et 1700. *In*: DE CLERCQ, J.; LIOCE, N.; SWIGGERS, P. **Grammaire et enseignement du français, 1500–1700**. Leuven/Paris/Sterling: Peeters, 2000. p. 217-235.

CLAES, F. s.j. Über die Verbreitung lexicographischer Werke in den Niederlanden und ihre wechselseitige Beziehungen mit dem Ausland bis zum Jahre 1600. *In*: NOORDEGRAAF, J.; VERSTEEGH, K.; KOERNER, E. F. K. **The History of Linguistics in the Low Countries**. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1992. p. 17-38.

CLAES, F. s.j. De lexicografie in de zestiende eeuw. *In*: BAKKER, D. M.; DIBBETS, G. R. W. **Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taalkunde**. Den Bosch: Malmberg, 1977, p. 205-217.

CLAES, F. s.j. L'influence de Robert Estienne sur les dictionnaires de Plantin. **Cahiers de lexicologie**, Paris, v. 23, n. 2, p. 109-116, 1973.

CLAES, F. s.j. **De Thesaurus van Plantijn van 1573**. 's-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1972.

CLAES, F. s.j. **De bronnen van drie woordenboeken uit de drukkerij van Plantin. Het *Dictionarium Tetraglotton* (1562), de *Thesaurus Theutonicae linguae* (1573) en Kiliaans eerste *Dictionarium Teutonico-Latinum* (1574)**. Brussels: Belgisch interuniversitair centrum voor neerlandistiek, 1970.

CONSIDINE, J. **Sixteenth-century English Dictionaries**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022.

DE CLERCQ, J. Gabriel Meurier, een XVIe-eeuws pedagoog en grammaticus in Antwerpen. **Meesterwerk**, Amsterdam, v. 10, p. 29-46, 1997.

DE SMET, G. Deutsche Einflüsse auf die niederländische Lexikographie des 16. Jahrhunderts. **Niederdeutsche Mitteilungen**, Lund, v. 22, p. 65-90, 1966.

DE TOLLENAERE, F. De lexicografie in de zeventiende en achttiende eeuw. *In*: BAKKER, D. M.; DIBBETS, G. R. W. **Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taalkunde**. Den Bosch: Malberg, 1977. p. 219-227.

DEHÉ, N. Particle verbs in Germanic. *In*: MÜLLER, P. O.; OHNHEISER, I.; OLSEN, S.; RAINER, F. **Word Formation. An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe**. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2015. p. 611-626.

DIBBETS, G. R. W. **De woordsoorten in de Nederlandse triviumgrammatica**. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1995.

DIBBETS, G. R. W. **Twe-spraak vande Nederduitsche letterkunst (1584)**; ingeleid, geïnterpreteerd, van kommentaar voorzien en uitgegeven door Dr. G.R.W. Dibbets. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum, 1985.

DIBBETS, G. R. W. (ed.). **Ont-werp der Neder-duitsche letter-konst, uitgegeven, ingeleid en van kommentaar voorzien door dr. G.R.W. Dibbets**. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1981.

DIBBETS, G. R. W. Grammaticale geschriften uit de zestiende eeuw. *In*: BAKKER, D. M.; DIBBETS, G. R. W. **Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse taalkunde**. Den Bosch: Malmberg, 1977. p. 23-37.

FURNO, M. Editing the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*: Robert Estienne's Dream and Nightmare. *In*: GRAHELLI, Sh. **Buying and selling. The Business of Books in Early Modern Europe**. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2019. p. 208-222. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004340398\\_011](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004340398_011).

FURNO, M. Les dictionnaires de Robert Estienne: sens et finalités d'une œuvre lexicographique. **Voces**, Salamanca, v. 10, p. 11-27, 1999. Available at: <https://revistas.usal.es/dos/index.php/1130-3336/article/view/5433>. Accessed at : 24 jul. 2024.

HAUSMANN, F. J. Wörterbuchgeschichte und Historiographie der Linguistik. *In*: HÜLLEN, W. **Understanding the Historiography of Linguistics. Problems and Projects**. Münster: Nodus Publikationen, 1990. p. 219-228.

IMHOF, D. Plantijns achtdelige *Biblia regia*: de internationale top. *In*: PAPY, J. **Erasmus' droom. Het Leuvense Collegium Trilingue, 1517–1797**. Leuven/Paris/Bristol (CT): Peeters, 2017. p. 432-434.

LINDEMANN, M. **Die französischen Wörterbücher von den Anfängen bis 1600. Entstehung und typologische Beschreibung**. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1994.

LINDEMANN, M. Les apports du *Thesaurus theutonicae linguae* dans la lexicographie du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle. *In*: HÖFLER, M. **La lexicographie française du XVI<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. Actes du colloque international de la lexicographie dans la Herzog August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel (9-11 octobre 1979)**. Wolfenbüttel: Herzog August Bibliothek, 1982. p. 33-47.

LOONEN, P. L. M. **For to Learne to Buye and Sell. Learning English in the Low Dutch Area Between 1500 and 1800: a Critical Survey**. Groningen: Universiteitsdrukkerij, 1990.

McLELLAND, N. Albertus (1573) and Ölinger (1574): Creating the first grammars of German. **Historiographia Linguistica**, Amsterdam, v. 28, p. 7-38, 2001.

OSSELTON, N. E. The sources of the first Dutch and English dictionary. **The Modern Language Review**, Leeds, v. 64, n. 2, p. 355-362, 1969.

PADLEY, G. A. **Grammatical Theory in Western Europe, 1500–1700. The Latin Tradition**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

RIEMENS, K. J. **Les débuts de la lexicographie franco-néerlandaise. Leçon d'ouverture faite le 28 janvier 1921**. Paris: Édouard Champion, 1921.

RUIJSEDAAL, E. **Terminografische index op de oudste Nederlandse grammaticale werken**. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek VU, 1989.

SCAGLIONE, A. D. **The Theory of German Word Order from the Renaissance to the Present**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981.

STIEBELS, B.; WUNDERLICH, D. Morphology feeds syntax: the case of particle verbs. **Linguistics**, The Hague, v. 32, n. 6, p. 913-968, 1994.

TAVONI, M. Western Europe. *In*: LEPSCHY, G. **History of Linguistics. V. 3. Renaissance and Early Modern Linguistics**. London/New York: Longman, 1994-1998. p. 2-108.

THIM, S. **Phrasal Verbs. The English Verb-Particle Construction and its History**. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 2012.

VAN DER HORST, J. M. **Geschiedenis van de Nederlandse syntaxis**. Leuven: Universitaire Pers Leuven, 2008.

VAN STERKENBURG, P. **Van woordenlijst tot woordenboek. Een geschiedenis van woordenboeken van het Nederlands**. 2nd rev. ed. Schiedam: Scriptum, 2011.

VOET, L. **The Golden Compasses. The History of the House of Plantin-Moretus**. 2 vols. Amsterdam/London/New York: Vangendt & Co/Routledge & Kegan Paul/Abner Schram, 1969-1972.

WHETSTONE, G.; WALRAVEN, J. **The Honourable Reputation of a Souldier. With a Morall Report of the Vertues, Offices and (by abuse) the disgrace of his Profession. De Eerweerdighe achtbaerheyt van een soldener**. Leiden: Jan Paedts Jacobsz. and Jan Bouwensz., for Thomas Basson, 1586.

ZIMONT, E. **La lexicographie bilingue français-néerlandais et néerlandais-français (1527-1656). Étude de métalexicographie historique**. PhD thesis – Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, Université de Liège, Liège, 2022.

### **Como citar este trabalho:**

ZIMONT, Elizaveta. The Thesaurus Theutonicae linguae (1573): dictionary as a grammar. **Revista do GEL**, v. 21, n. 3, p. 192-220, 2024. Disponível em: <https://revistas.gel.org.br/rg>.

Submetido em: 09/10/2024 | Aceito em: 14/01/2025.