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Transcription and transliteration

**Dutch transcription:**

1. Capital letters are standardised to modern usage (names of places, beginning of a line in a poem, etc).
2. Abbreviations are expanded and italics used for any letter that is not in the manuscript itself (capl > capitele; & > ver; ā > aa, etc.).
3. Words written together: in case a) enclisis/proclisis: words that are written together because two phonetically weak words are combined are left as they are (e.g. tis = het is; inde = in de), if the phonetically weaker word is written as a part of the stronger word, they are separated her by an underscore (e.g. vindmen = vind men, teleeren = te leeren), b) two “independent” words that are written together by accident – here separated by underscore.
4. ā is normalised to u.
5. ij, y are not standardised.
6. Insertions are treated as regular text.
7. Line breaks are not preserved.
Note on transliteration of Hindustani and Persian

The transliteration of Hindustani words follows the spelling from Platts’ dictionary (1884); the transliteration of Persian words, if not from Greaves, is taken from Steingass (1892), preserving their original diacritics. Transliterations in citations from others remain unchanged. Persian letters and their equivalents in simplified Roman transcription are used otherwise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>΄</th>
<th>ā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh/x</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>zh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gh</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*kh if it is used in the original quoted text, x in modern transliteration*
This thesis is a result of my obsessive fascination with a little known manuscript from the late 17th century. Although “the first grammar of Hindustani” by Ketelaar seems to be a well-trodden ground, instantly returning over six thousand Google search results, there was amazingly little information about the actual manuscript.

When during my fellowship at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies in early 2010 I inadvertently embarked on this project, the official credendum was that there was one extant copy of the text, kept in the Dutch National Archives. It was translated into Latin in 1743, but the first English edition was made only in 2008 by Bhatia and Machida (incidentally, in the same institute where I was working two years later). By March, while still in Japan, I discovered that an anonymous manuscript with the same title was kept in the Utrecht University Library, which I went to see upon my return to Europe. Soon after, I learned by word-of-mouth from a well-informed source about yet another manuscript copy signed with the initials G.B. in Fondation Custodia in Paris, which I was able to consult in September. By mid-November, I identified the mysterious copyist. In December, on the eve of Ketelaar’s 351st birthday, I had my first presentation on the Instructie at the 32nd All-India Conference of Linguists in Lucknow, of all places, the city where one of the copies of the text was made. In early 2011, I arranged a hyperspectral examination of the Utrecht Ms in the conservation department of the National Archives in The Hague to try to reveal the blacked out text. A few months later, a comparison of the three copies led me to the conclusion about the source for the printed Latin translation. By the end of November 2011 I had no other option but to abandon my previous project and apply for a Ph.D. position at the UvA. And that is how this six year long journey started.

If my compulsive inquisitiveness was the primary driving force in this project, then a second one was the frustration with lack of connectivity between disciplines that held answers to my questions. I learned Dutch paleography to be able to read the original sources, but then I needed experts on bindings and watermarks; I plagued the antique booksellers with my emails trying to figure out the provenance and the itineraries of the three copies, and my historian friends for tips on searching the archives. Soon it became clear that to fully understand Ketelaar’s work, I needed to look at the whole linguistic production by people in a similar position to his, other VOC employees overseas. But when I traced some other unpublished Dutch linguistics manuscripts, I realised that to unravel their histories, their material aspects need to be analysed, using every technology available – and so my search for experts continued.

If it takes a village to raise a child, it certainly took a city the size of Karachi to write this doctoral dissertation. Indologists, Latinists, Iranists, Neerlandici; historians, paleographers, archivists, librarians and conservators; art historians, antique booksellers, and numismatists; astronomers and experts on Mughal calendar; experimental phoneticians and lexicographers; textual scholars, digital humanists, imaging lab technicians, and one geologist – all helped me along the way, and I am greatly indebted to each and every one of them. I hope the result is worthwhile.
1. Introduction

1.1. The purpose and scope of the present study

The primary aim of this study is to present an updated account of *Instructie off Onderwijsinge der Hindoustanse en Persiaanse talen, nevens hare declinatie en conjugatie, als mede vergeleijkinge, der hindoustanse med de hollandse maat en gewichten mitsgaders beduijdingh eenieger moorse namen etc.* ['Instruction or Teaching in the Hindustani and Persian languages, besides their declension and conjugation, together with a comparison of the Hindustani and Dutch measures and weights, and the meaning of some Moorish names, etc.'] by Joan Josua Ketelaar (1659-1718). The *Instructie*, widely considered to be the first grammar of Hindustani, is one of the most interesting pre-modern documents on Asian languages written in Dutch. Although it has been studied by Chatterji (1935), Vogel (1941), Bodewitz (1994-95), and Bhatia (1987, 2008), all these authors mostly focused on the ‘correctness’ (or often ‘incorrectness’) of Ketelaar’s descriptions of Hindustani, and never looked at the overall text: the Persian grammar; the topical vocabulary; unusual word-lists, etc. More importantly, until now, all studies (with the exception of McGregor 2001) have been based either on the same 1689 copy from The Hague, or the Latin translation from 1743. My research is the first to present and discuss two forgotten copies that include completely new elements, which shed fresh light on the history of the text and its circulation.

My interest in the text is twofold: on the one hand, I want to deconstruct Ketelaar’s work to see the origin and evolution of his linguistic thought. Was Ketelaar in any way an innovative scholar, or was he copying schemas and metalanguage used by other authors? Is it possible at all to trace back his influences and sources of inspiration? Being an amateur philologist, did he invent the grammatical terminology, or did he follow models? In my study, I want to dig under the obvious level of (often erroneous) linguistic data, since the historical development of Hindustani and Persian are of minor concern to the questions under scrutiny here, and they ought to be left to experts in these domains. (However, I will take time to reflect on the methodological limitations of using a handwritten multilingual historical text as a base for purely linguistic study). To use Errington’s (2008: 9-12) term, I want to unravel Ketelaar’s *practices of literacy* understood as transpositions of the author’s literacy-related values, habits and beliefs that determine his approach to describing unfamiliar and ‘exotic’ languages. It is these ‘automatic’ practices that decide whether one is able to see beyond the standard traditional Greco-Roman grammatical models and embrace a new linguistic reality of a typologically different language. But they can also reveal a lot about ways of dissemination of linguistic knowledge through textual transmission in the 17th century.
On the other hand, I want to return to the *Instructie* to its original context. To paraphrase Errington, every text created in a colonial situation is not just a purely empirical document, but a fossilized imprint of its time: a result of material conditions in which it was written, with all its underlying correlations. Without that context, the work cannot be fully and properly understood. The socially embedded linguistic observations will be especially visible on the macro- and microlevel in Ketelaar’s lexicon, but they can also be found throughout the entire text. Trying to decrypt phrases and words that at first glance are a mistake or just don’t make sense offers a perfect opportunity to stop and look deeper in order to gain cultural insights that would otherwise be missed.

For the purposes of linguistic historiography, Ketelaar’s pioneering effort in documenting the 17th century languages of Hindustan will greatly benefit from being placed in a broader context. Since he was neither the first, nor the last Dutch East India Company employee who took interest in new foreign languages he encountered in his travels and who recorded them in some form, it would be rather interesting and valuable to compare his work and his approach with those of his peers. Regrettably, to this day, the early sources on languages of the territories associated with the Dutch economic expansion overseas have never been gathered and evaluated together; my study makes a modest start at filling this gap. In doing so, my hope is to instigate a proper scholarly investigation of the Dutch linguistic heritage and to encourage its gelling into a self-standing research field. In time, editions of these Dutch linguistic works of the VOC period could be prepared, wherein the ‘VOC linguistics’ would serve as a framework and a prism through which the individual works would reveal their constituents to be compared and contrasted with the rest of the collection.

I hope that my multifaceted study of Ketelaar’s *Instructie* will serve as an example of how much information can be retrieved from even a seemingly uncomplicated historical text.

### 1.2. Disciplinary embedding

My study falls into the broadly understood field of *Linguistic Historiography*, defined by Swiggers (1990: 21) as a discipline which traces the formation, and development over time, of *linguistic knowledge*, i.e., theories and ideas about language. It is distinct from *Historical Linguistics* which studies the *histories of individual languages*, including the semantic, grammatical and phonetical changes, as well as languages’ genetic relationships (Koerner 1995). Linguistic Historiography has also to be distinguished from the *History of Linguistics* (also called History of Language Sciences), which is a branch of *intellectual history* and focuses on *ideas about language* (Law 2003; Koerner 1976). Zooming in on my topic, I should ascribe the present study to the *History of Descriptive Linguistics*: a study of how linguistic knowledge was formulated by individual authors in
particular times and places. The sum of these individual descriptive histories creates what we call Historiography of the field.

So far, the most systematic, rigorous and productive framework for studying linguistic documentation from outside Europe was provided by Missionary Linguistics. However, while the object of study and the methods applied in the present study show close affiliation with these of Missionary Linguistics, I do not believe, in contrast to Zwartjes (2012: 199) that Ketelaar’s text should be included in bibliographies of Missionary Linguistic sources. Stolz and Warnke (2015) proposed a new framework: that of Colonial Linguistics. They derive this from the works of Calvet (1974, 1999) and Errington (2001, 2008), who postulated a more comprehensive look at languages, which should shift linguistics from the humanities to social sciences. For Calvet, it is crucial to study l’écologie des langues, which takes into account not only the pure linguistic data but also the broader context of various social, economic, cultural and political factors in which a language operates. The term “language ecology” comes from a 1972 book by Haugen, The Ecology of Language, in which it is defined as the study of interactions between a language and its environment. Also in my study, I look beyond the structural and lexical description of a particular language – or indeed, two languages, Persian and Hindustani. I want to see the languages, as well as the work describing them, as a product of a particular place and time. The colonial context of the Instructie, which immediately imposes itself on the reader’s mind, is – as we will see – not as obvious as it may seem.

For the purposes of his Colonial Linguistics project, Stolz defines “the European-tinged prototype of colonialism” as “everything that relates to the de jure/de facto/imagined possession/occupation by a metropolis of territories overseas for the purpose of economic exploitation, military control, settlement, increase of national prestige, etc.” (Stolz 2013, no pagination). He also stresses that it is not his intention to defend or romanticize colonialism under an academic camouflage. Likewise, in my exploration of the context in which the Dutch carried out their linguistic investigations, my postulate of the ambiguity of ‘degrees of colonialism’ is not intended to dilute or justify colonialism, or to lift the moral responsibility for that blatant violation of human rights. Simply, I do not think that the adjective ‘colonial’ is always suitable for explaining the context in which the Dutch linguistic production occurred; nor do I believe the term can be used indiscriminately to describe every aspect of the Dutch activities overseas. (I will elaborate on this idea in chapter 2). In the case of Ketelaar’s Instructie, one could of course search for so-called missionary elements, just as well as for colonial elements, in the text. I argue that just as a couple of prayers and the Credo appended to the work do not make this work missionary, neither does the one grammatical example “You’re my slave – I’m your master” qualifies it as colonial, in contrast to Bhatia (2008 I: 49) who detects the “colonial attitude” in “the choice and richness of derogatory data” and consequently, classifies it as “religious-colonial-business” (idem: 51). I would argue
that the only religion the Dutch overseas wholeheartedly professed was the ‘religion of trade’ (I do so in more detail in chapter 2).1

With respect to the term ‘colonial’, which indeed may be useful for Stolz in the case of German linguistic production of the 18th and 19th century, I maintain, supported by the studies such as Prakash (1998) and Blussé (2008) that for a major part, the socio-political situation of the Dutch overseas was much more varied to be simply called ‘colonial’ – but, at best, ‘proto-colonial’ (Singh 2010). Therefore, ‘Colonial Linguistics’ would not be a proper term to describe Dutch linguistic production of the 16th and 17th century. In my nomenclature choices, I am leaning towards a more inclusive term. In order to avoid miscomprehension resulting from the use of historically and emotionally loaded terms, I propose ‘[Dutch] Mercantile Linguistics’, the more neutral nomenclature as an alternative for den Besten’s (2010) “colonial linguistics of the VOC period”, or ‘VOC linguistics’ for short. In my work, I use this term in connection with all the Dutch texts from 1600-1825, which were written either by VOC employees or under the auspices of the Company, primarily in Dutch, and which relate to the languages of the ‘newly discovered’ territories in Africa and Asia. It is important to note that these works do not follow a uniform model and do not exhibit a homogenous approach or methodology. It may be a result of a lack of institutional support or ‘guidelines’ from the Company (as opposed to Roman Catholic Church-backed ventures such as Propaganda Fide’s Polyglot Press in Rome, which systematically commissioned, edited and printed dictionaries and grammars). The question how ‘VOC linguistics’ relates to colonial and missionary linguistics has no simple answer and requires further study based on the existing text corpus. In the light of ongoing disciplinary discussions on differences and convergence points between both colonial and missionary linguistics (Stolz & Warnke 2015), I would argue that the VOC actors and authors could be seen as occupying an in-between position in the spectrum between missionary and colonial linguistics. Although for the ecclesiastical and the commercial companies conducting empirically-driven scholarly research was hardly the main objective, and they were seldom interested in foreign languages in their own right, both missionaries and merchants came to understand that local knowledge was often a crucial prerequisite for obtaining their respective goals.

1.3. The Instructie: Rediscovery

As the title suggests, Ketelaar’s work is not just a grammar, but a trilingual “instruction”, consisting of a Dutch-Hindustani-Persian thematic dictionary, followed by “declensions and conjugations” of Persian, then Hindustani, and closed by a set of various lexical lists, tables with weights and measures conversions, and translations of prayers. This combination of languages in Ketelaar’s work is quite understandable; at the time, Persian was the official administrative language of the

---

1 A notion borrowed from Keevak from his book project on “Western Failures in a Chinese World, 1248-1817” (personal communication).
Mughal Empire, while Hindustani, considered a ‘bastard’ mixed language, served as a link language for the whole of North India and the West coast (more on this in Chapter 4).

Although the Hindustani grammar (together with the Persian one) was translated into Latin by David Mill (Millius; 1692-1756), a professor of Oriental languages and of theology at Utrecht University, and appeared in the second expanded edition of his Dissertationes selectae in 1743, it did not seem to gain much popularity. The impact was limited to the publication being mentioned by the German missionary Benjamin Schulze (1689-1760) in the preface to his own Grammatica Hindostanica from 1745. Schulze praises Ketelaar’s effort but also very politely suggests that using the Persian alphabet would be helpful for the study of the verbs, as would be adding pronunciation; he also points to mistakes in the translations of prayers.2

Published only once and in Latin, Ketelaar’s grammar came very close to being omitted from the history of Indian linguistics. The manuscript was briefly mentioned, together with the Mill’s edition, by Eichhorn (1807: 280) as die Declinationen und Conjugationen aus den Papiere des ehemaligen hollandischen Statthalters zu Suratte, Jo. Josua Ketelaer (‘Declensions and Conjugations from the papers of the former governor in Surat, Jo. Josua Ketelaer’). Some 86 years later, the influential Irish Indologist Sir George Abraham Grierson (1851-1941) in his article “On the early study of Indian vernaculars in Europe” stated that the first Hindustani grammar was written by Benjamin Schulze. His oversight was spotted by the Venetian philologist and translator Emilio Teza (1831-1912) who in 1895 presented a paper before the Reale Academia dei Lincei in Rome (The Royal National Lincean Academy, an Italian academy of science) in which he corrected Grierson, pointing to a mention of an even earlier grammar in Schulze’s introduction – the one by Ketelaar.3 Grierson subsequently published an abstract of Teza’s article in the proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal (1895: 89-90). Thanks to Teza, Grierson’s seminal opus magnum Linguistic Survey of India from 1916 contains the corrected information on Ketelaar (with 1715 as date of completion of his work; Grierson 1916 vol. 9-1: 6).4

---

2 “Certe studium Optimi Viri, ut decet, collaudamus: quoniam ita huic linguae famam conciliavit, exoticarum linguarum studiosis eam commendavit, atque observationibus suis instructos, excitatosque in campum deducit ampliorem, quem nostrae aperiunt institutiones. Optandum fuissent, ut Vir Nobilissimus Verba Hindostanica characteribus Persicis expressisset, atque illorum addidisset pronunciationem. Fortassis etiam non defect, qui emendet ea, quae in composito ab illo Decalogo, Symbolo Apostolico & Oratone Dominica a structurae Hindostanicae regulis aliena esse vide.” (Schulze 1745: [vii-viii]– a footnote in Prefatio Auctorem).


4 Corrected yet still not correct: since neither Mill nor Schulze mentioned any date in relation to Ketelaar, how did Grierson come up with the year 1715? I will offer one possible answer in section 3.5.1.
It was not until 1935, however, that the first proper analysis of ‘the oldest Hindustani grammar’ was undertaken. Its author, the famous Bengali linguist Suniti Kumar Chatterji (1890-1977), accidentally came across Mill’s Dissertations in a second-hand bookshop in England in 1921. In his analysis, Chatterji is not terribly appreciative of Ketelaar’s language knowledge, to say the least. He calls the grammar “very meagre indeed” and concludes that it is based “on haphazard notes of a busy man of a position of Ketelaar” rather than a “scholar’s detailed and leisurely study” (Chatterji 1935: 78). However, he praises it as a “good side-light on popular Hindustani” of the time (ibid: 83). It did not help that he only had access to the edited and expanded Latin version, with its own transcription and translation errors. Although in his original article, Chatterji gives (after Mill) the year 1715 as the tentative date of the creation of the text, the appended note from 1934 states that “it is now quite clear that the grammar was written before 1698”, effectively pushing it back to the 17th century. This correction is a result of a contact Chatterji had with the Dutch Sanskritist and archaeologist Jean Philippe Vogel (1871–1958) who “very kindly gave [him] some particulars about Ketelaar’s grammar”, such as the bibliographical information on the 1689 Dutch manuscript from Lucknow that Vogel discovered in the State Record Office in The Hague.

Vogel himself became interested in Ketelaar’s linguistic work relatively late in his career, when in the years 1933-36 on request of the board of Linschoten-Vereeniging5 (the Linschoten Society) he was preparing an edition of Ketelaar’s embassy journey to the Great Mogul in Lahore. Vogel’s interest in Ketelaar’s early life must have led him to Elbing, where he probably contacted the city archivist Hermann Kownatzki (1899–1991). In 1936, Kownatzki published a thirteen-page long biography of Ketelaar in a local historical journal, entitled “Johann Josua Kettler, Elbing’s größter Abenteurer” (‘J.J. Kettler, Elbing’s greatest adventurer’), which Vogel quotes in his Linschoten-Vereeniging edition from 1937. The cross references and the almost simultaneous publication dates most likely suggest that Kownatzki’s study was instigated by Vogel’s quest. More importantly, in the course of Vogel’s research, an archivist from the Royal Archives, R. Blijsma showed him a manuscript with the Dutch text of the Instructie. Intrigued, Vogel retraced everything that has been written about this work, and a few years later, in 1941, wrote his own analysis. For the first time, it was based on the original manuscript, and not on Mill’s Latin translation. Vogel did not limit himself to the grammatical part, but rather analysed every component of the text: the vocabularies, the translations of religious texts, the introductory remarks on Hindustani, and even details such as a couplet – persiflage on the Emperor Aurangzeb (1618-1707). In what could be considered a lengthy response to Chatterji’s 1935 article, Vogel vehemently refuted the claim that the

---

5 History and mission statement from the Society’s website: “The Linschoten Society was founded in 1908 by a group of scholars, professionals and enthusiasts of Dutch maritime history. Named after Jan Huygen van Linschoten, a Dutchman who provided the merchant companies from Holland and Zealand at the end of the 16th century with the necessary information to reach the East Indies, the Society’s main objective is to advance knowledge on travel and navigation history through the editing and publication of contemporary travel accounts.” (http://www.linschoten-vereeniging.nl/english.htm, accessed on August 6, 2013).
language described by Ketelaar was not a standard Hindustani, but the "ungrammatical bāzār dialect". Chatterji’s "unfair" and "incomprehensible" opinion cannot even be blamed on Mill’s abridged translation; it rests on “prejudice and a misunderstanding of the position which a European merchant as Ketelaar occupied in the Indian society” (Vogel 1941: 29[671]). Vogel’s main argument is that Ketelaar undoubtedly “did not pick up his knowledge of Hindustani in the bazaars of Bombay and Surat, even though he visited the former place. Using “bazaar language” he would surely not have been received among the refined courtiers of Bahadur Shah and Jahandar Shah with the distinction of which the logbook of his mission bears witness” (ibidem). Furthermore, the language of the religious texts appended, according to Vogel, “however imperfect it may have been reproduced, certainly does not smell of the bazaar” (ibidem).7

In the mid-1990’s, the discussion continued between the next-generation scholars, Bhatia and Bodewitz. Bodewitz (1994-95) transcribed and translated parts of Ketelaar’s manuscript and wrote a polemic against Bhatia, after the latter had included a brief analysis of Ketelaar’s work into his book on the Indian grammatical tradition (Bhatia 1987). Bhatia included his response in the edition of the Instructie, co-authored with Machida in 2008 yet he still has not corrected or addressed multiple errors pointed out by Bodewitz. To this day, the book has not received any deep critical review. Having compared the text of the edition with the original manuscript, I suggest a new edition is needed to improve its reliability as a source for those interested scholars who are unable to consult the original.

1.4. Structure of this thesis

After the introductory remarks on the scope of this study and its disciplinary embedding in the present chapter, Chapter two is dedicated to an exploratory overview of the linguistic documents created under the auspices of the VOC. I strongly believe Ketelaar’s work has to be regarded as a part of a bigger phenomenon, with shared characteristics but also its own specificities – a result of socio-historical circumstances of time and place. The chapter starts with a brief historical introduction contrasting the Catholic legitimisation of the overseas expansion with the Dutch pragmatic and seemingly libertarian standing. A brief outline of the Company’s attitude to indigenous languages and its role in the circulation of linguistic knowledge between Asia and Europe follows. The main part consists of an overview of extant Dutch linguistic documents, some of them described for the first time, and classified according to their purpose and target audience.

6 The linguistic situation in Mughal India and the question what language Ketelaar actually described will be discussed in Chapter 6.
7 Also, Vogel might have noticed that in the Persian grammar, Ketelaar mentions views of the geleerdste Persianen (‘most learned Persians’, UMS: 83).
In Chapter three, I introduce Ketelaar and the fate of his work, which after being translated into Latin and published in 1743 fell into oblivion for a couple of centuries. The story of its rediscovery took a new turn when in 2010 I was fortunate enough to trace and study two previously unknown copies: one in Utrecht and one in Paris. Consequently, in this chapter, I focus on the *Instructie* as a document, combining cutting edge technology with archival research to reveal new facts about the provenance of two recently found manuscripts. A detailed analytical study of differences and similarities between the three copies leads me to the answer as to which of the manuscripts most likely served David Mill as the basis for his Latin translation – a result corroborated by historical evidence.

Chapter four is a methodological reflection on how to read the *Instructie*. I will start with an outline of the convoluted history of Hindustani and its script as described by the early European travellers, followed by a brief discussion of issues with its Romanisation. Presenting the model of Ketelaar’s notation prepared by Chatterji (1935: 71-78), I will make a case for paying more attention to the language of description of the original text: the 17th century Dutch. Consequently, I will identify spelling tendencies in the three copies of the *Instructie*, putting them in the context of Dutch standards at the time. Searching for Ketelaar’s transcription strategies, I will analyse his spelling of Persian first, as it possibly had a different source than the Hindustani. I will finish the chapter by presenting a case of a Dutch Romanisation of a similar text, which shows the value of comparative studies for understanding how the Dutch orthography and phonology may be influencing the transcription. Without such an approach, I claim, it is not possible to properly evaluate the 17th century phonemic values of Persian and Hindustani words in any future study. Further research in this area will help create better methodology for a historical phonological analysis.

In Chapter five, I set out to establish whether and to what extent Ketelaar’s Persian grammar is an original work. Starting with a brief history of Persian studies in Europe, I describe the process that led me to the discovery of a direct model for Ketelaar’s Persian grammar, which happened through the perusing of other relevant 17th century grammatical works. The paragraph-for-paragraph comparison between the source text and Ketelaar’s adaptation is also an opportunity to describe the content of the Persian grammar in the *Instructie*, which has been up to the present constantly overshadowed by its Hindustani twin.

In Chapter six, I sketch the linguistic situation in Mughal India to emphasize the role and position of the two languages described by Ketelaar. In the 17th century, Hindustani and Persian were two important languages of North India, and their mastering was crucial for the swift functioning of the Dutch East India Company kantoor. Persian was the language of administration of the Mughal court and therefore necessary for any correspondence; Hindustani was a link language of communication used in daily trade dealings, which explains why Ketelaar decided to include both of them in his language manual. In order to help contextualise Ketelaar’s pioneering work, I briefly present other early European descriptions of
Hindustani written in French, German, Latin, Portuguese and English. The main goal, however, is to scrutinise the textual evidence to determine whether and to what degree the Hindustani grammar might have been modelled on the Persian text we have seen in the previous chapter. Wherever possible, Ketelaar’s grammatical definitions and observations are put in a comparative perspective, be it from the standpoint of the modern standard Hindi-Urdu (MSH-U), or other aforementioned grammars.

Chapter seven is dedicated to an analysis of the grammatical metalanguage used by Ketelaar in an attempt to identify its origins. Which of his terms draw from the Dutch grammatical tradition, and which are his own creation? Which terminological choices are deliberate, and which incidental, or maybe a mistake? I start with Ketelaar’s use of Latin, and then I scrutinise his strategies in the Dutch language. At the end, I trace the textual transmission of terminology that crosses the language divide: from the original Greaves’ Latin, to the Dutch of Ketelaar, back to the Latin of David Mill who retranslated the *Instructie* in 1743.

In Chapter eight I focus on the lexical part of the *Instructie*. Along with presenting the general structure and various lexicographical styles used by Ketelaar, I look for possible models and direct influences. I test a hypothesis that his vocabulary was based on a Latin schoolbook to see how much it evolved from the model. I also demonstrate how a close reading and attention to apparent mistakes can enrich our understanding of a ‘simple’ lexical text. Furthermore, I attempt to go beyond lexical entries in his trilingual wordlists: I will try to decipher his aims by considering the implicit cultural and historical information that may be hidden in the text. Although elements such as conversion tables of weights and measures used in India point explicitly to a mercantile readership, what internal evidence can the text furnish us with to better understand the selection and presentation of topics? What other factors were at play when Ketelaar was compiling his book?

Finally, conclusions and desiderata close the current study.

1.5. Papers and conference presentations included in this thesis

**Chapter 2:** “Left to right and right to left: Two Dutch vocabularies of Persian and Hindustani compared”. North American Association for the History of the Language Sciences (NAAHoLS), Boston, USA (January 2013).

“Learning to read 'not only Malay, but also Arabic, Persian, Turkish and other scripts' under the Dutch East India Company”. 13th International Conference on the History of Language Sciences Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro/ Centro de Estudos em Letras, Vila Real, Portugal (August 2014).

“'For without the knowledge of the language, you’re just a mute in a foreign country': Dutch descriptions of Indian languages under the VOC”. Indian History Congress, Thiruvananthapuram, India (December 2016).

“The creation and spread of linguistic knowledge under the Dutch East India Company”. 24th European Conference on South Asian Studies (ECSAS), Warsaw, Poland (July 2016).


Chapter 3: “The first grammar of Hindustani by Joan Josua Ketelaar: the itineraries of the lost manuscripts”. 32nd All-India Conference of Linguists, Lucknow, India (December 2010).

Chapter 4: “In search of early modern Hindustani: reflections on the method”. Henry Sweet Society Colloquium, Palazzo Feltrinelli, Gargnano del Garda, Italy (August 2015).

Chapter 5: “Ketelaar's Instructie for Hindustani and Persian and De Tours' Lingua Mongolana: in search of models and inspirations”. A workshop "François-Marie de Tours and the European Discovery of ‘Hindi’", The Institute for Linguistics and Philology at Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden. (June 2014).


“In search of grammatical models for the first European description of Hindustani (Ketelaar 1698)”. 14th International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences, ICHoLS XIV, Paris, France (August 2017).

Chapter 7: “Pre-modern descriptions in Dutch of languages in India: Ketelaar's grammar of Hindustani and Persian (1698) and Rüell’s grammar of Sinhala (1699)”(Forthcoming).
Chapter 8: “Reading between the lines of the first Hindustani grammar (1698)”. 12th International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (ICHOLS XII), St. Petersburg, Russia (September 2011).

“The Pagan Sunday which comes once in a fortnight and the Muslim Sunday that falls on Friday”: North Indian ‘ways of life’ through the eyes of a curious young Prussian (Ketelaar 1698). 7th International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Bremen, Germany (February 2012).
2. Dutch colonial linguistic sources: towards ‘VOC linguistics’

The establishment of the Dutch East India Company (VOC) in 1602 and its subsequent activities in South Asia contributed to extending Dutch interest in oriental studies well beyond Semitic languages. Although the company itself was at times more interested in financing botanical studies than investigating linguistics (Den Besten 2010), many of its overseas employees undertook their own private studies of local languages. The colonial language policy relating to the teaching of Dutch has been well documented (Groeneboer 1993), but the practice of describing ‘exotic’ languages under the VOC still awaits a systematic study. To determine the scope of what could be tentatively called ‘VOC linguistics’, or ‘mercantile linguistics [of the VOC times]’, we need a proper survey of all the linguistic documents composed either by VOC employees or under the auspices of the Company. There is scattered information on grammars, dictionaries and other language tools in classical historiographical sources (cf. Van Dam 1954; Valentijn 1726), as well as in various VOC missives and correspondence; still, no comprehensive overview of Dutch pre-modern language descriptions as yet exists. This chapter aims to highlight this gap and to make a start on filling it.

At every step we are dealing with a serious problem of information loss. Amateur philologists in the areas where the VOC had no deeper interest in the local language beyond immediate commercial contacts, had to work at their own instigation. Of all linguistic works composed, many have been lost, and all that is left today are occasional allusions in contemporary literature, historical documents, and private correspondence. The best-studied and documented area – by reason of its having been a Dutch colony – is the Dutch East Indies (cf. Van Hoëvell 1839). Consequently, Malay and the other languages of Indonesia enjoyed a lot more scholarly attention (cf. Werndley 1738) than for example the languages of India. To paraphrase Vink’s complaint we can say that “some grounds of the VOC are well-covered” (esp. Indonesia; Japan; De Caap) while others, like the “western districts” in the Indian Ocean “remain virtual terra incognita” (Vink 2011: 590). In this chapter I will attempt to bridge this gap and present various contexts and multiple geographical areas in which linguistic works were written. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to present an exhaustive list of Dutch linguistic works; I will therefore make a selection of documents that illustrate how the conditions and circumstances shaped the linguistic output. This approach will help contextualise the work I will focus on in the rest of my thesis: the first Hindustani grammar by Joan Josua Ketelaar.

---

1 This chapter is directly based on a paper I wrote with Toon Van Hal (Pytlowany & Van Hal 2016).
But before I get to that, it may be worthwhile to review the Dutch moral and legal standpoint on their commercial expansion, strikingly different – at least in theory – from their main rivals at sea.

2.1 The legal and moral justification of the European expansion: Catholic policy of ‘export of religion’ versus the Dutch ‘religion of trade’

Long before the Dutch became a significant player on the world trade stage, the Spanish and Portuguese had legitimised their overseas activities by the Papal Bull *Inter Caetera* issued by Pope Alexander VI in 1493. In this document, the Pope exhorted the king “inasmuch as with eager zeal for the true faith you design to equip and despatch this expedition, you purpose also, as is your duty, to lead the peoples dwelling in those islands to embrace the Christian profession; nor at any time let dangers or hardships deter you therefrom” (Alexander VI, 1917[1493]: 62). To facilitate the missionary endeavour, the pope magnanimously and “of [his] own sole largess” decided to “give, grant, and assign forever” to the King of Castile and Leon and his successors the possession of any territories and islands found by his envoys and captains (unless they be in possession of any Christian owner) “together with all their dominions, cities, camps, places, and villages, and all rights, jurisdictions, and appurtenances of the same.” (*ibid.*).

The document virtually divided the world into two zones of influence: Spanish and Portuguese. The demarcation line, apparently suggested by Columbus (Scott 1987:

---

2 In 1992, a movement initiated by the Indigenous Law Institute (http://ili.nativeweb.org) called Pope John II to formally revoke what was effectively the Christian Doctrine of Discovery. The so-called “Declaration of Vision” stated: “This Papal Bull has been, and continues to be, devastating to our religions, our cultures, and the survival of our populations.” (source: http://ili.nativeweb.org/dovision.html, accessed on October 24, 2016.) On May 4th 2016, the anniversary of the *Inter Caetera* Bull, 11 indigenous leaders brought a message to Pope Francis in a historic pilgrimage of all Indigenous People called The Long March to Rome, an initiative of the Indigenous Movement (indigenousmovement.org). During a meeting at the Pontifical Council, Archbishop Silvano Maria Tomasi “acknowledged that the Vatican might have to consider issuing a statement and maybe even an apology” (source: http://longmarchtorome.com). In August 2016, Archbishop Tomasi sent an extensive response in which he reaffirmed that the Holy See “firmly asserts that Indigenous people, created in the image and likeness of God our Creator, ought to have had their fundamental human rights recognized and respected in the past, and that any failure to recognize and respect their humanity and fundamental human rights past or present is to be rejected and resisted in the strongest possible way”. He added: “the Holy See and the Church anywhere in the world repudiate illegitimate concepts and principles used by Europeans to justify the seizure of land previously held by Indigenous Peoples”. Moreover, in regard to *Inter Caetera*, Tomasi reminded that it had already been declared as abrogated and “without any legal or doctrinal value” at the United Nations in 2010 (full text of the letter online: longmarchtorome.com/march/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/TOMASI-DMK-LETTER.pdf).
run “100 leagues to the west of the Azores” (and was amended by a Treaty of Tordesillas a year later to 270 miles farther west; *idem*: 356). From now on, all newly discovered lands to the west of the line belonged to Spain, and everything to the east to Portugal, as shown on the map below (the red line represents the demarcation in *Inter Caetera*; the green one – in the Treaty of Tordesillas). 3

---

3 Over three decades later, in April 1529, Spain and Portugal signed a peace treaty known as Treaty of Zaragoza, which specified the anti-meridian to the Treaty of Tordesillas demarcation line, thus defining and appropriating their respective zones of influence in Asia.
compromise to help avoid trade wars and crossing each other’s ship routes, for the Dutch the sea constituted access to coveted ‘barter goods’. Interestingly, the Dutch managed to weave a theological argument into the very principle of trade:

God Himself says this speaking through the voice of nature; and inasmuch as it is not His will to have Nature supply every place with all the necessaries of life, He ordains that some nations excel in one art and others in another. Why is this His will, except it be that He wished human friendships to be engendered by mutual needs and resources, lest individuals deeming themselves entirely sufficient unto themselves should for that very reason be rendered unsociable? So by the decree of divine justice it was brought about that one people should supply the needs of another, in order, as Pliny the Roman writer says, that in this way, whatever has been produced anywhere should seem to have been destined for all. (…) Those therefore who deny this law, destroy this most praiseworthy bond of human fellowship, remove the opportunities for doing mutual service, in a word do violence to Nature herself. (idem: 7-8)

To strengthen his argument Grotius evokes Nature’s own design: the boundlessness of ocean and wind. Quoting Seneca he reaffirms that the ocean itself, “navigable in every direction with which God has encompassed all the earth” is a proof that Nature “has given to all peoples a right of access to all other peoples”. Also the wind is seen as “Nature's greatest service” to unite “the widely scattered peoples”, making by default the “commercial intercourse a necessity to mankind” (idem: 8).4

For the Spaniards and the Portuguese the overseas explorations came with the holy duty to lead the inhabitants of the newly discovered territories “to embrace the Christian profession” (Alexander VI: 62), but the Dutch understanding of God’s mission was more basic: to establish the “most praiseworthy bond of human fellowship” by means of “commercial intercourse” which would allow them to redistribute the goods “destined for all”, just as Nature intended. In a way, they and their merchant vessels were only instruments in the service of the “religion of trade”: a religion that quickly spread throughout Asia.

4 A testimony to Grotius’ writings being popularised beyond a mere philosophical divagation can be found in contemporaneous and later writings. For example, in the Seconde Lettre D’un Ami à Danzig à un Ami à Amsterdam from 1714, regarding the trade conflicts in the Baltic sea region, the Swedish Ambassador in the Hague Joachim Fredrik Preis (1667-1759) summarizes his correspondents’ line of reasoning: “Vous philosophez beaucoup sur le droit de vôtre liberté de Navigation & de la Commerce. Vous la fondez tantôt sur le Droit de la Nature, tantôt sur le Droit des Gens, & tantôt sur la Neutralité” but then discredits it with a very well aimed argument: “[…] Vous seriez sans doute offencez, si on vouloit, par exemple, mettre la maxime de la liberté de Commerce que vous faites sonner si haut en Europe, si, dis-je, on la voulait mettre en usage envers vos États dans les Indes. Cerities, vous fouleriez au pied cette Doctrine aussi galament que la Croix au Japon; l’affaire de Bantam & d’Amboine, ce semble, ne verifie pas mal ce qu’on avance. Les Hollandois n’y épargnerent ni ruses ni forces pour empêcher que les Anglois n’y établissent leur Commerce” ([Preis], Lettre 1714: 4-5).
In contrast to other seaborne powers like Spain and Portugal, all overseas dealings of the Republic of the Seven United Provinces (Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Provinciën) were conducted not by a central monarch, but by trading companies (the Dutch East and West India Companies, VOC and WIC). Their federal structure, rather unique for Europe, was a reflection of the Dutch Republic’s political structure and, in the case of the VOC, directly as a result of a 1602 merger of Voor-Compagnieen, or ‘pre-companies’ which since the end of 16th century individually attempted to establish trading routes with Southeast Asia.

In spite of the unstable political situation in the Netherlands, initially fighting to regain sovereignty from the Spanish Crown and then involved in the Anglo-Dutch Wars, the VOC managed to become one of the major players in the world sea trade. Although the Company started off without any significant military ambitions, the fierce rivalry from the Portuguese and Spanish soon made them change their strategy. In 1605 the second fleet was already heavily armed and prepared to launch an attack on the Portuguese. And since that date, military force could – and in various degrees was – also be exerted against anybody. Initially run by the board of directors called Lord or Gentlemen XVII (Heeren XVII) based in Amsterdam, it soon turned out that in order to guarantee smooth operation, it was necessary to appoint a Governor-General and a Council (de Hooge Regering) residing in Batavia. In practice, this move drastically reduced the power of the Gentlemen XVII to the point where if local VOC interests were not compatible with those of the Dutch Republic, the governor would carry on with his own policy, like in 1640 when he refused to end the wars with the Portuguese until 1644, in spite of a peace treaty signed in Europe (Mostert 2007: 8).

As a result, the VOC was much more than just a commercial company. The privileges granted in the regularly renewed and amended charter (octrooi) included these typically reserved for a state: concluding treaties, waging wars, building forts, appointing directors, etc. (cf. Van Santen 2016). With its 4700 ships transferring almost 1 million passengers and transporting 3.4 million tons of cargo, the VOC was the most successful trading company in the 17th and 18th century (its biggest rival, the British East India Company had ‘only’ 2600 ships (Gaastra 2007)). The Company’s growth and commercial success was initially stimulated by it winning monopoly on spice trade. Later, intra-Asian trade between its establishments became a source of huge supplementary income. At the end of 17th century, tea from China, Arabian coffee and textiles from India captured the imagination of people in Europe, which led to a significant market growth. In so doing, the VOC has also contributed to what De Vries (1994: 249) has labelled the “Industrious Revolution”, a period of economic growth driven by a household-level consumer demand. However, with increasing competition and wars at home, VOC’s profits dropped while administrative expenses and corruption grew. Hence, the company was officially dissolved in 1800.

---

5 The issue of VOC warfare has not been well studied (besides Knaap & Teitler, 2002). For a historical analysis of 1655-1663 period see Mostert (2007).
2.3 The VOC and its attitudes towards indigenous languages

From a geographical point of view, the map of VOC areas of influence and activity remained very patchy: it stretched from a colony in the African Cape to a small-scale trade post on a minuscule artificial island in front of the coast of Japan. Whereas the native people in Indonesia suffered from unabashed Dutch colonization in the worst sense of the word, Dutch merchants exerted far less power and supremacy in other long-term posts overseas. They themselves distinguished three categories of administration in Asia: first, the cities and territories obtained by conquest (such as Batavia, today’s Jakarta, and Malakka); second, rather large-scale factories, with (exclusive) trade contracts with local rulers (Ayutthaya, the royal capital of Siam, is an example); third, small-scale posts (e.g. Nagasaki and Canton), which were extremely strictly controlled by local authorities (Blussé 2008: 34-35). Considering these various local contexts, it does not surprise that the VOC did not establish a unified language policy. Whereas the Portuguese, English and Spanish colonial powers eventually succeeded in imposing their own languages to the indigenous populations, Dutch became a major language only in Suriname and South Africa (Willemyns 2014: 196; 212-214). One Early Modern Dutchman ascribed this to the ‘congenital modesty’ that was so typical to the Dutch, whereupon he, quite ironically, immediately suggested that it was also possible that Dutchmen were more talented in mastering foreign languages thanks to their ‘particular ingenuity’ (Maier & Van der Putten 2002: 101 offer some contextualization).

Present-day scholars, startled about this relatively modest impact of Dutch, have been arguing that the relatively small native language communities in the Americas and in Africa were more likely to adopt the language of the colonial powers through the larger influx of European emigrants (see Willemyns 2014: 212-214). Asian communities, on the other hand, proved to be more resistant as they remained powerful in both numbers and organization (Groeneboer 1998: 21-22). Moreover, in several new Dutch settlements the language of another European power had become a well-established link language. Both the ‘higher variety’ of Portuguese and Portuguese-based Creoles were used in several Asian trade posts. Willemyns (2014: 213) has stressed how VOC strategies in general were highly characterized by pragmatism, and that the same holds for their language policy. This does not imply that there have not been any trials to introduce Dutch as a general language for education and religion. As early as 1611, the VOC published *Sovrat A.B.C.*, attributed to Albert Cornelis Ruyl (life dates unknown), a basic introduction to the Latin alphabet accompanied by some Christian prayers for the use of [Malay-speaking] children from East India. Other works and catechisms followed (cf. Thiiento 2014; Groeneboer 1993: 43-45).

In India, Dutch Seminars were established so as to educate children in both Dutch and the local language (Tamil or Sinhalese) so that they would be able “to teach and educate others for the Company’s benefit” (Van Dam 1954: 19). In many other cases, VOC officials tended to hire local interpreters. However, Early Modern
tradesmen knew the risks of being entirely dependent on interpreters, even to the point that it became a *topos* in Early Modern treatises presenting the ‘perfect ambassador’: an interpreter could always deliberately twist words (see Sutherland 2010). The pragmatic solution applied by Dutch commanders in Golconda (India) consisted in “mastering Telugu to that extent that they could express their opinion as well as control the interpreters’ job” (Van Dam 1954: 264). Thus, some degree of knowledge of local languages was a daily necessity for ordinary employees. Fleischer mentions how Jan Wilhelm van Grevenbroek (1644-1726) recommended his fellow settlers in the Cape to gain a basic knowledge of the local Khoi language, commenting that the “Dutch ought to be aware how firm a bond of union a common language is, and how powerful a means it is of keeping peoples loyal and peaceful” (quoted after Fleischer 2010: 260). Although imposing one’s language to the native population can be seen as a means of ‘overpowering’ this population, the company also saw a danger in ‘Dutchifying’ the settlements: once these natives had acquired Dutch, they would be able to make active use of this language precisely against the colonizing forces (Willems 2014: 197; 213). In their relations with the Dutch traders, the Japanese authorities had a similar concern with the power of language. They were so eager in protecting their own language that all the dealings with the Dutch were conducted via a team of 150 interpreters of different ranks, whose jobs were hereditary. This was enough “to prevent the Dutch from having to learn Japanese” (Goodman 2000: 20). Hence, a Dutch VOC-official was forced to leave Japanese soil in 1718, as he was said to have a too profound knowledge of the language (Feenstra Kuiper 1921: 173).

The following sections will explore to what extent the Dutch scientific interests as well as commercial and missionary activities resulted in the production of written language learning aids.

### 2.4 VOC as the agent in the broadening of the linguistic horizons

Unlike the potentially lucrative study of medicinal plants and minerals, well able to attract Company’s sponsorship (Baas 2002: 125), language studies did not receive much financial support from the VOC. Nevertheless, publications devoted to the natural sciences often contained indirect linguistic information. The most famous is probably *Hortus Malabaricus* by Hendrik Adriaan Van Reede (1636-1691), a monumental work edited by a team of nearly a hundred people (some named in the preface) and published in Amsterdam during the period 1686-1703. *Hortus* contained plant names in Latin, English, Arabic, Konkani and Malayam (notably, it was the first instance of Malayalam script in print). Colonial botany was a nationwide passion. German-born Paul Hermann (1646-1695), who spent five years in Ceylon as a Medical Officer to the Dutch East India Company, returned to Europe with a collection of dried plants, insects and drawings, today preserved in the Natural History Museum in London. It was one of the first major collections of the botany of the East Indies, and was famously used by Linnaeus for his taxonomical studies. Published posthumously by William Sherard under the title *Musaeum*
Zeylanicum sive catalogus plantarum, in Zeylana sponte nascentium (1717), the book recorded native “Ceylonic” (Sinhala and occasionally Tamil) names of plants and plant parts. Similarly, another German-born botanist Georg Eberhard Rumphius (1627-1702) produced works that must have inspired the nation’s passion for curiosities: _D’Amboinsche rariteitkamer_ (1705) (see Leuker 2010) and _Het Amboinsche kruidboek or Herbarium Amboinense_ (1741). His _Thesaurus imaginum piscium testaceorum_ from 1711 contained words in 17 languages, including ten from Asia:

![Figure 2.2: List of languages occurring in Rumphius’ _Thesaurus_ (1711)](image)

Often, the philological interest went hand in hand with the study of _naturalia_ and other objects and antiques from Asia. Even drawings of ancient architectural inscriptions in undeciphered languages, samples of non-European scripts as well as inscriptions on foreign coins and objects, were sought after, circulated and eagerly studied by curious minds in Europe. Van Campen (2000) presents the case of

---

6 In the Asian and African Studies section of the British Library, there are two Sinhalese manuscripts from the collection of the English orientalist Thomas Hyde (1636–1703). The first of them, MS 81 (REG 16B XX), entitled _Vocabularium Senalese seu Insulae Ceylon in India Orientali_ is a seven-page vocabulary including body parts, days of week and months, and honourable titles of persons (Regis Ceylonensis Ministri) in Sinhala and Latin. The Sinhala words are written “in an uninformd irregular hand, apparently by a European unacquainted with the language” (from the catalogue description by Martino de Zilva Wickremasinghe (1900: 90). The second manuscript (MS 83, REG 16. B. III) _Alphabetum Zinghalensin_ is a four-page pamphlet containing “the Sinhalese alphabet, with the names of letters and their equivalent sounds in Roman character, arranged in parallel columns, and followed by a similar list of consonants combined with vowels, a few notes on pronunciation, and ten Sinhalese words with their meanings in Latin” (idem: 93). Both manuscripts come most probably from the hand of Paul Hermann, who upon his return to Europe in 1679 became a professor of botany at Leiden University.
Jean Theodore Royer (1737-1807), a lawyer from The Hague, who, unsatisfied by the lack of Chinese dictionaries started compiling his own, based on available European publications, notably manuscripts produced by the Jesuits in China from the library of book collector Johan Meerman (1753-1815). Royer’s VOC connections helped him consult experts in Chinese language and meet providers of Chinese artificialia. He even managed to borrow a Chinese servant named Tan Assoy from his VOC friend for a couple of weeks to work on the labels and descriptions for his collection of Chinese objects (Van Campen 2000: 400).

All the same, the overseas VOC activities resulted in a wide range of published and unpublished linguistic materials. The earliest wordlists of Telugu and Malagasy and a phrasebook of Malay were written down by Dutch merchants and explorers, Peter Willemsz. Floris van Elbinck and Frederik de Houtman (1571-1627) (cf. Lombard 1970; Bertrand 2013). Many other works in Malay followed (Ronkel 1936, 543-598). In Sri Lanka, Dutch Calvinist clergy (Baldaeus, Cat, Ruëll et al.) produced works on Tamil and Sinhala. Formosan languages Siraya and Favorlang, now extinct, owe their first descriptions to the efforts of Dutch ministers in Taiwan (Klöter 2008: 207-223); the first word list of Korean comes from a Dutchman (Vos 1975). Europe’s earliest published translation from Sanskrit was prepared (via Portuguese) by Abraham Rogerius; the first grammar of Hindustani was composed by the VOC merchant and ambassador Ketelaar. Unfortunately, very few of those works survived till today. There was no push from the VOC to get them printed, and, needless to say, the fate of the manuscripts shipped by sea was never certain: if they made it safe to Europe, they might have got lost in the piles of papers of a VOC bureaucrat – or indeed, of an interested scholar. Den Besten quotes the case of two glossaries of African language Khoekhoe that were sent on two occasions from the Kaap to Amsterdam, and which were promptly forwarded to a German orientalist Hiob Ludolf (Job Leutholf, 1624-1704) by the mayor of Amsterdam Nicolaas Witsen (1641-1717):

In a letter dated The Hague, 16 December 1691 Witsen says: “Nil mihi ultimae naues Indicae adportunat [read: adportaverunt], praeter vocabula aliquot Hottentotica, quae heic habes.” That is: “The last ships from India have brought me nothing but some Hottentot words, which you receive herewith.” (Den Besten 2010: 277 n29).

Incidentally, these wordlists were never published in their original form in The Netherlands, and Het compendium off vocabulaer van de Hottentotsche taele by the same author Georg Friedrich Wrede (ca. 1635-1672) also got lost, although the VOC wanted to have it printed (Den Besten 2012: 336-337).

Not surprisingly, not all languages had enjoyed similar interest and attention; and not all the works had an equal linguistic or pragmatic value. Depending on the circumstances of creation, purpose of the text and even author’s background, we can distinguish different categories of such documents. In the following section, I will present a few less known examples, describing the main characteristics of the text and placing them in context of the VOC activity in the area where the language was spoken.
Since the times of first explorations, travelogues and geographical descriptions of newly discovered territories included linguistic information. The most basic forms were wordlists with common nouns, numerals, as well as names of places, etc. Any such information, no matter how fragmental, was quickly picked up, collected and studied by interested authors in Europe. Van Hal noted how Ludolf appreciated his VOC informant for samples as small as a list of numbers in Hindustani (Pytlowany & Van Hal 2016: 31).

Vink (2015: 142) attributes the almost instantaneous transfer of information about Asia to a “brisk export trade in books throughout Western Europe” in which Amsterdam in particular played a role of the “metropolis of print” (ibid.).

Olfert Dapper (1636-1698), a polyglot medical doctor, historian and geographer who himself never travelled outside the Netherlands, compiled a series of authoritative descriptions of foreign countries based on travel reports of other missionaries and explorers, which also included linguistic information. In his work Asia, of Naukeurige beschryving van Het Rijk des Grooten Mogols on the Mughal Empire from 1672, for example, he distinguishes between the religious groups: Wat de tale der Indianen belangt: een andere gebruiken de Mooren of Mahometanen: en een andere de Heidensche Indianen (“In what concerns languages of the Indians: The Moors, or Mahometans, use one language, and the Hindus use another’, 1672: 74). Then he quotes Della Valle’s claim that the languages of India are almost the same, and differ only in writing as they use different alphabets. Dapper also mentions the language of the learned Brahmins, which has a similar function to Latin; and discusses the use of Persian, Arabic and Turkish. But in conclusion, he admits the Malay seems to be the most widespread, and he presents seven pages of Dutch-Malay vocabulary. Dapper’s open-minded descriptions of South Indian religion fitted well in an anti-dogmatic empiricism that became characteristic of the Dutch Radical Enlightenment (Vink 2015: 143). In contrast, his comments on languages carry aesthetic judgements: the letters used by Brahmins are “big, clear and beautiful” (schoone en klare, doch groote letteren); Hindustani is very similar to Persian and Arabic yet it is liefelijker en lichter uit te spreken (lovelier and lighter to pronounce); Persian spoken at the court is “a bit bastardised in pronunciation” compared to “the original Persian” (een weinig verbastert in d’uitsprake van d’eerste Persiaensche tale). The Turkish used by common Muslim people is “not as pretty and refined as that of genuine Turcs” (niet zoo cierlijk en geschaeft, als oprechtge gebooren Turken). But of all Indian languages the one with “nicest words and the most beautiful way of speaking” (d’aengenaemste woorden en cierlijkste wijze en aert van spreken) is this of Malakka (Dapper 1672: 81).

7 “On f. 82” he [Ludolf] noted that ‘a certain Dutchman, returned from Suratta, reported that the following numbers were used in Hindostani, pronounced as follows: 1. êek; 2. do; 3. dîn; 4. giahr; 5. bânch; 6. chö/Tschö; 7. sêr; 8. âr; 9. noh; 10. tês. [...]’ He added that these numbers ‘were written in an imperfect way’, and he assigned some of these numbers (1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9) with a letter P written in red ink, thus hinting at similarities with Persian” (Pytlowany & Van Hal 2016: 31).
The Dutch Orientalist and cartographer Adriaan Reland (1676-1718) in his miscellaneous dissertations (*Dissertationum miscellanearum pars tertia et ultima*, 1708) also used geographical and linguistic information provided by various European travellers and VOC informants. One such contact person, now largely forgotten, was Java-based expert on Malay, Cornelis Mutter (1659-?), author of an extensive Malay-Dutch dictionary (cf. Reid 2014: 53). Besides longer descriptions of Malay, Sinhala, or Tamil, likely obtained via his VOC contacts, Reland also published a series of short ‘sailors’ wordlists’ in languages of Solomon Islands, Cocos Islands, New Guinea, Moses Island, and Moa Island copied from Spanish explorer Antonio de Herrera (1549-1625). For access to travel reports, Reland as well as Dapper definitely benefited from their friendship with Witsen, who from 1693 was also VOC *bewindhebber* (shareholder acting as managing director) (Vink 2015: 143). Witsen himself holds a record for most languages mentioned in one work: in his opus magnum *Noord en oost Tartaryen* from 1692 containing detailed descriptions of flora, fauna, people and cultures of Central Asia, he incorporated word lists in 26 languages. Some of them he might have collected personally during his trip to Russia, other ones were supplied by Witsen’s informants: Dutchmen working in Russia, the VOC employees sent to the East, important people in the Russian empire such as statesmen and foreign researchers; he also consulted classical European and Arabic authors (De Graaf & Naarden 2007: 207). The book, besides word samples of Jakut, Samoyed, Mongolian, Georgian, Crimean, Kalmuk and other languages, contains a list of 143 Korean words – possibly, first such list in Europe. The man who provided it to Witsen was Mattheus Eibokken (ca. 1634-?). He was a survivor from the Dutch ship *Sparweer* (where he was a surgeon) sailing from Formosa (Taiwan) to Nagasaki, which got wrecked off Cheju Island in August 1653. Together with 36 crew members, famously including Hendrik Hamel (1630-1692) who later wrote the first European account of Korea based on first-hand experience (Hamel 1668), they ended up as prisoners of the King and prohibited from leaving the country. Only eight of them, including Hamel and Eibokken, managed to escape thirteen years later.

Not unlike the explorer Frederick de Houtman (1571-1627) who used the two years of his captivity in Sumatra to learn Malay, or Robert Knox (1641-1720), the British East India Company captain who after 19 years of captivity in the Ceylonese Kingdom of Kandy wrote a comprehensive account of the island and the language, also Hamel and his companions used the time of captivity to learn the language and

---

8 Compare Herrera (1622: f. 81v-83r) and Reland (1708: 121-137).
9 Extended second edition was published by Halma in Amsterdam in 1705.
10 This statistics is taken from The Nicolaas Witsen Project (http://www.mercator-research.eu/research-projects/endangered-languages/the-nicolaas-witsen-project/) according to which “Much of the linguistic material has been investigated and compared to the present day language situation in Siberia” (http://www.culturalheritageconnections.org/wiki/Nicolaas_Witsen accessed on May 30, 2017). For a full list based on the first edition from 1692, see Marsden 1796: 73.
11 Cf. Knox 1681.
culture of the country of their involuntary residence. Although Hamel’s description of Korea is very brief, his observations on the language are quite interesting. Among other remarks, he mentions three types of script: one for printing books, similar to Chinese; one used by higher governors; and the last type, used by women and simple men (1.04.02 Archief Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie, inv. nr. 1265, p.1169a).12 Eibokken interviewed by Witsen about the country’s geography and culture confirmed Hammel’s information on the language, and produced a list of 143 Korean to be added to Witsen’s collection.13 Eibokken, who must have been around 60 at that time, recalled that

De spraek op Korea, heeft in klang geen gemeinschap met ’t Sineesch, ’t geen Meester Eibokken oderdeelde, om dat hy de Koresche Tael zeer wel spreekende, van de Sineeven op Batavia niet wierde verstaen, doch Zy konden malkanders schriften leesen; Zy hebben meer als eenderlei schriften; Oonjek14 is een schrift by hen, als by ons loopend, hangende alle de letteren aen malkander: van het zelfde bedient zich de gemeene man; de andere lettergreepen zijn met die van Sina eenderlei. (Witsen 1705: 59)

‘The sounds of the language of Korea have nothing in common with the Chinese. This was Master Eibokken’s opinion, because he spoke the Korean language very well, but was not understood by the Chinese at Batavia. Yet they can read each other’s writing. They possess more than one system or writing. Their Oonjek is comparable to our running hand: all letters are attached to each other. This [kind of writing] is used by the common man. The other syllables15 [sic] are the same as those of Sina.’ (Translation: Vos 1975: 28-29)

12 “Soo veel haer spraeck schrijven, en reekenen belangt, haer spraeck is alle andere spraken different [sic], Is seer moeijlijck te leeren, doordien sjij een dingh op verschillende maniere noemen, spreeken seer prompt ende langsaem voorname lijk, onder ’t grooten ende geleerde, schrijven op drie derlij maniere, teerste ofte principaelste Is gelijk dat van de Chinessen, ende lapanders, op deze wijse worden alle hare boecken gedrucht, ende geschreven, ’t land ende de overheijt rakende geschreven tweede, Is seer, vast, gelijk ’t loopent int vaderlant wort veel bij d’ grooten ende d’ gouverneurs gebruijct, om vonisse in, ende opostille op requeste te stellen, mitsgaders brieven, aan malkanderen te schrijven, alsoo de gemeene man niet wel lesen can, het derde ofte en slechtste wort vande vrouwen ende gemeene man geschreven” (1.04.02 Archief Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie, inv nr. 1265, p.1169a) Transcription Henny Savenije, source: http://www.hendrick-hamel.henny-savenije.pe.kr/transcription/page1169a.html.

13 According to Osterkamp, Witsen’s account of Korea is a compilation from various published and unpublished writings (among others, Martino Martini, 1614-1661, and Andreas Cleyer, 1634-1697/98?) as well as Hamel’s companions (Osterkamp 2010: 18, 20).

14 Osterkamp commenting on Vos’ interpretation of it as “translation [from the Chinese] into ḍānmun 言文 = han’gil” (Vos 1975: 29 n91) suggest that Vos might not be mistaken and that possibly, the word was indeed used (as well) in the general meaning of ‘Korean script’, and quotes John Ross’ Corean Primer (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, 1877: 7), where it occurs as ünchen 언의 율문 (Osterkamp 2010: 24 n61).

15 The use of the word lettergreep (‘syllable’) is quite curious here, but in his letter to Cuper from 12th October 1712, Witsen makes a clear distinction between Chinese characters (characters) and Sinhalese letters (letteren) (Gebhardt 2006 [1882] II: 345).
It was also VOC merchants and explorers Floris van Elbinck (life dates unknown) and Frederik de Houtman (1571–1627) who wrote down the earliest Dutch wordlists in Malay and Malagasy (cf. Ronkel 1936; Bertrand 2013; Lombard 1970). But those sailing merchants needed better knowledge of the language than just enough to be able to get supplies on route. De Houtman adapted and popularized another language help: *t’samen-sprekingen* (conversations, or dialogues), particularly effective for practicing communication skills. In the following section I will present his *Spraeck ende woord-boeck, in de Maleysche ende Madagaskarsche talen, met vele Arabische ende Tursche woorden. Inhoudende twaelf tsamensprekinghen inde Maleysche, ende drie in de Madagaskarsche spraken [...], which set a model for other Dutch works of this type.

### 2.4.2 Sailors and merchants

De Houtman’s work was modelled on Noël de Berlaimont’s (?-1531) popular octolinguial phrasebook and glossary “Colloquien oft t’samen-sprekingen met eenen vocabulaer in acht spraeken...” from 1527 (Dutch edition was printed in Middelburg in 1631). Just like the original, which was aimed at merchants and travellers (“seer nut tot Coopmanschap, reyse ende andere behandelingen” – title page), De Houtman’s book was written to serve the travellers to the Oost-India (*sonderling nut voor de gheene die de Landen van Oost-Indien besoecken* – title) but also, interestingly, his observations were meant for the entertainment for “all the curious amateurs of foreign things” (*niet min vermakelick voor alle curieuse lief-hebbers van vreemdicheydt* – from the title page). And indeed, besides more ordinary conversations at the table or in the market, or advice on how to approach one’s debtor, some more exotic scenes are bound to teach and to entertain. Weighing of pepper, the topic of Conversation VIII is one of them: – *Hola Heer, weecht rechtelick / ghy en laet den oncer niet los uyt de handt / gheeft ons onsegherechtichheydt* (Lombard 1970: 93) (‘C’mon, Sir, weight properly! Don’t let the scales out of your hand! Give us our due!’) The quality of pepper is also an important issue and requires certain expertise: *Die Peper is ydel en licht / sy is te jong van de stam ghepluckt / ende dede is te nat vant water / soo dat hy schijnt gheweyckt te zijn / oock isser zand in geme ngt met steen / om dat het te swaerder weghen soude / daerom en begeer ick die niet t’ ontfanghen / want zy soude de goede Peper bederven* (idem: 92) (‘This pepper is hollow and light; it’s been picked too early. This one is too wet – it looks to me like it had been soaked. And also, it has sand and gravel [stones] mixed in to make it heavier. So I’m not taking it as it would spoil the good pepper’ [all translations mine]).

Elements of inter-cultural communication are presented across many chapters. In conversation I, the captain of the ship is brought to meet the king, and he presents himself as a humble slave: *Eere sy den Coning: versoecck van my als slaef van sijn Majesteyt / om te mogen spreken* (‘Hail to the king! Your Majesty’s slave is asking for permission to speak’ idem: 27). After exchanging the pleasantries, the king orders to feed the captain with best food and wine, and excuses himself from not
drinking because of the medicine he is taking (drink ick niet / het is om dat ick medicijn ghebruyck. idem: 29). The book is full of cultural information about the Indonesian islands. In conversation iv, Dutchman Jacob is lost in a forest but fortunately, a local Indian named Gabriel hears his calls. –God geve u gheluck heer / van waer comt ghy soo root? Ende so besweet zijn? (‘May God bless you with luck, where are you coming from all red and bathed in sweat?’ idem: 52). On hearing the story of how Jacob lost the path when hunting for birds with his companions, Gabriel offers him refreshments. –Geeft my eens wijn de palm te drincken / ende geeft my ee jonghe kokesnoot t’eten (‘Give me some palm wine and a young coconut to eat’), implores Jacob. (idem: 55).

In all sailors’ phrasebooks, getting provisions for the ship is a recurrent theme. Also in De Houtman Conversation iii is devoted to this topic. On meeting a local Indian, a Dutch sailor asks for some animals and fruit to buy, but he’s reluctant to follow his guide: –Isset verre te gaen? Ick en gaen niet garen door bosschen. Wanter dickwils veel wilt ghediert is / als Tygers / Renosters / oft Slanghen / daer ick vervaert voor zy (‘Do we have to walk far? I don’t usually wander in forests since there are often wild animals, such as tigers, rhinoceros or snakes, which I’m afraid of’ – idem: 43).

It is also a good opportunity for De Houtman to talk about treacherous sea travels. Seeing how exhausted the sailor is, the Indian asks how long he has been at sea. Four months, answers the sailor. Dat is te lang in Zee te zijn / ick soude wel haest sterven dat ick soo langhe op de Zee was (‘That’s too long at sea; I’d be almost dead if I stayed at see for so long’), responds the Indian. But if there were no people who would be willing to risk their lives at sea, this world would remain unexplored” points out the Dutch sailor (idem: 42). The last conversation in the book is devoted to navigation (Scheeps-varinghe): passengers are invited and they negotiate the price for the passage; they ask about safety on ship, which in this case is ensured by carrying cannons and weapons. De Houtman’s sense of humour shines throughout the book. In the same conversation, the passenger asked to pay 15 krones for the passage inquires: ende ist dat t’schip verdrinckt of sinckt / en dat ick verdrincke? (‘And what if the ship goes under and sinks, and I drown?’) –Soo sul dy vracht vry / en costeloos zijn (‘then you travel for free – no need to pay’ – idem:159). Then things take turn for the worse, and we get a glimpse of what it must have been like to be left on the mercy of the elements. A massive storm comes; the terrified passenger is begging: Om Gods wille laet ons hierhavene nemen / en uit den schepegaen / ick zal u gheven al dat ik inde Werelt hebbe (‘In the name of God, let us find a haven and let’s get out of the ship. I’ll give you everything I have in the world’). After the storm has passed, the relieved passenger sights: Ick meynde wel begraven te worden tusschen de golven / ende een spijse der visscher te zijne. ( ‘I thought I was already buried under the waves and became food for the fish’ idem: 166). The captain admits: Die niet ghevaren en heeft / en weet niet wat vreese is. (The one who’s never travelled at sea does not know what fear is’, ibid.).
De Houtman’s work also contains some grammatical sketches but typically, this was not a common occurrence. More complicated grammatical description became a specialty of a different class of VOC employees: Dutch Reformed Church ministers.

2.4.3 Missionaries and teachers

For most of the time, the continuous relationship between VOC and the Dutch Reformed Church had been uneasy for both parties. The chartered religious responsibilities of the Company remained nominal and were implemented only when Christianity did not interfere with the trade.\(^{16}\) Even if the Dutch Reformed Church pastors were appointed to work on the ships as well as overseas as Company’s paid employees, the VOC had more interest in them catering to the spiritual needs of their compatriots, or rather: to create a “favourable moral climat” (Zubkova 2004: 14) than to active conversion of the natives (Groot 2009: 26-27). In the Republic, where the VOC financed establishing of the Seminarium Indicum (Seminary for the Indies) at Leiden University in 1622, their subsides were discontinued already eleven years later when they realised the chaplains were actually putting the evangelisation of the natives above Company trade profits (Moffett 2014: 216). Unlike in the Republic, where the local congregations were organised in clasis and synods, the members of the Reformed Church in Asia were not allowed to form any hierarchy and were ruled directly by the Company; the Company solely decided about the placement of ministers (van Goor 1982: 110). At the same time, predikants enjoyed a relatively high position in the Company ranks, only after the governor and the opperkoopman. The assistant to the minister was called ziekentrooster, (a.k.a. krankbezoeker or lekelezer, literally ‘comforter of the sick’ or ‘visitor’). The assistants were ranked much lower since they had no university education, and could only lead a prayer, sing a couple of psalms and provide spiritual care for the sick and dying.\(^{17}\)

Shortage of staff was a general issue of the Protestant missions; having eradicated monasticism from their territories, they also lost a significant work force. The Roman Church had an army of young, single, well-educated and enthusiastic men at her disposal. Meanwhile, the Dutch were trying hard to find suitable candidates for the pastoral jobs overseas. Even the creation of the aforementioned Seminarium Indicum failed to produce volunteers for the missionary service. It is estimated than in the period between 1602-1799, less than 1000 Dutch ministers travelled to work in the East (cf. Begrippenlijst Nederlands-Indië, http://www.nedindie.nl/Z.htm).

---

\(^{16}\) The Instruction for the first Governor-General Pieter Booth (1550-1615) from 1609 stipulates that the East Indian trade must serve “spreading Christ’s word” (tot verbreiding van de naam van Christus) and “the salvation of non-Christians” (tot zaligheid der onchristenen) (Jonge 1865: 132).

\(^{17}\) The other positions in the Dutch Reformed Church were ouderling, or elder, and diaeken – deacon, brother-attendant to the poor. In Ceylon, predikants were assisted by proponents – men who had done a theological course.
However, in places where the Dutch administration was established, the Dutch Reformed Church assumed an important role: managing the language policy on the ground. One of the best examples of such intertwined colonial-missionary situation is Sri Lanka (or Ceylon, as the Europeans named it). Invited by the King of Kandy Rajasinghe II to help liberate Ceylon from the Portuguese, the Dutch soon took advantage of their position. In 1656, they established a colony in Colombo. One of the first Governors, Rijkloff van Goens (1659-1675) had the ambition to make Ceylon a “New Netherlands”; he even hoped that the East Indian Company would prefer Colombo as its residence, instead of Batavia. His linguistic policy was aimed at the establishing of the Dutch language as the main language of the island. However, eradicating, or even replacing “the language of the enemy”, Portuguese, was not an easy task, so some radical means had to be introduced:

Ydere inwoonderen deses eylants gelast ende bevolen hare slaven (wel verstaande jongens ofte mannen), alle die de Duytse tale niet spreecken konnen, het haar van den hoofde kort doen affsnijden ende soodanich sonder hoeden dragen laten totdat sij Duysts connen. (cited from Groeneboer 1993)

‘Every inhabitant of this island is obliged to have the hair of their slaves (boys and men) cut off, of all who are not able to speak Dutch, and prohibit them of wearing hats, until they can speak Dutch.’

This policy was deemed to fail, since the well-established lingua franca of the island was Portuguese (the ‘higher variety’ and the Portuguese-based Creoles) that served as language of contact between the Europeans and the natives for over a century. Even in mixed families where Dutch men married local women, Portuguese was typically spoken at home (Van Goens 1932: 32-3 quoted in Groeneboer 1993) and children were brought up by Portuguese-speaking slaves. Aware of the fact that introducing Dutch on broader scale was virtually impossible, the Dutch Calvinist ministers suggested a two-way approach: through bilingual education and through the activity of proselytism conducted in the island’s main languages, Sinhala and Tamil.18

---

When talking about the 17th and 18th century use, “Tamil” is used as the English equivalent of the “Malabar language” (‘Malabaerse taal’) (cf. James 2007: 188, Zwartjes 2011: 31). Although “lingua Tamulica” was technically more correct, the less precise name “lingua Malabarica” was in popular use. Bartholomäus Ziegenbalg (1682-1719) in his *Grammatica Damulica* calls the language “lingua Damulica” but acknowledges that the Europeans call it “Malabar” (“Damulica... quad Europaei Malabaricam vocant” – 1716: xi). Aware of the usage issue, the English Missionaries of Madras in 1778 entitled their grammar *A grammar for learning the principles of the Malabar language, properly called Tamul or the Tamilian language* yet in the text kept calling the language Malabar, and using the name Tamil only once to make a distinction between registers: “The high, abstruse and poetical Tamul, quite different from the ordinary and common, that is used by all the people, we have nothing to do with (...)”. Paulino a St. Bartholomaeo in his *Alphabeta Indica* (1791: 6) mentions “Malabaricum vulgare” and “Tamulicum” as separate languages. He also makes a distinction between “lower Malayalam” and “higher Malayalam” which he calls “Grantha-Malabarica”. From the 18th century onward, the preferred name in Latin was apparently “lingua Tamulica” (cf. James 2007: 188-190), possibly to avoid confusion with “lingua Malabarica” (“Malabar
One of the most prominent personalities in the field of Tamil was the writer and cartographer Phillipus Baldaeus (1632-1671), nephew of Robert Junius, a missionary to Dutch Formosa. Sent to Ceylon in November 1656, shortly after the Dutch conquest of Colombo, Baldaeus spent eight months in Punto Gale as a VOC chaplain, and then seven years as a *predikant* in Jaffnapatnam (1658-1665; van Langeraad & Visscher 1907: 296). Based on his experiences, and the success of the approach adopted by his missionary uncle in Formosa, Baldaeus believed in *predikants* learning local languages:

> ‘t Is zeker ende gewis, dat het beste middel om de Godts-dienst voort te zetten, hier in bestaat, niet dat men het Volk laat leeren de *Nederlantsche* tale, maar dat de *Leeraars* hare tale leeren: want het eerste zoude langzaam voortgaan, ende zeer kostenlijk vallen, gelijck al mede op andere plaatsen de ervarenheit geleert heeft; nu is het betamelijker dat een Man ofte *leeraars* aanelee de tale van zijn Volk, dan dat alle het Volk leere de tale van den *Leeraar*. (Baldaeus 1672: 152)

> ‘It is sure and certain that the best way to continue God’s service consists not in the [local] people learning Dutch, but the teachers learning their language, because the first way would happen very slowly, and be very costly, as we learned from experience in other places. Nowadays it is more suitable that one man, or a teacher, learns the language of his people than that the whole population had to learn the language of the teacher.’ [transl. mine]

Impressed by the learning methods and resulting language competence of the Jesuits, Baldaeus openly admitted copying their methods and learning materials:

> These [The Franciscans] were succeeded by the Jesuits […] who in their way of teaching both the old and young ones, did far exceed the *Franciscans*, and all other Orders among the *Romanists*. And I am very free to confess, that I have frequently follow’d their Footsteps in reforming the Churches and Schools in *Manaar* and *Jafnapatnam*, as far as they were consistent with our Religion, and consonant to the Genius of these Nations. (Baldaeus 1703: 792)

After his return to Europe in 1666, he wrote *Nauwkeurige Beschryvinge van Malabar en Choromandel, derzelver aangrenzende ryken, en het machtige eyland Ceylon*, a description of coastal India and Ceylon, and a discussion of Hindu religion (which according to Lach draws heavily on a manuscript by the Jesuit Father Giacomo Fenicio (ca. 1158-1632) (Lach & Van der Kley 1993: [995-996]). This work, published in Amsterdam in 1672, also includes an alphabet and a short grammar of Tamil (*Malabaarsche spraak-konst*). Baldaeus introduces it with a
three-page preamble, in which he emphasises that these are the first Tamil letters to come out of a Dutch press. He also praises the work of “the pillars of the falling Babylon” – the Jesuits, who preceded them in discovering the Malabar language, especially the outstanding Fr. “Gaspar D'Aguilar” [Gaspar de Aguilar]. Moreover, he complains about the VOC lagging behind “their enemy the Portuguese” who do not spare costs to get the language books in Tamil printed – not to mention books in Chinese and Japanese. About the language itself he says that it is quite difficult as it has a lot of names for one thing, such as *ook elke dagh in de weke niet alleen, maar in 't gantsche Jaar zijn eygen naam [heeft] ('not only is there a word for every day of the week but every day in the year has a special name’) (Baldaeus 1672: 197). He does not hide his initial difficulties with the language, and describes in detail how he was learning to write. He sings praises of the local *tolk* who helped him with Malabaar as well as Portuguese, and even mentions his name: François [da Fonseca] (*idem*: 192). The same *tolk* is credited with translating Baldaeus’ writings, allegedly published in 1672 in Rotterdam by Johannes Borstius. In another place, Baldaeus remarks how civilised the Malabar people are “daar zy in civiliteyt dikmaals Europaeanen ten hooghtsten beschamen” (‘that by their politeness they oftentimes put Europeans to utmost shame’ – *idem*: 197). Interestingly, when it comes to grammar, Baldaeus presents only a couple of grammatical rules to tease “the curious reader” and saving the rest for a larger grammar, which he already had prepared for print (*idem*: 195). Unfortunately, a few months after writing these words, and even before they were published, Baldaeus passed away. The promised Tamil grammar in Dutch never saw the light of day.

However, the story does not end here: in 2016, a manuscript of a Tamil grammar written in Portuguese surfaced in the Hamburg State and University Library in Germany (Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg, Cod. Orient. 283). According to the collector’s plate in the front paste down, the manuscript comes from the library of Zacharias Conrad Uffenbach (1683-1734), with signature C 25. It was reported by Streit in 1929 in Halle, and since considered lost (Zwartjes 2011: 44). The grammar entitled *Arte Tamul, sive institutio grammatica linguae Malabaricae* was written by the Jesuit father Gaspar de Aguilar (1588-?), as confirmed by a small note on the title page. Surprisingly, the name of Baldaeus VDM (*Verbi divini minister*), written in both Latin and Tamil letters appears on the title page:

---

19 I am indebted to Prof. Ines Županov for sharing this information.
20 Uffenbach’s biography mentions how he travelled Europe in order to “to expand his knowledge and enlarge his library” (“seine Wissenschafft zu vergrossern und seiner Bucherschatz zu bereichner” – Hermann 1753: 73). In winter 1709, he supposedly visited quite a few famous Dutchmen, including Adriaan Reland, Gijsbert Cuper, Peter Burmann, etc. (*idem*: 74). It is possible that during that trip he acquired Baldaeus’ manuscript.
This copy does not seem to be done by Baldaeus own hand. For one thing, he surely
would not waste time copying Catholic elements such as Confessionario or other
prayers. Also, the ink used for the Portuguese part is visibly different from the
‘rusty’ iron gall ink used for annotations in Dutch. Yet undoubtedly, Baldaeus’
Korte Malabaersche Letter-konst is based on it, which is clear even in the
handwriting in Baldaeus’ alphabet plates (note the slightly incorrect orientation of
Tamil letters in print):

Figure 2.4: Fragment with letter na from Korte Malabaersche Letter-konst (left)
and Arte Tamul (right).
The manuscript bears traces of an editorial hand that selected and marked fragments to be included in Baldaeus’ book. There is a note by the conjugation used in the Dutch version, also the Our Father and the Credo are selected in the same rusty–coloured ink (Fig. 2.5).

![Figure 2.5: Fragment with Our Farther marked in a different ink. (Arte Tamul, n. pag.)](image)

The last 16 pages of the manuscript with a heading De Malabaersche Schryffconst look like a barely started draft of a Dutch translation of the part on Tamil script (Arte de escreuer Tamul) from page 42.

![Figure 2.6: Front page of the unfinished Dutch translation (Arte Tamul, n. pag.)](image)
The provenance and origin of the manuscript will require further study. For now, we can presume that the first grammar of Tamil in Dutch would have been based on this earlier Portuguese work of Aguilar.

Even less is known about the provenance and origin of another unpublished manuscript on Tamil entitled *Poginge om net te beschrijven d'eygenschap, kragt en het gebruyk van de Malabaerse vocalen, letteren etc. in vergelijking met die van andere talen* (Universiteitsbibliotheek Utrecht Hs. 1479). It is a treatise on “Malabaric letters” with a grammatical sketch appended, on 28 folios. On the front page, the title says “Hadriani Relandi Grammatica Linguae Malabaricae”, most likely in Reland’s own hand, however, the text itself is written on a different paper and in a different hand. The note at the very end that mentions the town of Chavakachcheri on the Jaffna peninsula suggests that the author was working in the Tamil northern part of the island:

Hier bij had ik gedacht te voegen de conjugatie of vervoeging der werkwoorden, die ik seer net meene opgestelt te hebben, dog de kortheijt des tijts tot mijn verhuijsing na Chavagacheri laet mij niet toe de selve te copieeren, sal s'egter bij d'eerste occagie oversende. (Hs. 1479 f. 28v)

‘Herewith I had thought to add the conjugation or inflection of verbs, which I think to have drawn up very neatly, but the shortness of the time until my moving [of house] to Chavagacheri does not allow me to copy the same, but will send them over at the first occasion.’

Was it Baldaeus, or one of the predikants who followed in his footsteps? The method to learn Tamil for teaching religion developed by Baldaeus, who spent the first 4.5 years serving in Jaffna by himself, became the base for the Dutch ministers for years to come. By the end of the 17th century, the project grew significantly, although not without frictions between the Church and the VOC. In an effort to create a pool of future predikants (ordained ministers), public servants and translators, Dutch seminars were to be established (Van Dam 1954: 229; Valentijn 1726: 454). The hope was that children educated in both Dutch and local language (Tamil or Sinhalese) will then in turn be able “to teach and educate others for the Company’s benefit” (“om anderen te kunnen leeren en onderwijsen voor den dienst van de Companie” – Van Dam 1954: 19).

The first seminary was founded in 1690 at Nallur, in the Tamil-speaking Jaffanapattanam district of North Ceylon, where 27 children were “educated in Dutch and Tamil languages and brought up in the fear of God to the knowledge of the true Christian religion” (“in de Nederlantsche en Mallabaerse taal [...] onderwes, in de vrese Godes opgevoet en tot de kennisse van de ware Christelijcke religie gebragt te worden” - *idem*: 21). Six years later, a Sinhalese seminar was founded in Colombo, where religion was taught in Dutch. By then, in the District of Colombo, 3417 children were studying in 34 Christian schools. The bilingual education Dutch-Sinhalese was to be facilitated by Joannes Amos Comenius’ *Ianua Linguarum*
In the letter of the Church Council of Colombo (of which he was the scribe at the time) from 5th of February 1691, a senior predikant Simon Cat (or Kat, ca. 1630-1704) from Zandaam updates the Gentlemen XVII on ongoing educational and linguistic activities in Ceylon. The name of Johannes de Vooght (1636?- unknown) figures prominently: his knowledge of Tamil was so good that he made a Dutch-Tamil dictionary, compiled some examples of declensions, and started working on conjugations. Under his supervision, Cat started to learn Tamil around 1670 and soon started reversing de Vooght’s dictionary “according to the Tamil alphabet” (‘nae de orde van het Malabaerse A.B.C.’ – idem: 261) but the work was interrupted when the French fleet threatened the Dutch possessions in Ceylon in 1672, during which time he was ordered to serve as ship chaplain. The Governor Ryklof van Goens de Jonge (1642-1687) took personal interest in the dictionaries, and Cat copied and sent him the two, however incomplete, works (idem: 262). Encouraged, Cat started reworking the unfinished grammar of de Vooght, providing “fuller and neater example of Tamil conjugations” (‘een volmaeckter en netter voorbeelt van de Malabaerse conjugatie’), and adding “adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions and interjections” (‘adverbia, praepositiones, cunjunctiones en interjectiones’). More interestingly, he admits attempting to invent some grammatical terms for Tamil and also checking to what extent the Dutch grammatical rules can be used for Tamil (‘[…j] eenige pogingen aangewent om de terminos artis [emph. added] in de Malabaerse tale uyt vinden als oock om te beproeven, hoe verre deselve regulen op gemelte tale applicable sijn’. This work was also sent to the Governor, who then had another idea: to add Dutch equivalents to the Portuguese-Sinhalese dictionary as an attempt to later produce a Dutch version. Local language experts (‘taelkundige Cingalesen’) were to be enlisted to help with the task. Bilingual dictionaries and grammars were to be composed with the local people in mind: for one thing, to learn Dutch, but also to learn their own language properly, i.e. “according to the rules”: “want men sal haest haar eygen Singalese tale volgens regels kunnen leeren, als oock onse Nederduytse tale door behulp van ‘t gene men uyt een Nederduytse letterkonst, de men in handen heft, sal konnen trecken” [“because people should be able to earn their own Sinhalese language according to the rules, just like our own Dutch language which can be learned by a common man from the Dutch grammar book which he has in his hands”] (Van Dam 1954: 227).

It was not until 2013 that a manuscript of the Dutch-Sinhala dictionary composed by Simon Cat and based on Commenius’ Portael (or rather: the index of it) surfaced in Sri Lanka. An edition including a facsimile of its 33 folios was prepared by K. D. Paranavitana and published by the National Archives of Sri Lanka. According to “The register of Tamil and other papers” from 15th April 1697, Cat had already completed the dictionary (along few other linguistic works in Sinhala and Tamil), and on October 24th of the same year, he submitted it to the Governor Gerrit de Heere. The copy of the manuscript had been preserved in the Wolvendaal Church until 1757 (Paranavitana 2013: 21-23). The MS finally ended up in the National
Archives of Sri Lanka where it is kept under the record group 24 “Loan Donations” with the ref. No. 1. In 2011, it was chosen to be edited and published under the Mutual Cultural Heritage project.

The first rector of Colombo seminary Joannes Ruëll (1660 or '63-1701) first arrived in Ceylon in 1690, and within a year became fluent in Portuguese. Soon after, he became the main translator of the governor’s correspondence with the king of Kandy. In 1695, encouraged by Simon Cat, Ruëll was released from his duties for a year and a half, and went to Moratuva in the South-West of Colombo to study Sinhalese. Ruëll swiftly exceeded his colleagues in his knowledge of Sinhala. Motivated by the poor quality of translations of prayers prepared by his colleagues (which he judged so bad that it pushed him to a bitter realisation that it would be better for the children not to learn any religion at all than to learn with such errors), he prepared Sinhalese translations of the catechism and composed a Dutch grammar of Sinhala. Van Dam (1954: 25) offers some more context to the origin of this grammar: in September 1698, during his trip to Tuticorin on the Fishery Coast, Ruëll met a German Jesuit Sebastiaan Sevelet21 who hardly one year after his arrival in India could read and write in Tamil – and even started to preach in this language. He showed Ruëll a catechism in Tamil, as well as a grammar and a dictionary that was given to each new brother to help him learn the language. Galvanised, Ruëll decided to write a similar grammar of Sinhala for the use of Dutch ministers arriving in Ceylon, which he composed within a year.

This work, *Grammatica of Singaleesche Taal-kunst, zynde een korte methode om de voornaamste Fondamenten van de Singaleesche Spraak te leeren* (‘Sinhalese Grammar, being a short method to learn the principal basics of the Sinhalese language’) is a rather innovative book. The care with which the writing system is displayed is quite remarkable: not only are all the letters presented along with the romanised transliteration: thirty-three pages of various ligatures follow, to make sure that at the end of it, the student will be able to read and write. Ruëll also introduces special characters of his own invention, d and t ‘met een streep door het hoofd geteekend’ (‘crossed through the head’) to render the retroflex consonant sounds. In his conjugation paradigms, Ruëll manages to reflect various grades of respect in Sinhala: standard; the more distinguished way (*aanzienlijker*); the most distinguished way of speaking (*De Aanzienlykste wyze van Spreeken*), and the most disdaining way (*De verachtste wyze*). Although still a certain simplification of the

21 Probably Sebastian Souvelet (?-1705) from Luxemburg, recorded in 1695 as a pastor in St. Peter and Paul parish in Buhl, Germany. (Source: [www.kath-kirche-buehl.de/pfarrer.htm](http://www.kath-kirche-buehl.de/pfarrer.htm) ©Reinhard Loeper 2003) According to Jesuit sources (Flasche 1969: 312) he was sent to India in 1698. In 1688/89, he’s mentioned as “rhet. hum. praes. sod. stud.” in Géry (1895: 352). By 1704 he was a secretary of the Jesuit Malabar Mission (I am grateful to Paolo Aranha for this information). Heinrich Niderndorff mentiones him in his *Geographia naturalis absoluta* in a diary of D. Schillinger under 22 February 1702: “Transivimus promontorium & tractum Comorinum, in quo P. Souvelet, P. Hanxleden, et P. Freysleben laboribus Apostolicis fungebantur” (1739: 54).
sophisticated system of Sinhalese honorifics,\textsuperscript{22} we may regard it as an innovative extension of the classical Greco-Latin paradigm of verb inflection. In the final few wordlists, Ruëll takes notice of the diglossia in the language.

The manuscript was sent to the Gentlemen XVII in 1699 and was personally taken in charge by Nicolaas Witsen who commissioned a printer from Amsterdam, François Halma, to publish it. Special Sinhalese characters had to be carved in wood, and as it turned out, it was to be the first book with Sinhala letters printed in Europe.\textsuperscript{23} The process took a long nine years (although the dates on books from that period are not entirely reliable) and finally, in 1708, \textit{Grammatica, off Singaleese Taal Kunst} finally came out. The distribution of the limited edition book was restricted to within the Company – which meant that the general public could not get a copy unless they had a friend in the directories of the VOC ("elle ne se vend point, et on ne la peut avoir que par le crédit de quelque Ami entre les Directeurs des Indes", Gijsbert Cuper (1644-176) informed his correspondent – Cuper 1755: 299). Even the copy in St. Petersburg library, presumably a vestige of Witsen’s Russian connections, is a hand-written copy of the actual printed book. The book is quite rare today, yet there are two manuscript copies of it in The Netherlands; it is quite likely that both were used in the preparation of the printed book: one as a basis for text edition, and the other used by the craftsman who cut wooden blocks of Sinhala characters. Since the manuscripts do not contain Roman transliteration of Sinhala words, yet we find them in the final book, an expert in Oriental languages must also have been involved in the process. It would be interesting to trace who may have done it; one likely candidate is Reland, who not only corresponded with Halma, but also mentioned the grammar in his \textit{Dissertationum miscellanearum partes tres} before it was published. Ruëll’s grammar may well have been a rare success story in the sense that it attained funding and publishing in Europe, however, there was no happy ending in Sri Lanka: the book reached the island well after the author’s premature death, and was judged too difficult and not really useful by his surviving colleagues (some professional jealousy may have played a role as well). However, it remains a good example of a language manual created with a clear purpose to be used to learn a language

When talking about Ceylon, we need to mention another big part of Dutch Reformed Church language activity: preparing translations for religious purposes. Naturally, the main effort of Dutch ministers went into translating prayers, the catechism and the Bible.\textsuperscript{24} The Wolvendaal Foundation\textsuperscript{25} in its history of \textit{Successes

\textsuperscript{22} For a comprehensive overview and discussion of social deixis and honorifics in Sinhala, see Chandralal (2010: 267-272).

\textsuperscript{23} However, since the words were cut in wood block and not cast in lead and movable, they cannot be qualified as first ‘fonts’ or ‘types’ in a bibliographical or typographical sense, as incorrectly stated by Peiris (1943).

\textsuperscript{24} A detailed account of the religious works translated into Sinhalese and Tamil is presented in van Troostenburg de Bruyn 1884, of which extracts were published in English in the Journal of the Dutch Burgher Union (1941, Vol. 30, No. 4, 116-130).
and Pitfalls of the Dutch Reformed Church (1642–2010) mentions the names of a few others ‘Predikants of repute’ who contributed to this work:26

*M. Wetzelius* (1744) […] supervised the casting of the first Tamil and Singhala types for the printing of the Bible translated by Dutch and Ceylonese clergymen; Andriaan de Meij; Petrus Synjeu; Johannes Ruel; Contijn; Fybrandsz; and J. de Meijer, Rector of the Colombo Seminary, who was a Doctor of Theology of the University of Leiden. Rev. Johannes Ruel was the second Rector of the Colombo Seminary besides his other Ministerial duties. He, together with Henricus Philippus Panditharatne, a Singhala Minister and Phillip de Melho, a Tamil Minister, was responsible for the translations of many books of the Old Testament, the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles. (source: Wolvendaal Foundation website)

The case of Adrianus de Mey (?-1699) is particularly interesting. Born in Paliacatta (Pulicat) in India, de Mey “sucked the Tamil language with mother’s milk” (de Mallabaerse tale als met de melck had ingesogen – van Dam 1954: 261) (he was a son of a Dutch father and an Indian mother). As one of a few Asians, he was sent to study theology in Europe where in 1675 he graduated from the Utrecht University with a thesis *Disputatio theologica de conversione Indorum* (‘Theological dispute regarding the conversion of the inhabitants of the Indies’). Soon after, he was ordained by the *classis* (i.e. presbytery, or governing body of elders) Amsterdam and in 1677 sent to Ceylon, where he became the first rector of the Dutch seminary at Nallur. De Mey was likely helping Cat with the dictionaries, and certainly worked on Bible translations, as mentioned above.

The fact that the VOC was educating indigenous youth for the pastoral duties may also explain a rather unique palm-leaf manuscript written entirely in Dutch, which I found in the library of the Tropenmuseum (*lontarblad A-2646*):27

---

25 The Wolvendaal Foundation, named after a famous church near Colombo, has been established in 2005 by the Dutch Reformed Church of Sri Lanka for “the furthering of harmonious relations between all races and religions on the island and the promotion of the unique position of the Church as the oldest Protestant Church in Ceylon.” (http://www.wolvendaal.org). The name *Wolvendaal* (‘Dale of Wolves’) is the Dutch equivalent of Guadeloupe; supposedly, the site where the Dutch church is now was originally the location of a Portuguese church dedicated to Our Lady of Guadeloupe. The Dutch church, completed in 1757, is “The Westminster Abbey of Ceylon where so many brave Hollanders lie buried” as the English Governor Sir William Gregory once described it (*ibidem*).


27 In Dutch library catalogues, the term *lontarblad* is used interchangeably with *palmblad*. 
This must be the manuscript mentioned by Kern in 1896 (brief information on the content, which consists of purely theological texts, can be found in Kern 1896: 147-148). As far as I know, palm leaf manuscripts in an European language are hard to come by.\textsuperscript{28} Palm leaves, a popular writing support in South India and Sri Lanka, were incised with a stylus, and then rubbed in with a mixture of soot or berry juice and oil.\textsuperscript{29} The structure of a leaf allowed for incising round letters of alphabets like Sinhala or Tamil, but was not suitable for Latin alphabet with its straight lines, which tend to split the leaf along the veins. Here we have to admire the skill of the author, who, writing the text entirely in Dutch, managed to shape the letters into a near-perfect roundness. Baldaeus (1672: 172-173) mentions his attempts to master writing on \textit{Olen}, or palm leaves, and admits to even have written letters home and to his friends in this form – could this be a sample of his exercises?

On the other side of the Gulf of Mannar, on the Malabar Coast, “the Dutch administrative machinery, too, urgently needed reliable interpreters”, as Heniger (1986: 34) puts it. The governor Hendrik Adriaan van Reede originally depended on Tupasses and Brahmins as interpreters, but when German soldier Herman Hasencamp (?-1670) arrived in Kottayam in Kerala to teach Latin to local Christians of St. Thomas, van Reede promptly seized the opportunity and employed him. Soon a school was created where under the auspices of a local raja Tekumkur, not only Latin and Dutch but also the local languages Malayalam and Sanskrit were taught by prominent Brahmans, in which also the Dutch boys were trained as interpreters (\textit{ibidem}). A reminder of the school is to be found in the Bodleian Library in Oxford.

\textsuperscript{28} I found a similar manuscript among the palm leaf manuscripts with Sinhala texts in the British Library collection (Sloane 3417). Dating back to early 18th century, it contains the Sinhala alphabet with notes on pronunciation in English together with the Lord’s Prayer in Sinhala and Roman letters and a literal translation. However, the English part of the text is written on European paper cut to the size of a palm leaf and bound together with the real palm leaves.

\textsuperscript{29} For more information on palm leaf manuscripts, see https://chinapreservationtutorial.library.cornell.edu/content/palm-leaf-manuscripts
among miscellaneous manuscripts in Indic languages: *Alphabet der Samscortamsche Mallabaarsche taal, gescheven voor d’Ed. Heer, mijn Heer H Van Reede, Commandeur der gantschekust van Mallabar, en Canara. Door Harman van Hasen-camp.* (‘Alphabet of Malabar Sanskrit, written for the Noble Sir H. van Reede, Governor of the whole Coast of Malabar and Kanara. By Harman van Hasencamp’, MS. Ind. Misc.c.5). Bes & Kruijtzer (2015: 245-6) describe it as “survey of the Malayalam script used for writing Sanskrit, with a short Malayalam vocabulary and explanations, [...] c. 1660s (?)”. Technically, the script described by Hasencamp is Grantha, a writing system developed in the 5th century AD in the South of India to write Sanskrit. Although at that stage (mid 17th century) it did resemble Malayalam and Tamil scripts, the author realises they are not the same thing. Introducing two additional letters after the main alphabet he remarks:

Dese twee volgende characters zijn seer frequent en noodig inde Samscortamsche schriften, maar de verklarede Alfabet heeft geen characters, die de selve uitspreken, en daerom staen hier a part aengehaalt, zijnde vande tamoelse mallabaarsche letters ontleent (Hasencamp, no folio numbers)

‘These two following characters are very frequent and necessary in the Sanscrit writings, but the alphabet explained [before] does not have characters which would be pronounced like this, therefore they are attached separately here, being borrowed from Tamil Malabar letters.’

The first six pages are dedicated to “the ordinary alphabet” (*ordinare alpha-beth*), consisting of 51 grond- en klinkletters (*consonants and vowels*). The following nine pages elaborate on additional letters and combinations of letters. Alongside extensive description of Grantha letters and their combinations, Hasencamp offers instructions regarding pronunciation (for example, the retroflex *ul* is *met een kromme tonge na boven in de mond, en grof uijt de keel gesproken* – ‘pronounced with a curved tongue up in the mouth, and rough from the throat’). At the end, Hasencamp explains to van Reede why such a long presentation is necessary, and mentions how Grantha writing system is open to innovations:

Soo verre strekken sig de letters ende teyken, die in dese Samscourtamsche taal te leeren werden opgegeven: dog zijn buiten die wel eenige diergelw. gecomponseerde characters, en werden ook dagelijk nog meer gecomponseert; want wie sulke letters uitvind, draagt daer van groote eer; maer wanneer sulke voorkomen, hebben geen groote difficulteit, en konnen ten eersten verstaen worden: ik verhope mijn heer geen misnoegensal scheppen uijt de largiteit welke gebruikt heb; d’oorsaak die mij daer toe gemoveert heeft, is, dat andersins van malkaer niet konnen onderscheiden werden. (*idem*)

‘This is the extent of letters and symbols which are given to learn in Sanscrit. Yet there there are also some other compound characters, and they are being created daily, because the one who invents such letters bears great honour from it. But when they occur, they are not that difficult and can be understood at once. I hope, my lord, that I am not causing displeasure with the size I applied. The reason behind is that otherwise, they could not be distinguished from one another.’
The manuscript ends with seven pages of *exempla hoe dat de gem[ene] characters tot woorder werden gemaakt* (‘examples how the common characters are combined into words’), in which Hasencamp decomposes 39 Sanskrit words into primary elements. Such thorough introduction to writing does indeed suggest it was used in a context of a school rather than being a practical language aid for quick reference.

Yet probably the highest achievement of the Dutch missionary linguistics was the work of Swiss *predikant* working in Batavia, George Henrik Werndly (1694-1744), the author of *Maleische Spraakkunst uit de eige schriften der Maleiers opgemacht* from 1736, proudly presented as *Op kosten van de E. A. Heren Bewindhebberen der Oost-Indische Maatschappye gedrukt* (‘printed at the expense of the Gentlemen Administrators of the East India Company’). In the introduction extending to 68 pages, Werndley analyses in great detail the local glosstonomy and geographical outreach of Malay. Not unlike Ruëll, he discusses five different registers of the language. The novel approach is to explain these registers to a Dutch reader by comparing them to the styles of speaking, as described by Lambert Ten Kate in his *Aanleiding tot de kennis van het verhevene deel der Nederduitsche sprake* (1723). And so, style one is *hoogdravende of verhevene […]* that *zweemt naar ‘t oude gebruik* (pompous and exalted, bordering on archaic usage) and used mostly by scholars – yet still understandable; style two is *defige of stitige* (dignified and stately) – for daily use but still correct, without using *metaplasms* (changes in orthography and phonology) or abbreviations; and the last one is *de gemeenzame styl*, (colloquial style), free from rules and restrictions and not shying away from shortenings and euphony – yet not as common as the language of the street. *Op zodanige wyze verdeelen de Maleiers hunne taal in vyven, welke eigentlyk niet anders dan vynderlei stylen…zyt* (‘In such a way, The Malays divide their language in five ways, or styles’), concludes Werndley 1736: XLV-XLVI). The Malay registers he distinguishes are:

a) *Bahâsa DJâvij, de gemene Maleische taal* (common Malay);

b) *Bahâsa dâlam, de hofsyle* (language of the court);

c) *Bahâsa bangsjawan, de taal der groten en edelen* (language of the nobility);

d) *Bahâsa gûnong*, literally *de bergtaal* (language of the mountains, used by peasants);

e) *Bahâsa katjokân, een gemengde taal*, a mixed language used commonly in the street, also called *Bahâsa bêzâr*, or *pâsar, marktoal*, the language of the market used in daily commercial dealings and only sophisticated enough to make sure that the two speakers can negotiate a price of a merchandise. Werndley strongly recommends going beyond that last register and postulates learning the proper Malay “as appearing in the books and in the speech of real Malay people” (echte Maleische taal zo als ze in en uit de boeken en spraak der ware Maleiers te halen is –*idem*: XLIX). His position settles the discussions about the suitable register for translating the Bible that in the century before him troubled two competing ministers and translators, François Valentijn (1666-1727) and Melchior Leydekker (1643-1701) (Hunt 1989: 36-37). The contentious issue was whether is it better to translate the Bible using the high register ‘court’ Malay from the Sumatran province of Riau, as Leydekker did, or is it more practical to use the local Ambonese dialect of Maluku, as did Valentijn?. One strategy may ensure uniformity and may help standardisation, but on the other hand, using local dialect would bring bigger communicative success (Grimes & Maryott 1994: 311n28).
Wherever the main interest was trade, and not the territorial expansion, like in India, the Dutch established a network of fortified trading posts called *factorijen* (factories). Following the Portuguese model, they usually consisted of a few warehouses, living quarters, the offices, maybe a chapel, and sometimes a garrison for its defence. The factories carried on their own trade dealings under the direction of an *Opperhoofd*, or Chief Factor.

Gaining a foothold on the subcontinent was no simple matter, however. In the Indian northwest, at the time under Mughal rule, there was already a strong and long-lasting Portuguese presence. Although the first Dutch trade attempts in Gujarat date back to early 17th century, it took almost twenty years to establish the first *kantoor* (trading post) in Surat.

However, the Dutch traders’ greatest rivals were not the Portuguese or the English, but local merchants. Gujarat was already an established trading centre for centuries before the arrival of Europeans. “Perhaps no other part of India has evolved a class so single-mindedly devoted to trade and commerce as had Gujarat in its Banjas” (Gokhale 1979: 94). Those local Indian merchants benefited from the strategic location of the main port, Surat, which allowed fluent transit of goods between north and south, at the same time drawing upon the abundant produce and commodities.

However, Singh (2010: 72-77, 89) challenges the established “emporalists, not imperialists” view according to which dominance over markets rather than territory was the VOC’s goal (Winius & Vink 1991: 5). Based on archival documents that show the Dutch leasing land and collecting taxes (in Malabar, specially in and around Cochin), she identifies and analyses this shifting trend from traders to landlords, which leads her to redefining the Dutch in India as proto-colonialists.
coming from the countryside — textiles, indigo, saltpetre, wheat, rice, butter, sugar and even tobacco, recently introduced from the New World (ibid: 94, 106). Surat was also a major centre of distribution of spices (ibid: 105), metals and other goods. Even when the city was nearing its decline at the end of 17th century, it was still described by John Ovington (1653-1731) as

> the most fam’d Emporium of the Indian Empire, where all Commodities are vendible, though they never were there seen before. The very Curiosity of them will engage the Expectation of the Purchaser to sell them again with some Advantage, and will be apt to invite some other by their Novelty, as they did him, to venture upon them. (Ovington 1696: 218)

Besides commerce, sea transport was another important business, and the seasoned Dutch ships had an advantage over larger but sluggish Indian vessels. The Dutch had already proven themselves quite capable of using their naval power to look after their own interests in any way they chose (Gokhale 1979: 168). They would play this card in negotiating better terms with the Mughals on land, as famously expressed by Jan Pietersz Cohen: “to use well the advantage God gave us above others at the sea” (as quoted in van Santen 2001: 37).

Rivals in trade often became partners in faith. The Christian community in Surat was so small that different nationalities — Dutch, English, Portuguese, Spanish, French, Italians and even Armenians — might join together for a funeral (Van Santen 2001: 56) or borrow a priest for a baptism (Ovington 1696: 404). Under these circumstances, Dutch missionary activity would have been virtually non-existent. The Dutch focused instead on cultivating favourable relations with the local Mughal officials (Gokhale 1979: 168). Their only language policy was to communicate in such a degree as to maximise the Company’s profits. When negotiation of trading agreements, obtaining privileges over competitors and generally staying in good relations with local rulers meant the success or failure of a factory, language competences required “on the ground” in the VOC establishments went beyond mastering the basic vocabulary sufficient for daily conversations with the indigenous people. The language used between the merchants was Portuguese, and every Dutch civil servant had at least basic knowledge of that language (Van Santen 2001: 54). Some also mastered Persian, the language of the court and of the Mughal administration, and some had knowledge of spoken Hindustani, the lingua franca of the North India and the Indian West Coast. For most official needs, local translators and interpreters were hired. It was company policy, however, to have at least one speaker of local languages in every post; and few of them, according to mentions in the VOC documents, had attained considerable fluency.

A lot of borrowings used in VOC missives and correspondence entered locally the Dutch language: administrative terms such as *hasbulhockum* (royal warrant, order), *firman* (a broad term for written permit or license from the ruler), *muchalkah* (an imposed contract or obligation) as well as other frequently used words (*peec* – *pcs*, *souba* – province) or units of weight, measure, and currency were rarely translated or explained; similarly, the Mughal titles or functions (*ammerrau*, *jemindaer*,...
fausdaer, addlys, mansebdaar, jagierdaers, souba, etc.) were used in the original with little effort to find Dutch equivalents. The notable exception is J. J. Ketelaar who seems to be the only one who recognised the need and made a glossary of the Hindustani and Persian words encountered in daily life. In his *Instructie*, he collected and names of foreign objects, products, places and customs, and explained their meaning in Dutch. A few of them have since entered the Dutch language for good (e.g. ‘halal’, ‘Ramadan’). His work also witnesses his deep political, historical and cultural interests (these aspects will be discussed in detail in Chapter 8).

Surprisingly few Dutch linguistic documents are left from that period in India, especially if we compare it to monumental works on Hindustani by the French Capuchin François-Marie de Tours from early 18th century, or later German and British works. This scarcity and the novelty of Hindustani still in 19th century is confirmed by two notes attached to a small Dutch-Hindustani-Persian vocabulary, *Vocabularium Persico-Belgicum*, preserved in the University Library in Leiden (LTK 589, 111f. 4v). The manuscript comes quite likely from the collection of Adriaan Reland, as his delayed *veilingcatalogus* from 1761 under the position 23 on page six mentions *Vocabularium Persico Belgicum*, in the same quatro format. The first note come from baron [Pierre] Leopold van Alstein (1791-1862), professor and book collector in Ghent, and the second is an assessment by H. E. Weyers, dated March 31, 1841. Hendrik Engelinus Weyers (1805-1844) was a scholar and orientalist who wrote, among others, a commentary on the Catalogus of the Oriental Manuscripts from Leiden. He was familiar with Islamic writings and Persian and Arabic scripts. The date of the Weyer’s note, March 31st, 1841, suggests that it was the Society for Dutch Literature in Leiden (Maatschappij voor Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leyden) who bought the manuscript at the auction in Ghent a few months earlier (Oct 26th, 1840) and sent it to Weyer to estimate its significance. Comparing the glossary “with the best printed Persian dictionary to date”, i.e. the latest edition of Richardson’s Persian, Arabic and English Dictionary, London 1829, Weyer believes the anonymous work could not contribute much new info on Persian language at this point but it would have been printed in its time, it would undeniably be a significant contribution to the field, as a dictionary of *kunsttermen* (specialized terms) and names of most popular nature products, bearing testimony to its author’s attentiveness and “personal relations with the Persian nation”. He refrains from evaluating the Hindustani part since he has never done any study “in this new Indian language branch that is a mixture of Persian, Arabic, and Indian proper (echt Indisch)”, and also for the lack of comparative material in that language. Having some knowledge of Persian, he doubts the work had ever been printed because the Persian part is totally unknown to him. He supports Alstein’s view that there had never been any Hindustani dictionary published in “our country” [The Netherlands]. Although the manuscript is catalogued as *hoofdzakelijk over plant- en zeevaartkunde* (primarily botanical and nautical), it is in fact a classical onomasiological dictionary, staring with God, elements, etc. The miscategorization comes from the fact that the book is based on a Persian vocabulary and therefore written from right to left, so that the title page is on the “last” page of the manuscript:
The layout, composition, and content of the manuscript do not leave doubts as to the Persian origins of the text. The combination of Persian and Hindustani languages, as well as the ink used and a trained in calligraphy hand who wrote the Perso-Arabic letters seems to point to India as the place of creation of this book. The fact that a Persian model served the Dutch author as a base for this vocabulary suggests that Persian, the official language of the Mughal Empire with its rich written linguistic tradition might have been a good starting point for foreigners interested in Hindustani. We will see another example of this attitude in the following chapter.

When the VOC started establishing long-term posts overseas, and some degree of knowledge of local languages was a daily necessity for ordinary employees, the field of language studies itself became very democratic. Language skills ceased to be the privilege of the institutional scholars; in fact, the tables had turned, and now university professors needed amateur philologists as their informants. Even less trained yet talented individuals could achieve great fluency and become language experts. One such case is definitely Joan Josua Ketelaar, whose amateur work on Hindustani and Persian grammar was translated word-by-word into Latin by a professor from Utrecht David Mill and published in 1743.\(^{31}\) (However, it happened only after his position was established as “the famed ambassador”). Yet the philological competence did not always translate into fame in the fatherland; when Herbert de Jager (1634-1694) died in a Batavian weeshuys, his apparently amazing linguistic library and notes got scattered and lost, which prompted his friend and patron Witsen to remark that nobody

\(^{31}\) I will present details of Mill’s publication in Chapter 3.
in Holland was “curious enough” to appreciate de Jager’s linguistic genius (“hij heeft een schat van geleerde aantekeningen nagela eten, dog alle verwaerloost, sijne schier niemand bij ons curieus.” – ‘He left a treasure of scholarly notes, yet all are neglected, as hardly anyone among us has any curiosity’ Gebhard 1881[2006]: 361).

The intensity and the exact nature of the contacts between the Dutch scholars and VOC “field workers” have not been well studied yet. A part of the problem is that the VOC carried on its activities quite secretly, especially in the early years. For sure, the exchange was never limited to straightforward sales of Oriental manuscripts acquired during foreign trips by amateur collectors. Some philologists started their careers in the service of the VOC; others often used both VOC- and missionary contacts to get the information they needed. One thing is certain: the exchange of knowledge has always taken place, irrespective of any political or religious loyalties. The intellectual curiosity swiftly surpassed any existing division lines, which at the time would often split one family. Jacobus Golius, a Protestant, who himself travelled extensively in the Levant,32 kept contacts with his Catholic younger brother, the Discalced Carmelite Peter Golius (1604-1673; religious name Celestin de Sainte-Lidwine), who spent part of his life in Syria and Lebanon (where he established the first Carmelite monastery in 1643) and later become a Professor of Oriental languages in Rome. Jacobus was also eagerly awaiting the return of the Italian Jesuit Martino Martini, famed for his research of Chinese geography, culture and language. Although their first meeting in Leiden was very brief, limited to the time Martini had between transfer from one barge to another, the two scholars, clearly interested in each other’s work, arranged another week-long meeting in Antwerp. Their colloquies on the “secrets of Chinese language” and empire resulted in Golius writing De Regno Catayo Additamentum – an appendix to Martini’s great Chinese Atlas Novus Atlas Sinensis printed in 1655 as a part of Volume 10 of Atlas Maior by Joan Blaeu in Amsterdam. Notably, the publication confirmed the connection between Cathay and China, presented the Chinese sexagenary calendar cycle, and also contained the first printed woodcut Chinese characters in Holland (Duyvendak 1936: 299-303; Zwartjes 2011; 2013).

The issue of anonymity is a persistent one in the history of VOC linguistics. So, for instance, a 17th century Persian-Hindustani-Dutch vocabulary kept in Leiden University Library lacks a proper title page, the name of the author and the date. A Malay grammar from the Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana (Ms Or 237) mysteriously lacks the title page and any information on the author or date. A second manuscript copy of the same work, preserved in the State Library of New South Wales (Ms A637), bears however a beautifully written title page stating Herbert de Jager as its author, as well as the date 1683, leaving no doubts as for the authorship of the Marciana copy (see also Lombard 2001). Similarly, the two later copies of

32 According to Chalmers, he travelled in Syria, Arabia, Mesopotamia and Constantinople for a long period of time, and also visited Morocco.
Ketelaar’s *Instructie* have his name, yet the apparently earlier one in the possession of Reland, did not.

How can one explain this striking number of anonymous works? A letter from professor of Classics Gijsbert Cuper (1644-1716) to diplomat Pieter Valckenier (1638 or 1641-1712), described by Marion Peters, offers a suggestion. When visiting Witsen’s place, Cuper

saw two volumes of De Jager’s sketches of plants and herbs of Java. Witsen had on that occasion also told him that De Jager had been in the habit of sending him large quantities of drawings of flowers, plants, men, women, houses, implements, utensils, etc., but that the Company had seized them, as it had previously done with De Jager’s Arabic manuscripts. Now everything was held at the VOC’s offices, locked away in a chest. (Peters 1989: 113)

If such “shipping orders” from overseas of a prominent man like Witsen were at risk of a seizure by the Company, would this imply that the Company’s secrecy policy might be the reason why linguistic works had to be anonymised if they were to reach scholars in the Republic? Maybe such measures had to be taken to protect works from being identified as “belonging” to the Company? On the contrary, the works officially received by the VOC or acquired via legal routes have no such issues (e.g. Ruëll’s *Grammatica off Singaleese Taal-Kunst* which proudly bears the name of the author and the date of the *Opdracht*, ‘dedication’). More than once, and especially in the early years, the VOC explicitly prohibited publishing any research results obtained, out of fear that concurring associations could also take advantage of them. In contrast to the scholarly Republic of Letters, characterized by its members’ willingness to share information, the VOC’s products of knowledge – by definition subservient to making money – were often destined to internal use only (see Van Berkel 1998: 146; Naarden 2010). Even if the spread of scholarship was actively hampered by some VOC officials, it still was unfeasible to intercept all kinds of specimens and curiosities that were imported from Asia to Europe – be it illegal or not (see Van Berkel 1998: 146). Rietbergen (2002: 166) points out that some VOC directors understood the importance of ‘public relations’ and ‘image-building’, resulting in a more liberal access policy to VOC archives from time to time.

Certainly, the reasons for removing all identifiable elements from the manuscripts may have been of a far more mundane and self-serving nature. What was easier than taking an anonymous text from a faraway place and publishing it under one’s own name? One of the authors famous for his reluctance to quote his sources was the Dutch minister François Valentijn (1666-1727), who was next to being author of a monumental history of the VOC also involved in a dispute on the authorship of a Bible translation into Malay. In addition, he was accused of plagiarizing a Malay dictionary and suspected of

---

34 Rietbergen (2002: 166) argues that precisely their profit-driven attitude inspired some VOC servants to make money from their adventures in the Far East by composing travelogues.
illegally acquiring De Jager’s papers after his death (see Beekman 1988: 67, 70). Whether these latter allegations are true or not, it is a fact that the above-mentioned anonymized copy of De Jager’s Malay grammar comes ex libris Francisci Valentini. On the other hand, his linguistic talents evidently passed on to his daughter Cornelia, who was, “hardly thirteen years old, endowed with an astonishing and even miraculous command of languages, primarily Malay, Latin, Portuguese and Dutch” (Wilkins 1715: ***3; see Damsté 1953 for further background). Interestingly, another copy (?) of the same text is kept in the State Library, New South Wales (MS A 637). After the extensive research, the librarian Julie Sweeten informed me that she had not been able to identify its actual provenance. “There are no bookseller stickers or any identifying marks to provide additional information. There are some related documents on the same shelf, on the subject of Batavia and the Dutch East Indies. One or more of these has the David Scott Mitchell bookplate, which may indicate that all these manuscripts may have come from this major benefactor […] Most of our accession records are later than the 1940s so it may have been received well before that date” (personal communication, August 2014). And yet, knowing the provenance would help us understand a bit more about De Jager’s impact and his elusive legacy. There are still a lot of VOC mysteries waiting to be solved.

2.6 Conclusions

The linguistic works from the VOC era that survived to our times are scattered in libraries and archives around the world. Many questions on provenance and authorship of the extant works can be answered by studying them not only as texts but also as physical documents. There is now an arsenal of methods to analyze the material features, ranging from classical bibliographical queries based on bookseller plates and auction or library catalogue numbers, over paleographic and watermark studies, to more sophisticated scientific tests for paper fiber and petrographic analysis of blotting sand, X-ray fluorescence (XRF) tests of inks and pigments, and hyperspectral imaging.35

Contrary to Maier & Van den Putten’s statement that “from the linguistic point of view, the Dutchmen of the VOC have not done that much” (“Taalkundig gezien hebben de Nederlanders van de VOC wellicht niet zo wel gedaan”, 2002: 111-112), it is clear that there were many attempts to combine the practical aspect with more rigorous linguistic approach to the languages studied. For one thing, the bewildering typological and sociolectal variety the Dutch encountered in Asia forced a whole new set of discussions on translations and language use, such as the one between Valentijn and Leydekker. Such linguistic decisions, whether conscious or not, impacted the Europe-Asia relations for years to come.

---

35 See Pytlowany (2014, 2015) for a general overview and some examples.
The time is ripe to prepare a comprehensive critical evaluation of the Dutch linguistic heritage. On the basis of the short exploratory overview presented above we may expect to unravel a story of knowledge circulation between European nations, be it attributed borrowing or sneaky plagiarism; we may witness an occasional dip into the indigenous linguistic tradition; but most certainly, we will see a story of an intellectual adventure of a nation who left the comfort of their European home, surely in search of profit but also, to use De Houtman’s words, “not to leave the world unexplored”.
3. Joan Josua Ketelaar and the manuscripts of his *Instructie Ophe Onderwijsinghe Der Hindoustaanse en Persiaanse talen*

3.1 Ketelaar’s biography

The name of Joan Josua Ketelaar (1659-1718) is well known to historians of the Dutch colonial period from trade and diplomatic missions he led on behalf of the Dutch East India Company, and to the linguists and Indologists – from the first written grammar of Hindustani. However, his life from before his VOC employment is only known from anecdotal evidence. The most complete biographical information on Ketelaar’s early years comes from a German historian and archivist Hermann Kownatzki (1899-1991) who worked in the City Archives of Ketelaar’s native Elbing (today’s Elbląg, Poland) before the Second World War. The only known portrait of Ketelaar hung in the *Zum Heiligem Leichnam* church next to a remarkable pipe organ, which was funded by money he bequeathed to the church in his testament (Vogel 1936: 820). Soon after, most of the records pertaining to his life were destroyed and the painting got lost when the city was hit by Soviet bombs in 1945. Thanks to Kownatzky, a black-and-white reproduction of this oil painting has survived (Fig. 3.1).

![Portrait of Ketelaar from the *Heiligem Leichnam* church in Elbing.](Source: Kownatzki 1936: n. pag.)
Joan Josua was born on Christmas Day 1659 as the first out of six children: another Josua (who probably died young), Maria, Barbara, Christianus and Christina. His father, Josua Kettler, a bookbinder turned merchant, and mother Anna Slocumb got married on October 29, 1658. Both had previous relationships, and the father was already 48 when Josua was born. Ketelaar’s grandfather, John Slocumb (or Slocomb), an English merchant from Bristol, was a well-known figure in Elbing. He rebuilt and ran the famous seven-gable inn “Bollwerkskrug” (Fig. 3.2), also called “the English House” and “Terminus Hotel”, which was very popular among foreign merchants visiting Elbing. Ketelaar’s father must have died before 1680 because his signature is missing on Joan Josua’s absolution from the bookbinding apprenticeship on August 4th that year. Three months later, on October 12th, a fateful event took place: accused of stealing money, 19 year old Joan Josua made an unsuccessful attempt to poison his bookbinder master with arsenic added to his beer. When his deed was revealed, Ketelaar ran away to Danzig (Gdańsk), then followed the route of the Baltic merchant ships to Stockholm. There is then a two-year gap in the records, after which he reappears in Amsterdam. On May 3rd 1682, with the name recorded as

Figure 3.2: Bollwerkskrug, "The English House". (Image source: http://www.aefl.de/orldd)

Ketelaar’s father must have died before 1680 because his signature is missing on Joan Josua’s absolution from the bookbinding apprenticeship on August 4th that year. Three months later, on October 12th, a fateful event took place: accused of stealing money, 19 year old Joan Josua made an unsuccessful attempt to poison his bookbinder master with arsenic added to his beer. When his deed was revealed, Ketelaar ran away to Danzig (Gdańsk), then followed the route of the Baltic merchant ships to Stockholm. There is then a two-year gap in the records, after which he reappears in Amsterdam. On May 3rd 1682, with the name recorded as

1 “…primo bibliopejus, deinde Mercator Elb.” Ostdeutsche Familienkunde (1962: 66).
2 Anna was a widow of a mintmaster Anthon Toscani, and Josua had been married to Anna Maria, daughter of Sigismund von Brauden.
3 Thanks to an artificially created bulwark, which assured necessary canal depth, even big ships could sail inlands. The inn became the unloading place for merchandise, and gradually acquired expensive decorations outside and inside. The building was finished in 1637 and had Ketelaar’s grandfather coat of arms on the west side. In 1711, Tsar Peter the Great of Russia stayed in for the night (cf. http://www.elbing-land-familienforschung.de/seite128.html). Unfortunately, the building was destroyed in the Second World War.
“Ketelaer” he embarked as a soldaat (a soldier) aboard a VOC ship Wapen van Alkmaar which set sail from the Dutch island of Texel. On February 13th 1683, the ship finally arrived in Batavia, and soon after Ketelaar was sent to Surat in India to work as a clerk. Ketelaar gradually rose through the ranks as assistant, accountant, deputy and chief of a factory. In 1705, he went on a trade mission to buy coffee in Mokka, Yemen, and when, on the return voyage, the ship was attacked by French pirates, Ketelaar and his crew successfully defended the precious cargo. In 1711, Ketelaar became opperkoopman (senior merchant, or director of trade), and when the head of the Dutch Embassy suddenly died, Ketelaar took over as an envoy to lead an important mission to the Great Mogul in Lahore – his knowledge of local languages was cited as one of his qualifications. This two-year long journey is described in Journaal van J.J. Ketelaar's hofreis naar den Groot Mogol te Lahore 1711-1713. This costly mission to Lahore turned out to be unsuccessful due to the untimely death of the emperor Bahadur Shah (1643-1712), with whom Ketelaar had met to discuss trading opportunities. The freshly obtained trading letters were instantly rendered useless, and all valuable gifts wasted in face of the new power struggle for the throne.

However, the mission had an unexpected cultural impact. In Udaipur, where Ketelaar was granted an audience with the local ruler Maharana Sangram Singh (r. 1710-34),

---

5 See http://vocseavoyagers.nationaalarchief.nl/detail.aspx?ID=1604289. The details of the voyage, including quite a high number (31) of deaths between The Netherlands and the Cape, are available at http://resources.huygens.knaw.nl/das/detailVoyage/92494.

6 A manuscript of the Dagverhaal van de ambassade van Jan Josua Ketelaar, directeur van Souratte, naar de Groot Mogol, 1711 is kept in The Hague (Nationaal Archief, Den Haag, Collectie Sypesteyn, Supplement, 1658-1722, 1.13.19.02, inv.nr. 1) together with the Instructie der Hindoestaanse en Perzische talen door Jan Josua Ketelaar, 1698 (inv.nr. 2).
the visit of the first Europeans was later commemorated in impressive large-scale paintings on cloth. Two of them are in Europe, one kept in a magazine of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam (Fig. 3.3), the other one in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London. In India, "the exotic appearance of the Europeans created a theme in Mewari painting" (Topsfield 1984).

A less well-known episode from Ketelaar’s life revolves around the literary society created in Batavia around 1705, called Suum Cuique Ridder-Orde ('Chivalry Order Suum Cuique'), of which he was Great Master and, with Joan Montanus, likely the co-founder. A handwritten book containing the statutes of the Society, the member list, as well as various celebratory poems is preserved in the Special Collections of Leiden University (MS LTK 373). The Society consisted of ‘knights’ and their ‘princesses’, all of whom were using literary nicknames; Ketelaar was known as den Poolse Orondates ('The Polish Orondates', after the heroic Orondates, the prince of Scythia, and possibly referring to his birth place). In the chronicle of the sea journey the Society took in December 1707, also included in the manuscript, Ketelaar’s name features prominently, and a few elaborate poems are devoted to him for the occasion of his 47th [sic] birthday and the New Year, which followed a few days later (Fig. 3.4). In one of them, the secretary of the Suum Cuique Society Joan Montanus a.k.a. Den Ridder van den Berg, refers to Ketelaar as E. Coopman en hooft der Mochasen handel ('Noble Merchant and the Head of Mokka Trade', f. 19r). In another one with wishes for the New Year, Montanus praises Ketelaar in 17 verse acrogram, of which the first letter of each line are arranged to spell “Joan Josua Ketelaar”. A small fragment below:

Koors, ziekte, of geen quael die plaagden uwe leden;  
Een hemels nectar dranck u grijsen tijd sou troosten,  
Tot loff u lefs, en dienst der maatschappij van’t oosten,  
Eer-rijk, soo is u naam, door sooveel braave daaden,  
Lofvaardigh wijtgevoet, in koopmanschap bequaem,  
Al om bekent, bij moor, arbier en persjaen,  
Altijd gekeeerd met loff, en winste overlaaden.  
Roemt kairo koopmans stijl, en amstel winstrijkschatten. (MS LTK 373 f. 14v)

7 The VOC official in the third painting from the Tropenmuseum in Amsterdam, originally thought to be a depiction of Ketelaar, has later been identified by Pauline Lunsingh Scheurleer and Gijsbert Kruijtzer (2005) as ambassador Johannes Bacherus (1642-1693) in the Mughal encampment of Emperor Aurangzeb in the Deccan (Tropenmuseum, A-9584).
8 At the beginning of the 18th century, the old Greek principle of justice Suum Cuique (To elck het sijnde –‘to each his own’) was a part of Zeitgeist. In its German form, Jedem das seine, it became the motto of the Prussian chivalry Order of the Black Eagle established in 1701 by King Frederick I of Prussia (Hoher vom Orden Schwarzen Adler); in 1715, Johann Sebastian Bach’s cantata Nur jedem das Seine was first performed. During the Second World War the expression was infamously appropriated by the Nazis and displayed over the gate of Buchenwald concentration camp.
9 A selection of poems from the Suum Cuique manuscript was published by Du Perron (1948: 136-144).
10 The nickname probably originated in a tragicomedy Le mariage d’Orroondate et de Statira by Jean Magnon from 1649, translated into Dutch in 1670 by Lingelbach.
So, already in 1707, Ketelaar’s name was famous among “the Moor, the Arab, and the Pers”, and his brave deeds gained him recognition among his companions.

Although Ketelaar never went back to his hometown, he stayed in contact with his family, and especially his younger sister Barbara, whom he included in his testament. After the death of Barbara’s husband, Ketelaar arranged for her son Samuel Traugott Grüttner (1689-1748), also a trained bookbinder, to become his assistant. It was this nephew who accompanied Ketelaar on his last mission to Persia. At the end of the mission, the Dutch got into trouble for the refusal to use Dutch ships to support the Shah in a local conflict. The Shah ordered that they be put under house arrest; the journal notes that the men had to survive almost two weeks only on minimal provisions. Weakened by the journey’s hardships, Ketelaar went down with a violent fever. Within a couple of days, on May 12th, 1718 he died and was buried in Gombroon (Bandar Abbas, see Fig. 3.5) on the Persian Gulf.

---

11 Barbara was born on January 10th 1666, got married on Dec. 4th 1685 and died on Dec. 24th 1741 (Vogel 1937: 106). According to a note from the Landsarchief Batavia, Ketelaar’s testament, kept in Testaments Repos[itory] Batavia (1718/19, page 147) and prepared by the notary Job Freeman on July 17th, 1716, mentions “his sister, Barbara Ketlerin, widow of Nicolaus [Gruttner]”.

Figure 3.4: A commemorative poem written for Ketelaar’s birthday (Source: MS LTK 373 f. 4r)
His nephew organised the burial, and erected an obelisk for Ketelaar in Bandar Abbas. Its exact location is not known; however, a possible location may be provided in a description of tombs in Gambron by Stiffe in 1900 (who also provided a sketch of them, Fig. 3.6):

In the plain, about a quarter of a mile northward of the town, stands a group of tombs of the European merchants. These have been large and pretentious erections, after the fashion of those days, such as may be seen at Surat. They are fast crumbling to ruin; the largest was about 30 feet high, many were mere mounds. No inscriptions could be found. (Stiffe 1900: 211-212, quoted in Vogel (1937: 126)

According to Vogel’s informants, the site with the ruins of the tombs of the European merchants was flattened at the beginning of the 20th century to make room for a new housing development, so, if this is indeed Ketelaar’s final resting place, then no material traces remain to mark it. Also, the three volumes of Ketelaar’s autobiography, written in

---

12 Source: Wikimedia, with the description: ‘A drawing by a Dutch artist working for the Dutch East India Company, who at that time had a trade post in the harbor of Bandar Abbas in Iran, formerly known in the West as Gombroon.’
Dutch, which his nephew Samuel apparently took back with him, have since been lost (Vogel 1937: 128). Fortunately, three manuscript copies of his linguistic opus magnum survived to our times.

3.2 Three copies – three witnesses

3.2.1 The Hague manuscript (DHMS)

The manuscript which has been known for the longest amount of time is kept in the National Archives in The Hague (Inv. no. 1.13.19.02, Coll. Sypesteyn, Supplement no. 2). According to the note on the title page, it is the work of Ketelaar copied in Leckenaun (Lucknow, India) in 1698 by Isacq van der Hoeven from Utrecht. The text starts with a dedication Ad Lectorem Benevolum (‘To the Kind Reader’). Then, a preface (VoorReeden) from the author follows. The text itself consists of 150 pages (IV–introduction, 125–body of text, 21–index), many of which are damaged. Whole sections are barely legible due to ink corrosion. The binding is very frail, and pages are coming loose. Stains and foxing are visible on several pages. The red goatskin cover is floppy, weathered, and bears traces of water damage.

Remarkably, the manuscript is not a part of the VOC archives. It belongs to a separate collection called the Sypesteyn Supplement. According to the online archival inventory, the Sypesteyn collection was acquired by King William I of the Netherlands at an auction in London in 1822. Since the manuscript was discovered and described by Vogel, it served Bodewitz as a basis for his unpublished translation in the 1970’s, then was analysed by McGregor, and finally, was published by Bhatia and Machida (2008) as a facsimile in Volume 3 of their edition. A digitized microfilm of this manuscript is available online.

---

13 In the Landsarchief Batavia, his name is recorded as Isaac van den Hoeven with a note: “Wordt onderkoopman en vertrekt om emplois naar Japan 17 1705. (Personalis II)” (‘Became junior merchant and left for a post in Japan on July 17, 1705.’)

14 Mr. van Felius from the Noord-Hollands Archief informed me that Ketelaar’s manuscript does not figure in the Catalogus Librorum of books owned by Cornelis Ascanius (IV) Sypesteyn (1694-1744): “Apparently, the books were sold after his death and the prices they made were added in pencil. It seems that the Sypesteyn collection kept at the National Archief contains documents originally in possession of one of the members of the Sypesteyn family. Possibly (judging by the dates) the same Cornelis Ascanius.” (private communication, May 2014). Since the papers could have been sold during a sale after his death, or after the death of his widow, or inherited by someone and sold at a later stage, it is difficult to find out in whose possession the manuscript originally was, and how it got there.

15 It is the reproduction used by Bhatia and Machida for their edition: http://www.aa.tufs.ac.jp/~kmach/gicas/Ketelaar/Ketelaar.htm (accessed on November 20th, 2017).
3.2.2 The Utrecht manuscript (UMS)

Among the aforementioned scholars, there has always been a tacit conviction that the manuscript found by Vogel in the archives in The Hague is not the only copy of Ketelaar’s grammar. Already Vogel himself, when commenting on Ketelaar’s misunderstanding of suffix -ji noticed that Mill (1743: 465) used a slightly different form of it, -dsjieve\(^{16}\) and concluded that it “points to the fact that he [Mill] has used another copy of the Instructie than the [DH]MS” (Vogel 1941: 26(668)).

Why had the Utrecht manuscript gone unnoticed for so long? I discovered that for reasons still unknown, someone had painstakingly inked over the author’s name. Thus altered, the manuscript became unsearchable as related to Ketelaar. But it is unmistakably the same work — starting from the first page with its identically convoluted title.\(^{17}\) The book is in a perfect condition, and it is by far the most complete version of all three. Any parts of the text that were illegible in The Hague Ms are clearly exposed here. Closer study reveals more delightful surprises: in addition to the two introductory texts we saw in the Hague Ms, there is also a 12-line rhymed invocation dedicating the text to Momus, the Greek god of writers (but also of satire and mockery), for his pleasure, but also pleading for compassion towards the present work:

```
Hier vind ghij weder stof
Ó Mome tot uw lasten
Beneemd het vrij de lof
En wild uw breijn ontrusten
’T is dogh in uwen aard
Met elck sijn doen te spotten
En kunst oft gij niet waard
Maar houwd het med de sotten
Aij bid ik schimpt dogh niet
Maar toont uw mede lijden
Aan die zijn wil zien lied
In alte leedige tijden.\(^{18}\)
```

\(^{16}\) Although the form is different, the meaning remained the same: “Vocabulum dsjieve additur in amoris testificationem, & significant chara, exempli gratia. Baab dsjieve chara pater. Maa dsjieve chara mater.” (‘The term dsjieve is added to witness affection and means “dear” for example: baab dsjieve – dear father, maa dsjieve– dear mother,’ – Mill 1743: 465).

\(^{17}\) However, the spelling of the title is slightly different, with a Latin form conjugationes instead of conjugatie, like in DHMS. For a more systematic overview of spelling variations in the three copies, see 4.3.

\(^{18}\) ‘Here you’ll find material again/ O Momus for your pleasure
Take away its praise /And let your mind wake up
It is after all in your nature/ to ridicule everyone’s doings
And you do not hold art in esteem/ That’s only for the foolish.
Ai, I pray, do not revile / But show your compassion
To him who showed his mind/ In all too meaningless times.’ (translation with thanks to Kees Huyser and Gijsbert Kruijitzer).
Furthermore, we see the chapter on the conversion of weights and measures that was missing in the only version known so far (DHMS). In terms of studying Ketelaar’s work, the discovery of Utrecht manuscript is definitely a game changer. Not only is the text much clearer and easier to read thanks to the excellent condition of the book, but also the extra elements it contains bring new insights about the author and the context in which the text was written.

The note on the front pastedown traces the book back to the library of Professor Adriaan Reland, who spent most of his working life in Utrecht. Most probably, Reland came into possession of this manuscript around the time when he was working on brief introductions of all newly discovered languages of the VOC influence areas in Asia. Was he also planning to write a chapter on Hindustani? Or was his main interest in the Persian part? After all, his inaugural speech as a professor of Oriental Languages in Utrecht, *Oratio pro lingua persica et cognatis litteris orientalibus*, that he made on 21 February 1701 was devoted to the Persian language. Nevertheless, for unknown reasons, Reland did not seem to make any use of Ketelaar’s work.

### 3.2.3 The Paris manuscripts (PMS)

The third copy of Ketelaar’s *Instructie* is kept in the Fritz Lugt collection of Fundation Custodia, which resides in the eighteenth-century Hôtel Turgot in the 7th arrondissement in Paris. I found out about it by an amazing coincidence when I went to see the copy from Den Haag. Lennart Bes, the author of a catalogue of Dutch manuscripts, *Dutch Sources on South Asia*, who that day was sitting behind the information desk was surprised to hear my request, as he had just come across another copy in Paris while working on his book. Custodia continues the oeuvre of the Dutch art connoisseur Frederik Johannes (Frits) Lugt (1884–1970), who all his life collected paintings, oriental drawings, prints, books and artists’ letters. The Hindustani grammar was possibly thought to complement a series of Mughal miniatures from the collection.

The manuscript must have changed hands several times over the years, yet it is difficult to reconstruct its provenance. In any event, the most recent acquisition took place in 1991, when Fundation Custodia bought it from an antiquarian bookseller in Amsterdam. Simon Blok from B.M. Israël informed me that “B.M. Israël BV antiquarian booksellers, then located at Nieuwezijds Voorburgwal 264, sold the Ketelaer [sic] manuscript and made out an invoice for HFL 6500 guilders on June 25 1991” (private communication, October 2016). Mr. Blok also found out that the manuscript had been in their stock at least 20 years before that, as the old fiche prepared for a sales exhibition / book fair *Verkoopentoonstelling Het Zegerpralend Nederland* that took place in the 70’s (or maybe even as early as 1964) bears the old name ‘N.V. Boekhandel en antiquariaat…’ at the address Singel 379 (Fig. 3.7). The company changed the legal structure of the business and became a so called ‘BV’, or limited company (Ltd.) in the early 1970’s and around 1973 moved with the books

---

19 Later, I did find a mention of it by Gautam and Schokker (2008: 96-98).
to Nieuwezijds Voorburgwal 264 (the prints remained at Singel 379 until 2005). As the manuscript was acquired pre-1970, finding the origin of the acquisition by B.M. Israël has not been successful so far, yet the search continues.

The obvious place to look is also indicated by a bookseller plate of Maisonneuve et Cie, at the time a famous publishing house and a bookshop for Oriental languages in Paris. Jean Maisonneuve, successor of Adrien Maisonneuve was still operating at the address of 3 bis, Place de la Sorbonne in Paris until his death in 2016. However, Claire Maisonneuve could not provide me with any specific information on Ketelaar’s manuscripts beyond the knowledge of her grandfather frequently travelling to the Netherlands, and the fact that Jean-Claude Maisonneuve might have re-purchased Ketelaar’s manuscript in 1938 with the whole collection “le fond Barrois” (private communication, November 2014).

It is the most recent copy dated 1714. The manuscript (inv. no. 1991-A615) consists of 183 pages and it is bound in red goat leather, with the remains of stamped golden letters “[V]oca[bularium] [Hi]ndost. Persa[n?]” on the spine. On the

---

20 A brief history of this libraire-éditeur (‘bookseller-editor’) is available at http://www.maisonneuve-adrien.com/historique.htm. According to the website, as of April 2017, a new company is being established under “Claire Maisonneuve sas” (société par actions simplifiée, ‘simplified joint-stock company’).

21 Gautam and Schokker (2008: 96) mistakenly date it as 1719; the same mistake, due to a specificity of the handwriting, happened in the Maisonneuve catalogue (1872: 197).
front pastedown, there are a few notes and numbers in various hands, and in the upper left corner, a circular bookseller label with the image of the Tower of Babel surrounded by the name “Maisonneuve et Cie. Editeurs, à la Tour de Babel”. There is no title; the front page bears only a short inscription in Latin, attributing the work to *amplissimi, spectatissimi nec non subtilissimi viri domini Joannis Josuae Ketelaer* (‘most outstanding and refined man, Joan Josua Ketelaar’), who, according to Boudaen, composed the original in Agra. It also states that the present copy was made in Surat in January 1714 (see Fig. 3.8).

![Map of India showing key locations for manuscripts](image)

**Figure 3.8: India: the key locations for the manuscripts**
*(Base map: Van Santen 2001, n.pag.)*

These are very valuable pieces of information; together with the DHMS copied in Lucknow, they show an interesting geographical distribution of the text already in its early days. Not surprisingly, this distribution follows the footsteps of Ketelaar and his business affairs, which, as we know from other archival documents, took him from Surat to Agra and Lucknow. We know that before Ketelaar became head of the Agra *kantoor* in 1700, he frequently travelled there. If the earliest dates of his stays in Agra could be reconstructed, it would help in dating the original text.
The brief note is signed with dashing initials G.B. An archival search for VOC personnel in the National Archives of The Netherlands led me to identifying the author as Gideon Boudaen [Courten] (1686-1744), fiscaal independent.

Boudaen (frequently spelled Boudaan) is mentioned on the last page of the Journaal van J. J. Ketelaar’s hofreis naar den Groot Mogol te Lahore 1711-1713 among the people who went to welcome Ketelaar’s mission returning from Lahore (Vogel 1937: 284). Although Boudaen’s name also figures – together with those of his colleagues – on a few letters from Surat, finding his original signature would have been impossible without a fair amount of luck. It is thanks to the fortunate fact that a year after copying the Instructie he was appointed as the opperhoofd of the Japanese mission in Dejima, and that papers from Japan bearing his signature, held in the Nationaal Archief, are among the few original complete sets of documents from overseas kantoors in the VOC archives. This meant that I was able to conclusively compare his real signature with the initials from the Paris MS (Fig. 3.10).

22 According to the VOC Glossarium, the role of fiscaal was “toezichthouder op de handhaving van de openbare orde en openbaar aanklager” (“supervisor of the maintenance of public order and public prosecutor” – glossarium: 44).

23 Again, I owe this very helpful information to Lennart Bes.
Originally from Middelburg in Zeeland, Boudaen’s family had traditions in the VOC. His father was a bewinthebber, a director of one of the Company’s Chambers, and so Gideon also entered the employment of the VOC on January 31, 1711. In a recommendation letter Gideon brought with him to Surat, he was described as *een jong heer die seer wel gestudeert heeft en geen verstand manqueert.* (*a young gentleman who did a lot of studies and does not lack brains*).24 He worked overseas for six years and made a career for himself that culminated in the position of chief factor (*opperhoofd*) of the trading post in Dejima, Japan, from Oct. 19, 1715 to Nov. 11, 1716. Shortly after, he decided to return home and was repatriated aboard the ship *Huis de Vlotter* in January 1717, returning to the Netherlands on July 31, 1717.25

### 3.3 Which manuscript is the original? From textual hints to forensic codicology

There can be no doubt that the three copies of the *Instructie* are closely related. However, some significant differences between them appear upon closer inspection. The first and most obvious kinds are related to the overall structure, the arrangement of chapters and omitted (or missing) elements. The second kind consists in variations in spelling, which was not yet normalised at the time. The last and probably most interesting kind of differences resides in added elements, and voluntary and accidental alterations in the texts.

If we compare the general layout of the three manuscripts, we can conclude that the most complete text is included in UMS:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMS</th>
<th>DHMS</th>
<th>PMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Title page]</td>
<td>[Title page]</td>
<td>[Introductory page including author’s name, signed G.B.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Momum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Lectorem Benevolum [signed Jan Josua Ketelaar]</td>
<td>Ad Lectorem Benevolum (was getekent Isaak [sic] van der Hoeven [sic])</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voor Reden</td>
<td>Voor Reden</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register den Capitulen</td>
<td>Register den Capitulen etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. van de substantiva en adjectiva</td>
<td>42. Van diverse substantiva ende adjectiva</td>
<td>41. van verschyde substantiva en adjectiva [alphabetical]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42: van d’adverbia</td>
<td>43. Van de adverbial</td>
<td>42: van d’adverbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43: van d verba</td>
<td>44. Verba [45] Verba der Eerste Conjugatie</td>
<td>43. verba 44. Verba primae conjugationis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44: verba der eerste conjugationes</td>
<td>45. Van de declinatie der Persiaanse taele</td>
<td>45. Declinatie der Hindoustanse taal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45: declinatie der persiaanse taale</td>
<td>46. Van de Conjugatie der Persiaanse taele</td>
<td>47. declinatie, der moorse taale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46: conjugatie, der persiaanse taale</td>
<td>47. Van de Conjugatie der Persiaanse taele</td>
<td>48: Conjugatie, der moorse taale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49: beduijdingh eeniger moorse namen</td>
<td>50. Beduijding eeniger moorse namen</td>
<td>50. Naestgeliykende Hindoustansche woorden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50: naest gelijkende woorden</td>
<td>[51] Naast geleijkende Hindoustanse woorden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMS</td>
<td>DHMS</td>
<td>PMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51: explicatie, eeniger hindoustanse woorden [explicatie van verscheijde, soo Persjaanse als Hindoustaanse woorden, bij de mooren gebruikelijk.</td>
<td>52: Explicatie van verscheijde soo persiaanse als Hindoustanse woorden bij de mooren gebruikelijk.</td>
<td>51. Explicatie van verscheijde soo Persiaanse als hindoustanse woorden, bij de Mooren gebruikeliklyk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52: reducksie, van Ceer en ponden, etc.</td>
<td>53. Reductie van caren en ponden [in the table of contents but not in the text]</td>
<td>52. Reductie van mannenn, ceeren, en hollandsche ponden, soo als in den steede Zouratta etc. werd gerekent. nevens vergelijking der hindoustanse gesser [{?}], met de hollandsche Elle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verscheijde oliteijten</td>
<td>Verscheide oliteijten.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De thien gebooden onses Heeren</td>
<td>Tien Geboden</td>
<td>De thien geboden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De twaelf artikuulen des Christelijken geloovs</td>
<td>De twaelf artikulen onses algemeenen Ende ongetwijfeeld en Christel. Geloofs</td>
<td>De twaalv artikuulen des Christelyken geloovs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onse Vader</td>
<td>Tonse vader</td>
<td>‘t Vader ons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alphabet Persiaans en Hindoustans Littera sunt xxx quorum figur et nomina</td>
<td>Alphabet der persiaanse tale in getale 30: [actual letters missing, just names]</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Persian Numerals; fraction symbols]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[Numerals in Dutch, Hindustani and Persian; list of Dutch fractions and their Hindustani equivalents]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>[Numerals used by the Indian merchant caste of banias] benjaiens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index Rerum et Verborum</td>
<td>Index Verborum et Rerum vel register der woorden en verhandelingen</td>
<td>Index Capitum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Comparison of the content structure in the three manuscripts.

The text of the Paris MS is stripped down to the bare linguistic part. Nothing of the original introductions and dedications we find in the other versions is preserved. Even the title page is replaced with an original introductory page from the copyist. We may assume the copyist put pragmatic value over a perfect reproduction of the book. However, the text itself is almost identical with the two other extant versions. It starts with the vocabulary and is followed by the grammar of Hindustani and Persian.
(this order is reverse to both UMS and DHMS). We find a few extra words in the dictionary: in section 1: *Van God* (‘of God’), *‘t Paradijs–bekond* 26–*bihiss* 27 (‘paradise’) is added, also names of stars: *d’morgen ster/ d’avond ster–soeker–sohoorer* (‘Morning-, Evening star’), *d’noord ster–kottob* (‘Northern Star’); in section 11: *Van verscheyde natien* (‘of different nationalities”), *Deen–Deenmarki* (‘Dane’) and *hooghduitscher–almaan* (‘a German’) make an appearance. The list of months is slightly different (with *Ramsaan* as the first month of the year).

At the very end of the vocabulary in section 51 a few words are added to the list:

1. *kaeler - is de sietigheyd die uyt de aard of muur slaat* (‘is the dampness from the ground or the wall’)
2. *nerdke grota* [goota?] – *de schijver van een verkeerbord* (‘roadsign maker’?)
3. *pansje – groote of lange dobbelsteen* (‘big or long dice’)
4. *kaabtend – kline dos* (‘small box’)
5. *halch – het binnest de keel* (‘the interior of the thoat’ i.e. ‘the æsophagus’)
6. *taloze – ’t verhemeld van de mond* (‘upper side of the mouth’ i.e. ‘palate’)
7. *kauwa – d’huijg, oft lelletje in de keel* (‘the uwula, or the protuberance in the throat’)
8. *chaes gidder – d’wijn god* (‘god of wine’)
9. *meter elaas – d’zee god* (‘god of the sea’)

From the simple analysis of the content and structure, it is not easy – if possible at all – to establish any stemmatic relationship between the manuscripts. The chances are that there existed more copies, and the three manuscripts we know are not necessarily directly derived from each other. The date of creation is the most obvious indication, and the PMS from 1714 is clearly the most recent one; the DHMS from 1698 suggests another (earlier) copy that coexisted at the same time; the undated UMS remains the most intriguing. If we attempt to date the manuscripts on the basis of paleographic clues, it is the UMS that has the oldest looking handwriting. In general, the accuracy of dating based on handwriting is estimated at 50 years or so (Pearson 1998: 50). However, when estimating the writing style, the writer’s age has to be taken into consideration, or rather: the age when he or she learned to write – and we do not have any such information in this case. In spite of the most ‘antique’ look due to its weathered condition, the DHMS is probably more recent than UMS. The cursive predominantly used in it was still quite unusual and a novel style in the late 17th century. The hand of the Paris manuscript is very sure and modern looking, which is consistent with the fact that Boudaen who wrote it was 28 years old at the time. In what concerns orthography, we find more traits of conservative spellings such as *gh* instead of *g* and *ae* instead of *aa* in the UMS, yet only a detailed quantitative analysis could confirm these tendencies for sure. 28 Yet, there are a couple of significant differences that may hide clues to the UMS position as the original (the archetype), or even the autograph, i.e. handwritten by its author. The most obvious one is that only the UMS does not explicitly mention the fact of

---

26 Platts (1884: 210) presents a form “*baikiṣṭha*, A name of Vishnu; the paradise or heaven of Vishnu; Paradise”.
27 Steingass (1892: 211) has “*bihisht*, Paradise; heaven”.
28 I will look at the spelling in more details in Chapter 4.
being a copy, nor the copyist name (or at least the initials). Also, the spelling of Ketelaar’s name: Ian Iosua/ jan josua differs from the Joan Josua, used in the other two cases, and seems closer to an older spelling. On a document from 1706, Ketelaar’s more elaborate signature is described as “Ian Josua” (fig.3.11):
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**Figure 3.11: Ketelaar’s signature from a report from the trip to Mocha, Yemen (1706) Source: Nationaal Archief**

Furthermore, although the wording and spelling of the preamble differ at points in the two manuscripts (the whole quite important line accidentally omitted in DHMS is analysed in detail by McGregor 2001: 23-24), the one most remarkable difference is the sentence in which the writer explains his reasons “for copying” the text (het **copieren**) in DHMS, but which in UMS is explained as “for putting together” or “composing” (het **formeren**), which may imply that the writer did it himself (Fig. 3.12 a, b):

![Image](image2.png)

**Figure 3.12a: The fragment with copieren (DHMS)....**

---

29 “Rapport gedaan door de ondercoopluijden Ian Josua Ketelaar en Joan van der Needen wegens hare werrigtinge tot Mocha ged[ateer]t 13en November 1706”. Nationaal Archief, 1.04.02, 9115-9123, f. 81.
Also, the signature underneath is somehow puzzling. In UMS, it is Ketelaar’s name; in DHMS, it sounds: *was getekent* (‘was signed by’) *Jsaak van der hoeven*. Usually, the phrase ‘was signed by’ was used for witnesses of a legal document, or alternatively, it could mean that the copyist is only reproducing names of signatories from the original document. In this case, it is unclear whether van der Hoeven is stating that he is the copyist, or – more unlikely – whether an unknown person made a copy of the MS copied by van der Hoeven. 30

In UMS, the invocation to Momus resembles the poem title from the Suum Cuique manuscript (*Abiit Momus, et legat hilaris Lector* – ‘Momus walks away and a reader must be cheerful’ f. 24r); to make the parallels even closer, the invocation in the UMS ends with the Latin motto *Festina Lente* – exactly like on f. 23v of Suum Cuique (Fig. 3.13). This similarity may mean that the UMS was created post-1705, or on the contrary – that Ketelaar’s literary interests predated the creation of the Suum Cuique Society. The fact that in LTK 373 all Latin phrases are translated to Dutch by the use of clever marginalia, which we do not find in UMS, may suggest that the UMS was ‘the prototype’ for these elements in LTK 373.

---

30 Vogel (1941: 7[649] interprets it as ‘a copy of a copy’.
These textual variants and hints suggesting that UMS may be the oldest, “the original”, or maybe even Ketelaar’s autograph require some corroboration. Since the date of the DHMS copy is known, and later Boudaen stated that the original was written in Agra, these two factors would help in establishing – if not a proper stemmatic filiation – at least the position of the UMS in the process of textual transmission. If it could be established that the manuscript was written in Agra, the positive answer to whether it is ‘the original’ would be much more plausible.

In April 2011, by courtesy of Dr. Bart Jaski, Keeper of Manuscripts of the Utrecht University Library, I was authorised to transport the manuscript to the Restoration Lab of Nationaal Archief in The Hague where it was examined with the Hyperspectral Imager by Roberto Padoan. I was able to organise this test thanks to Gerrit de Bruin, Head of Conservation at the Nationaal Archief. I was hoping that if the ink used to cross the name had a different chemical composition to the ink of the original text, the writing would become visible. And indeed, the ink of the text showed a lower reflectance in the near-infrared region than the ink covering it. This has made possible to visualize the text very easily in the near-infrared images at 1000 nm (from the test results description by Roberto Padoan; Fig. 3.14). As a consequence, Ketelaar’s manuscript was exhibited between April and July 2012 in Catharijneconvent in Utrecht as a part of the exhibition “Hemelse Ontdekkingen”, featuring most important discoveries from the Special Collections of the Utrecht University Library.

Figure 3.14: HSQI exam results: Ketelaar’s name emerging from under the ink at 1000nm. (Photos: R. Padoan)
A gratifying result as it was, the revealed text unfortunately did not contain any date nor the information on where the text was written. Neither the paper with its typical Dutch watermarks, nor the binding, offer any clues. There is, however, one last chance to find an answer: the analysis of the blotting sand used to dry the ink on the page.

Blotting sand was the alternative to blotting paper for centuries. Grains of blotting sand are often visible as shiny elements in the places where ink lines were the thickest, or they lay hidden under the thread binding the folios. Since the composition of the sand varies greatly depending on geographical location and conditions, it can potentially answer a lot of questions about the manuscript origin and provenance. Dr. Ralf Milke from the Institute of Geological Sciences, Freie Universität Berlin, was the first person to make writing (or blotting) sand a topic of mineralogical research. As a long-time member of the International Sand Collectors Society, he acquired over 6000 sand samples, and is well familiar with sand characteristics. He classifies the sands and sand components into seven categories (plus several sub-categories) as (1) Quartz-rich sands; (2) Heavy mineral concentrates; (3) Crushed black sands; (4) Mica sands; (5) Other crushed minerals and rocks; (6) Artificial components; (7) Biogenic components (Milke 2102). The first five types can be subdivided further by grain shapes, and can occasionally be related to regional resources, as the use of some sand types is restricted to specific areas. Besides identifying the geological and geographical origins of the blotting sand materials, Milke’s study provided insight into sands’ regional and temporal distribution. It also raised many questions about writing practices and fashions of the period, the blotting sand usage of social classes (decorative sands being much more expensive), etc. However, Milke recognized that further research was needed, and concluded that “this entire field” would “strongly benefit from collaborations between mineralogically and historically oriented scientists” (idem).

In 2015, we arranged one day of lab tests for samples of the blotting sand I collected in the Special Collections of the Utrecht University Library, the Leiden University Library and Biblioteca Marciana in Venice.

![Figure 3.15: Left: Sample preparation. Right: Microscopic ratio.](image-url)
The initial test showed a lot of promise - we were able to recognize distinctive sharp grains of black volcanic sand in the samples from Indonesian manuscripts, and to identify minerals not common in Europe in the samples from a Dutch manuscript possibly created in Sri Lanka (Fig. 3.15 & 3.16).

Unfortunately, due to the lack of funding, we were not able to continue with broader and more conclusive tests at the time. However, in November 2017, I received a grant from the Gonda Fund which will enable a week of testing of the blotting sand from the UMS.

3.4 Mill and his printed Latin translation of Ketelaar’s grammar

3.4.1 Searching for the source

With the rediscovery of three handwritten copies of the text, a compelling question arises: which one – if any of them – was used by Mill as a source for his Latin publication? Considering that both Reland and Mill were professors of Oriental languages at the same university in Utrecht, it would be natural to think that the presence of such a rare manuscript would not escape Mill’s attention. Moreover, the relatively late acquisition of the copy in the National Archives –1822, so long after Mill’s death in 1756– would support the hypothesis that the Utrecht MS is the most likely source material of Mill’s translation. However, anyone who hastily presumes that the shared Utrecht location is the key here will be in for a surprise.

31 Typically, Oriental languages taught included Hebrew, Arabic and later also Persian, however, individual professors would naturally have broader interest and would read and publish on many other languages. Whether languages such as Syriac, Ethiopic, or even important Asian languages such as Malay were taught at the academic level is hard to know since the records are scarce or non-existent.
A good starting point in search for an answer is Vogel’s remark mentioned earlier (1941: 26[668]), as indeed, we find the form -dsjieve only in PMS (p.103). In itself, it is obviously not enough to declare that Mill used the Paris copy, but it definitely makes PMS a strong contender. A second important indication concerns the way Ketelaar is introduced by Mill:

Lampada in adornanda, Grammatica Hindustanica, praetulit Vir Nobilissimus, JOANNES JOSUA KETELAER, Societatis Indiae Orientalis Legatus, ad magnum Mogolem, ut & Moderator quondam Suratae; qui cum Agrae degeret, Miscellanea de lingua Hindustanica, idiomate Belgico chartae mandavit, atque egregie, hoc in opere versatus est.32 (Mill 1743: Praefatio)

Although the fact of Ketelaar’s career as an ambassador was well known, this formulation bears strong resemblance to the title page of the Paris manuscript:

Opus Amplissimi, Spectatissimi, nec non Subtilissimi viri, Domini Joannis Josuae Ketelaer. Societatis India orientalis Legati ad magnum mogoelium, ut et Directoris in Zouratta. Etc. etc. etc. ab ipso compositum dum Agra habitaret, et a me subscripto, Zouratta exscriptum, mense januario 1714.

The mention of Agra and Surat, also absent from other copies (the only location ever mentioned is Lucknow in DHMS), we may safely presume that Mill repeated the information about the provenance of Ketelaar’s work directly after Gideon Boudaen.

Another interesting detail concerns the initial dating of the first grammar of Hindustani. Grierson in his Linguistic Survey of India, talking about Ketelaar’s grammar and vocabulary initially says: “We may assume that they were composed about the year 1715” (Grierson 1916, vol. IX-1: 6) and further simply quotes 1715 as the production year (idem vol. IX-1: 7-8; vol. IX-2: 333.) Since neither Mill nor Schulze mention any date in connection with Ketelaar, how did it enter the Survey - and effectively, for a long while, the received history of Hindi grammatical tradition? One possible trace leads to the place where the Paris manuscript was in the 19th century: Maisonneuve et Cie bookshop, as indicated by a characteristic bookseller plate. Interestingly, there is another Dutch 17th century manuscript with an identical label glued in exactly the same position: it is a catechism and a Malay grammar by Herbert de Jager (1636-1694) (Biblioteca Marciana, Legato Teza, Or. 237 (=11936), made ca. 1683) (Fig. 3.17).

32 ‘Noble sir Joan Josua Ketelaar, the Envoy of the East India Company to the Great Moghul and previously the administrator in Surat, illuminated the way with his Hindustani grammar. During his stay in Agra, he put on paper in the Dutch language the Miscellanea of the Hindustani language and conducted this work exceptionally’ [transl. mine].
The manuscript comes from the collection of the same Emilio Teza who was the first scholar in the 19th century to acknowledge Ketelaar’s text as the oldest Hindustani grammar. Although Teza quotes Schulze’s introduction as his source, could he possibly have seen Ketelaar’s book in Paris? Or, even more likely, did he spot it in the Maisonneuve’s catalogue from 1872? Under the number 3080 we find the Malay grammar later bought by Teza; Boudaen’s copy of Ketelaar is listed under 2550 (which agrees with the number written on the front pastedown next to the bookseller label of the PMS), and has the date of 1719 (often misquoted as 1714), which is the closest to the date given by Grierson.

### 3.4.2 Errors as evidence

One quite common transcription mistake in Mill is the confusion between r and n. Compare the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mill</th>
<th>UMS</th>
<th>PMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>apre nostrum (461)</td>
<td>apne (96 [100])</td>
<td>apne (105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apre gorra equus noster (462)</td>
<td>appen gorra (98[102])</td>
<td>apne gorra (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apre maal vestrum bonum (462)</td>
<td>apne maal (98[102])</td>
<td>apne maal ons goed (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toe’tsjakenhe tu es servas (463)</td>
<td>toesjackerhe gjij zijt dienaar (99[103])</td>
<td>Toe tsjaker he gjij syt dienaer (107)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat dsjauw (463)</td>
<td>Mat Jouw (99 [103])</td>
<td>mat dsjauw (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat soon kan ne tumultueris (463)</td>
<td>maat soor karre (99 [103])</td>
<td>mat soor kar raas niet (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sooë mat ne dormias</td>
<td>sooe mat slaapt niet (99 [103])</td>
<td>sooë mat slaap niet (108)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we compare the handwritings from different copies, we may conclude that the handwriting of PMS is most likely to have r mistaken for n:
Also other letters differ sometimes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mill</th>
<th>UMS</th>
<th>PMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koo mat <em>ne prohibeas</em> (99)</td>
<td>roo mat (99[103])</td>
<td>roo mat <em>ween niet</em> (108)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the contrary, some words are spelled identically only in Mill and PMS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mill</th>
<th>UMS</th>
<th>PMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naffier / Naffiersjie (465)</td>
<td>nasser / naffiertsje (102[106])</td>
<td>naffier / naffiersjie (110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gharadi / Gharaden</td>
<td>gharadi / gharaden</td>
<td>gharadi / gharaden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tornator / tornatrix (465)</td>
<td>druajer / druajerin (111)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, the line breaks in “Our Father” resemble most the ones in PMS:

Figure 3.18: ‘Our Father’ compared in Mill and in Paris MS
The similarities in spelling are obvious throughout the text, and can be best illustrated by comparing one line (“the third day he rose again”) from the Credo:

Mill’s Persian grammar also reveals one piece of evidence as to which manuscript he used as a source for his publication. In a list of examples of verbs changing the suffix -jijdem in -em on page 495, the Persian word خریدن, ‘to buy’, is mistranslated as Sperare, ‘to hope’, and not like in Greaves, emere, ‘to buy’.

---

33 The word in its actual spelling with the unvoiced pharyngeal fricative ḥ does not exist in Persian, so I’m presuming Mill meant to represent the same word as Ketelaar, chariden, and the missing diacritic from the voiceless velar fricative kha is just a typo.
There can be only one reason for this mistake: a transcription error. Let us compare this fragment in the three manuscripts:

Figure 3.20: The word *kharidan* compared (Mill 1743, Greaves 1649)

The last one has clearly the word *hoopen* in place of *koopen*. Now, its copyist Gideon Boudaen can officially be blamed for misleading a few generations of Orientalists.

All the above facts point to the PMS as the most likely source for Mill’s translation. And there is also the historical evidence to corroborate such a theory.
3.4.3 Historical circumstances: the Utrecht connection

As we have seen above, the author of the Paris copy, Gideon Boudaen, returned from his overseas mission in July 1717. Only a couple of months later, on 19th of October, he married his first cousin Isabella Johanna Boudaen (cf. Ferweda & Kok 1785, n. pag.). After his father’s death in 1726, in their hometown Middelburg, Zeeland, he bought a house Leeuwenburg in Driebergen near Utrecht (1728), which gave him the title of the lord of herlijkheid (lordship, jurisdiction) of Hardenbroek. He also became a councillor in Utrecht as well as the VOC director of the Amsterdam Chamber (Hoogstraaten et al. 1725: 344). When Boudaen settled in Utrecht in 1728 (where he lived until his death on September 30th, 1744) Mill was still active at the University. Immediately after the death of Adriaan Reland in 1718, Mill took over the chair of Oriental Languages, then ten years later started lecturing in Hebrew antiquity and theology, which he continued until his death in May 1756, and during that time was twice its Rector Magnificus (1725-1726, 1742-1743).\textsuperscript{34} Considering their high positions in society and their shared common interests – Mill was an avid collector of Oriental manuscripts and Boudaen had the invaluable first-hand experience in India and Japan – it is hardly possible that the two men would not meet. Mill was a perfect audience for Boudaen’s oriental manuscript, and he probably borrowed the copy of Ketelaar’s text for his studies. It would also explain why the Hindustani grammar appeared only in the second expanded edition of Mill’s *Dissertationes selectae* in 1743, and not in the first one from 1724. It would be curious to know whether Boudaen ever got his manuscript back before he died in the year following the publication. In any case, the manuscript is not listed in van Paddenburg’s *Veilingcatalogus* (auction catalogue) of books of David Mill, issued posthumously in 1757.

A puzzling question remains: why did Mill not simply use the copy that belonged to his predecessor Reland (UMS)? He should have known about it, had it been in the possession of the Utrecht University Library. However, Reland’s books and manuscripts may have stayed longer in the possession of his family, and only ended up in the University library years later. And indeed, in the *Veilingscatalogus* of Reland’s son Jan Hubert from 1763, Ketelaar’s grammar still figures on the list of manuscripts that belonged to his father. If the collection had been in family’s possession until then, it would explain why Mill did not know about Ketelaar’s manuscript.

\textsuperscript{34} The date of his testament is 1749; however, his wife Isabella and only daughter Anna Maria Margareta sold the estate on December 28th, 1747 to Matthijs Swemmelaar.
Despite his turbulent youth, the author of the first grammar of Hindustani, Joan Josua Ketelaar, achieved significant fame in the service to the Dutch East India Company. He is remembered for his diplomatic and commercial missions, but his literary interests are less known.

Contrary to the general belief, valid until a couple of years ago, there are three extant manuscripts of his work: one, undated, possibly made by Ketelaar himself (Utrecht MS), one made by Isaacq van den Hoeven in 1698 (Den Haag MS), and one made by Gideon Boudaen in 1714 (Paris MS). The results of paleographical analysis and other textual clues, especially shared mistakes, strongly suggest that the published Latin translation of David Mill from 1743 was based on the Paris copy – a conclusion that is corroborated by historical data. This also explains why the date 1715 entered (via Grierson) the received history of linguistics as the year of the creation of Ketelaar’s text.

Having got to know the author, as well as the codicological details of the three documents, it is time to look into the text of the book. But what languages did Ketelaar actually describe? And how straightforward is his *Instructie* for a contemporary reader? Chapter Four sketches the sociolinguistic background of 17th century India, and offers some methodological reflections on how to read a trilingual historical text.
Before we move to the analysis of the text, it is important to become aware of the particularities on the very basic level of the text: spelling, transcription and transliteration of foreign words. It is quite surprising to note that when in 1743 Professor Mill edited and published his Latin translation of the *Instructie*, he kept all Hindustani and Persian words in the original spelling without any further comment; he never cared to adapt their pronunciation to Latin orthography, not even to explain to his readers the fact that the original pronunciation was written down in the Dutch orthography, which is alien and possibly quite confusing for non-Dutch speakers (e.g. *<oe>* as /u/, *<g>* as /x/, *<oo>* as /o:/, etc.). Regardless, it did not stop scholars like Chatterji (1935: 71-78) from analysing the phonetic values of the letters, quite likely without even checking their original Dutch values, and taking modern sounds of Hindi words as a standard and a guide. Insofar as it may be understandable for lack of other comparative material, such an approach does not get us any closer to reconstructing the sounds of 17th century Hindustani. The first question we should ask before we discuss the possible sound of a Hindustani word is how a Dutch speaker of that period pronounced a particular vowel combination, or any consonant, for that matter, as many values change over time. For one thing, this may give us an idea whether the orthographic distinctions are always phonological, or if there is evidence of a transcription system in place more independent from Dutch. A comprehensive answer to these questions would demand a historical phonological study of its own; therefore in this chapter I will limit myself to outlining the problem with its possible pitfalls, and to suggest shortcuts that will allow for a more informed reading of the text.

In the present chapter, I will start with an outline of the convoluted history of Hindustani and its script, followed by a brief discussion of issues with its Romanisation. Presenting the model of Ketelaar’s notation prepared by Chatterji (1935: 71-78), I will make a case for paying more attention to the metalanguage of the original text: the 17th century Dutch. Consequently, I will identify spelling tendencies in the three copies of the *Instructie*, putting them in the context of Dutch standards at the time. Searching for Ketelaar’s transcription strategies, I will analyse his spelling of Persian first, as it possibly had a different source then the Hindustani. I will finish the chapter presenting a case of a Dutch Romanisation of a similar text, which shows the value of comparative studies for understanding how the Dutch orthography and phonology may be influencing the transcription. This approach, which I believe leads to a better methodology, is the direct avenue for further research.

### 4. How to read the *Instructie*

Before we move to the analysis of the text, it is important to become aware of the particularities on the very basic level of the text: spelling, transcription and transliteration of foreign words. It is quite surprising to note that when in 1743 Professor Mill edited and published his Latin translation of the *Instructie*, he kept all Hindustani and Persian words in the original spelling without any further comment; he never cared to adapt their pronunciation to Latin orthography, not even to explain to his readers the fact that the original pronunciation was written down in the Dutch orthography, which is alien and possibly quite confusing for non-Dutch speakers (e.g. *<oe>* as /u/, *<g>* as /x/, *<oo>* as /o:/, etc.). Regardless, it did not stop scholars like Chatterji (1935: 71-78) from analysing the phonetic values of the letters, quite likely without even checking their original Dutch values, and taking modern sounds of Hindi words as a standard and a guide. Insofar as it may be understandable for lack of other comparative material, such an approach does not get us any closer to reconstructing the sounds of 17th century Hindustani. The first question we should ask before we discuss the possible sound of a Hindustani word is how a Dutch speaker of that period pronounced a particular vowel combination, or any consonant, for that matter, as many values change over time. For one thing, this may give us an idea whether the orthographic distinctions are always phonological, or if there is evidence of a transcription system in place more independent from Dutch. A comprehensive answer to these questions would demand a historical phonological study of its own; therefore in this chapter I will limit myself to outlining the problem with its possible pitfalls, and to suggest shortcuts that will allow for a more informed reading of the text.

In the present chapter, I will start with an outline of the convoluted history of Hindustani and its script, followed by a brief discussion of issues with its Romanisation. Presenting the model of Ketelaar’s notation prepared by Chatterji (1935: 71-78), I will make a case for paying more attention to the metalanguage of the original text: the 17th century Dutch. Consequently, I will identify spelling tendencies in the three copies of the *Instructie*, putting them in the context of Dutch standards at the time. Searching for Ketelaar’s transcription strategies, I will analyse his spelling of Persian first, as it possibly had a different source then the Hindustani. I will finish the chapter presenting a case of a Dutch Romanisation of a similar text, which shows the value of comparative studies for understanding how the Dutch orthography and phonology may be influencing the transcription. This approach, which I believe leads to a better methodology, is the direct avenue for further research.
Hindustani (or Hindi-Urdu) is an Indo-Aryan language spoken in South Asia and among the people of the South Asian diaspora all over the world. With almost 500 thousands speakers, it serves as a link language of the large part of India and is also the world’s third most widely spoken language. Historically known by many names (Hindavi, Hindi, Rekhta), it originated in the North of India as a contact language between the native population and incoming flux of Afghans, Turks, Persians and Arabs. A modern definition of Hindustani in India that still retained its validity was given by Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi (1869-1948) in his *Thoughts on National Language*:

Hindustani is the language which is spoken and understood and used by Hindus and Muslims both in cities and in villages in North India and which is written and read both in the Nagari and Persian scripts and whose literary forms are today known as Hindi and Urdu. (Gandhi 1956: 113)

If put on a scale, formal Hindi and *khalis* (pure, unmixed) Urdu being on the two extremes, the whole middle ground between them is usually referred to as Hindustani – the language of the *bazaar* or more recently, of Bollywood movies. Although differences between colloquial Urdu and Hindi are almost negligible (besides inherent lexical differences, as Hindi incorporates some of its lexicon from Sanskrit, whereas Urdu relies heavily on Persian and Arabic), they coexist as two separate standardized registers. Masica (1991: 27) regards Hindi and Urdu as “the ultimate anomaly in the what-is-a-language dilemma” since they are officially considered to be two different languages in the sociocultural Sense B, yet according to him they are merely “different literary styles”, and not even “different dialects or subdialects in the linguistic Sense A” (ibid.), although “their identity as separate languages may now be regarded as a cultural fact, however anomalous

---

1 The frequently used term *lingua franca* referring to Hindustani (e.g. Bhatia 2008: 1: 2: “a lingua franca of India”) is too vague to be useful. In the classical definition, *lingua franca* was “a language of convenience used by speakers of mutually incomprehensible mother tongues” (Mallette 2014: 330) – a pidginised trade (or vehicular, bridge) language with no native speakers of its own. In case of Hindustani, it would be crucial to analyse whether its “universality” is purely functional, and to what extent it is a hybrid language, which structure has been shaped by language contact. A more neutral term for such suprasegmental form of speech is *link language* (cf. Hock & Joseph 2009: 349-354).

2 Because of the ambiguous usage of glottonyms for languages of India, it is not always clear what language is meant by a particular author (Rahman 2011: 23). For a detailed discussion, see Rahman (2011: 18-52).

3 Although Nagari is the older version of the Devanagari script, the word is often being used interchangeably with Devanagari referring to the modern script.

4 Masica defines dialect in Sense A as “a subvariety of a larger unit, which is typically a *language*”, and in Sense B as an unwritten form, as opposed to language possessing “a written ‘standard’ and a literature” (Masica 1991: 23).
linguistically” (idem: 30). Hock and Joseph (2009: 60) see Hindi-Urdu as a language “that is ‘divided against itself’ because of religious and political differences”.

Indeed, Hindi and Urdu today are mostly ethnic or religious markers: Hindi is associated with Hinduism, and Urdu with Islam.5 The study done by Hashami (2010: 209) has shown that although the majority of the Muslim respondents disagreed with the statement that Urdu is the language of Muslims alone, no non-Muslim claimed Urdu as mother tongue (cf. also Abbi et al. 2004: 4). What is more curious, educated Muslims who actually did not know Urdu (neither reading nor writing) still claimed Urdu as their mother tongue. In spite of the official non-recognition of the language name Hindustani, the vast majority of respondents (Hindi as well as Urdu speakers) asserted they “generally speak Hindustani” or a Mili-Juli, “mixed language” (Hashami 2010: 209). In some parts of India, Hindustani and Mili-Juli were even claimed as mother tongue, or as one of the languages spoken at home (by up to 33% in Lucknow; Abbi et al. 2004: 9). This phenomenon is more visible in the Hindi belt (the part of North and Central India where Hindi and Hindi languages are widely spoken), which according to the authors is indicative of the fact that the speakers in that area are [more] aware of the continuum between Urdu and Hindi.

4.1.2. Hindustani and its script
From its origin, Hindustani, being ‘a bastard dialect’, or a diasystem of both Hindus and Muslims, did not have one writing system ascribed to it, and was written down using either Devanagari or Persian script. In his A Voyage to Surat from 1689, an English naval chaplain John Ovington (1653-1731) observes:

The language of the Moors is different from that of the ancient Original Inhabitants of India, but is oblig’d to these Gentiles for its Characters. For though the Moors Dialect is peculiar to themselves, yet it is destitute of Letters to express it; and therefore in all their Writings in their Mother Tongue, they borrow their Letters from Heathens, or from the Persians, or other Nations. (Ovington 1696: 246-247).

John Fryer (ca. 1650-1733), British travel-writer and doctor, makes a rather general remark, supporting the Devanagari as the default script: “The language at court is Persian, the commonly spoke is Indostan (for which they have no proper Character, the written Language being called Banyani)” (Fryer 1698: 201).

Ketelaar’s grammar and dictionary uses only Roman script and transliteration for Hindustani words, however, there is a Perso-Arabic alphabet included in a separate part after the main body of text. In the Introduction, Ketelaar explains the complex situation regarding the writings in the geographic area of Hindustan:

---

5 For a recent study and an informative discussion on Urdu speakers in India, their attitudes towards Urdu, etc. see Abbi et al (2004). More fundamental research on Hindi and Urdu nationalism was done, inter alios, by Dasgupta (1970). On the limitations resulting from the “modern nationalist framing of Hindi as a Hindu language” on research on position and development of Hindi in Indo-Muslim contexts see Busch (2009: 7).
Among the highest officials, Persian is used most, all the more because all documents are drafted in that language, and sometimes in Arabic, since there are no writings in Hindustani to be found, and there have never been any. Therefore whenever learning to read and write is necessary, it’s exercised in Persian or Arabic, hence their book of law, Alkoran, is rarely to be found in other language than Arabic, and the less important books, as well as writing letters are commonly [done] in Persian. Among Banias [Indian caste of merchants] and other Pagans, we find their own script, but it is not used by the Moors."

Apparently, at the end of 17th century, Persian influence on Hindustani was so strong that it pushed Ketelaar to make an unusual complaint:

‘Another hopeless thing with the Moors is that they have bastardised the words so badly that they almost cannot tell themselves, if you ask them, whether it is in Persian or Hindustani, and therefore the biggest hope is that they [finally] learn to write and read.’

De Tours in his Hindustani grammar (1704) and dictionary (Thesaurus Linguæ Indianæ, 1703), also composed in Surat, uses characters of the Devanagari alphabet with some Gujarati features (McGregor 2001: 11), even in the title page claiming that these are the proprios caracterés (its own ‘specific characters’) of the Indian language he is describing. According to McGregor (ibidem), this association between the Devanagari script and Indian languages, “especially Hindustani” was popular among seventeenth century travellers to India. On the other hand, as McGregor (ibidem) has speculated, the perception of Persian script as ‘non-Indian’ was likely to be reinforced wherever the contact with Hindu communities was closer. If we analyse the social context and religious affiliations of the European traders and missionaries, this observation and the resulting assumption are confirmed: François Maria de Tours, a Capuchin friar, must have had closer contacts with

---

6 Intriguingly, Henry Curzon in his “Universal Library, Or, Compleat Summary of Science” (1712) states that “the Gazarete Tongue is the chief in the Mogul’s Empire, tho’ they Pray in Arabick, and at court speak the Persian” (Curzon 1712: 51).
the Gujarati Hindu community. On the contrary, Ketelaar must have had more opportunities of contact with local Mughal officials, as all administration was in the hands of Muslim rulers with whom the VOC strived to cultivate good relations (Gokhale 1979: 168). Moreover, Muslim merchants owned the majority of the ships in Surat, and although Hindus – the largest group in town – controlled much of its wealth, the Muslim shipowners were individually the wealthiest and most influential (Das Gupta 2004[2001]: 318; 312). Although Das Gupta (idem: 333) maintains that they had no direct business connections with European companies, the Dutch must have frequently encountered them in daily life.

Similarly, a century or so later, British sources like John Borthwick Gilchrist (1759–1841) and S. W. Fallon (1817-1880) also use Perso-Arabic alphabet. Gilchrist spends a lot of ink to rebuke the work of his fellow countrymen G. Hadley and J. Ferguson, authors of the first “military grammars” (1772, 1773), of what they called a Jargon. Gilchrist calls them “the unqualified poachers in the field of Hindoostanee philology”, and uses a quotation from a famous English Orientalist Nathaniel Brassey Halhead (1751-1830), author of a Bengali grammar (1778) to discredit their sources and methods:

> Europeans, on their arrival in India, reduced to a necessary intercourse with Mahometan servants, or sepoys, habitually acquire from them this idiom, in that imperfect and confined state, which is the consequence of the menial condition of their instructors; yet this curious system of study hath produced more than one attempt to a Grammar and Vocabulary. The jargon however, such as it is, proves utterly unintelligible to the villagers and peasants, both in Hindoostan and Bengal, [nor is used any where, but in large towns frequented by Mahometans and Strangers]. (Gilchrist 1787: V)

Gilchrist cuts the citation short and does not mention that the “idiom”, although not understood in villages, is used “in large towns frequented by Mahometans and strangers” (Halhead 1778: XIII-XIV). Halhead himself made a few remarks about the Moors dialect, and the inadequacy of Persian script for rendering Hindustani sounds:

> The dialect called by us the Moors is that mixed species of Hindostanic, which I have above described to owe its existence to the Mahometan conquest. In its idiom several elegant poems and tales have been composed by learned Persian and Mughal authors, and are still extant in the libraries of the curious. There are always written in the Persian hand, which is by no means calculated for expressing the sound either of the Hindostanic vowels or nasal consonants. The Mahometans of the lower rank have a few books on Religious subjects in this language, and in the Naagoree

---

7 Notable Catholic converts came from higher Hindu castes; Aranha (2015: 335) describes De Tours’ request on behalf of a young Indian Christian of Brahman caste for admission to the Urbanian College in Rome, and mentions that two other Brahmans provided the official confirmation in writing of the candidate’s caste status.

8 Rahman calls Hadleyan model of language teaching “Hindustani in the imperative mode” from the fact that the tone and examples in Hadley’s book are in the imperative tone and very rude, as well as grammatically incorrect (Rahman 2011: 209).
characters, which are also used by some of them in their petty accounts. (Halhead 1778: XIII)

German Lutheran missionary Benjamin Schulze believed that Devanagari is the original script of Hindustani, and that the Persian script came by laziness and pride of the invaders: “Lingua hæc Hindostanica gaudens characteribus Hebraicis, proprie vocatur Deva nagaram ab Incolis, qui adhuc ethnici sunt & a sectoribus Muhammadis distinguuntur.” (Schulze 1745: 2). Schulze provides a curious etymology of the Devanagari script. According to him, when The Ten Lost Tribes of Israel settled in today’s Georgia and consecutively conquered the land up to and beyond the Indus river, the local people who up to then were using Caspian Sea writing, took over Hebrew script for their Hindustanic language and called it Deva Nagaram. This script of the Pagans, or Hindus, was much different from the followers of Muhammad who conquered the Indian provinces. Schulze believed the explicit similarities between both scripts spoke for themselves, and the apparent differences were only a result of “bad copying”.9 Henry Curzon, the aforementioned author of the “complete summary of science” somehow cryptically declares that “the Indians have Thirty Three Letters in their Alphabet, and write from the Left to the Right in the Peninsula beyond Ganges, contrary to the Custom of other Indians” (Curzon 1712: 51).

Ironically, one could blame colonialism with its emphasis on the script differences for initiating the tug-of-war between Hindi, Urdu and Hindustani for the position of national or official language of the country. Led by the aforementioned professor of Hindustani at Fort William College in Calcutta, J. B. Glichrist, the British codified the differences between the language and script of Hindu and Muslim speakers of Hindustani. In the year 1837, under the British administration, Hindustani written in Perso-Arabic script was recognized in the courts of North West Provinces (roughly equivalent of present-day Uttar Pradesh, so the heartland of Urdu), replacing Persian. This sparked strong opposition by the Hindi-Nagari supporters, who claimed the Persian script was defective since it was susceptible to multiple readings, as opposed to “perfect” Devanagari (Ahmad 2008: 1164). They got their claims vindicated only in 1900, yet the issues of dual script and dual religious identity in the context of national language have never really disappeared.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the problem was still far from solved. In his early writings, Gandhi, perhaps inspired by his work among multi-ethnic and multilingual Indian communities in South Africa, sought solutions precisely by acknowledging the dual identity of Hindi-Urdu. In 1909 he postulated:

A universal language for India should be Hindi, with the option of writing it in Persian or Nagari characters. In order that the Hindus and the Mohammedans may have closer relations, it is necessary to know both the characters. And, if we can do this, we can drive the English language out of the field in a short time. (Gandhi 2014[1924]: 83-84)

---

9 “Apparens diversitas suborta est ex vitio literas male pingentium.” idem: 4.
However, from this political war, Hindi in Devanagari characters emerged as a winner and is a recognized official language of India. Urdu with its Perso-Arabic Nastaliq script became the official language of Pakistan. In spite of the initial restriction of 15 years, for practical reasons, English remains a subsidiary official language of India. There is no national language specified in either law or constitution.

4.2 Transcribing Hindustani and Persian

4.2.1 Transliteration, transcription, Romanisation: the definitions

Even with today’s linguistic knowledge and technology, the conversion of different scripts and writing systems is not, and has never been, a straightforward task. Every writing system is a convention, and its signs are designed to record speech of a particular language. Even in the best case of phonographic writing systems, it does not guarantee providing all the details of the speech sounds, especially that the same letters, or combination of letters, can be used to represent quite different sounds, according to the orthography of the language. This problem has been partially remedied at the end of 19th century by the introduction of the International Phonetic Alphabet. However, to illustrate the scope of the task, it should be noted that IPA in its current form consists of 157 symbols, of which 107 letters represent consonants and vowels, 31 diacritics provide more specific description of the letter’s pronunciation, and 19 extra symbols indicate suprasegmental qualities such as stress, length, tone, and intonation. Fortunately, since speech can be transcribed with various levels of precision, only a subsegment of the IPA is enough to describe the basics phonology of a particular language.

Technically speaking, transliteration is a letter-by-letter conversion of a text from one script to another. It does not necessarily reflect the pronunciation, but deals solely with the graphemes of another script, “using the exact same orthographical conventions, but using carefully substituted orthographical symbols” (Beesley 1998). Thus understood, it is called a strict or orthographical transliteration, in which the substituted orthographical symbols result in a “one-to-one fully reversible mapping with the character set of the original orthography”\(^\text{10}\) (ibidem).

Transcription, on the contrary, is concerned with phonemes. Phonetic transcription focuses on accurate representation of the speech sounds, and can be used to describe details such as dialectal variations in pronunciation. The most common type is phonemic transcription, also called broad transcription, which is general enough that two different sounds, if not forming a phonemic distinction in a particular language, can be treated as the same phoneme. Often, it also implies the use of unmodified letters of Roman alphabet. In opposition, a very detailed phonetic description of sounds, including details of the realisation of phonemes as

\(^{10}\) For more details on issues resulting from the nonequivalence of Hindi and Urdu scripts see e.g., Lehal and Saini (2010) (Hindi → Urdu), Malik et al. (2009) (Urdu → Hindi).
well as aspects such as aspiration, ‘breathiness’, etc. is called a narrow transcription and relies on phonetic symbols and diacritics (cf. Handbook of the International Phonetic Association, 1999: 28-30).

This distinction is particularly relevant for Arabic, using the Arabic alphabet, and Persian and Urdu, using the adapted Arabic alphabet, also called Perso-Arabic, since it is usual that short vowels do not appear in the text. The abovementioned example ﻫﺮﻳﺪن would be in transliteration <khrīdn> , and with vocalisation (adding vowels which are not visible in the original text), we get the transliteration kharīdan. This is particularly important when homographs occur, which are not homophonous. Therefore, transcriptions are interpretations made by scholars in order to propose a possible reading. Transliteration is needed to demonstrate how the word is spelled in the original script. Both steps are necessary when this can lead to ambiguity.

Romanisation (or Latinisation) consists in employing Latin characters as an alternative orthographic form for non-Latin scripts. Linguists like van Driem postulate that “a Romanised orthography must be as simple as possible, but no simpler than that. First and foremost, a Romanised orthography must be consistent and phonologically adequate. Ideally a new Romanised orthography should choose symbols as much as possible in keeping with the traditional phonetic values of letters and letter combinations” (van Driem 2007: 115). Inevitably, the lack of terminological agreements regarding Romanisation resulted in fuzzy borders between transcription and transliteration and meant that historically, a vast majority of Romanised texts contained a mix of orthographic and phonological information. While it can be acceptable for its practical value in some cases, for some languages like Arabic, “standard orthography is a poor clue to pronunciation” and “conversely, a good phonological transcription is often a poor clue to standard orthography. It’s a serious mistake to try to do [Arabic] transcription and transliteration at the same time” (Beesley 1998). To some extent, this is true of other languages using Perso-Arabic script, such as Urdu and Persian. This situation has changed with the advent of (commercial) technologies for natural-language processing, which require stricter methodological approach, and which have prompted development of new orthographic transliteration systems for particular languages.

4.2.2 Issues with Hindustani transliteration

The fact that Hindi and Urdu, the “two standardised registers of the single language Hindustani” are written in different scripts is, as it often happens, just a historical accident. Nevertheless, this situation has caused many difficulties in transliterating Hindi to Urdu and vice versa. In order to overcome the mutual illegibility of the scripts in

---

11 Vowel indicators are traditionally preserved in Qur’an to facilitate the reading for non-Arab people, and in elementary school books – here also in Greaves.
which Hindi-Urdu are written, the often-employed device is to write English in Latin alphabet. The inconsistent and random aspect of such orthographies is visible in omnipresent English-based advertisements in India, but probably most systematically in Bollywood movie productions. Inasmuch as Hindi films are a very important “generator and vehicle for contemporary popular culture”¹³ and their use of language “has a remarkable supra-regional and integrative quality” (ibidem), their Romanised titles leave linguists like van Driem (2007: 116) appalled by “the egregious orthographic vagaries of Hindi film posters”. Van Driem sees this problem in a broader colonial context: “In areas traditionally dominated by the British, childish orthographies may appear expedient to literacy advocates in the short run, but such orthographies and the inherently condescending attitude on the part of their proponents which such spellings represent are relics of an imperialist past and an insult to the intelligence of the local peoples” (2007: 115).

However, such spellings are reminiscent of the online written electronic communication language seen on social media sites. Originally, they were imposed by the limitations of the technology, lacking non-Latin scripts, and developed spontaneously, hence the lack of consistency and solid scholarly approach. Fortunately standardisation efforts are constantly being made, notably by the proponents of the Hamari Boli (‘our language’), or the “reincarnated Hindustani” initiative. They understand Hamari Boli as “re-unified Hindi-Urdu written using Roman alphabet with a combined vocabulary drawn from both standard Hindi and Urdu with generous helpings of English” and see “instant messengers, chat rooms, blogs, discussion boards and social networks […] as informal laboratories and nurseries of its development and popularization”.¹⁴

---


¹⁴ All quotations on Hamari Boli come from the website http://www.hamariboli.com (accessed on 16 April 2014).
It has to be noted that the Hindi and Urdu orthography does not always reflect the pronunciation. This is particularly visible in the spelling of Arabic and Persian loanwords in Urdu, and Sanskrit loanwords in Hindi (Nespital 1994: 318-20; Schmidt 2003: 290, 292), where the words follow the spelling of the original language; nonetheless, the range of discrepancies between written and spoken language is much broader. The peculiarities of the Hindi-Urdu phonology-orthography interface encompass, but are not limited to, vowel and consonant assimilation (sandhi), gemination or consonant elongation, deletion of /a/ phoneme in certain contexts, final vowel lengthening, etc. (cf. Pandey 2007). Some of the characteristics, especially regarding vowel quality behaviour, or marking of foreign phonemes, are a direct consequence of using Devanagari or Perso-Arabic script; however, both scripts were used interchangeably by important Indian writers until as late as the beginnings of the 20th century, and therefore the script itself cannot be blamed for creating the divergence.

The problem is quite visible in syllabaries like Devanagari, where the inherent a vowel often becomes problematic, especially when referencing both Hindi and Sanskrit sources. Many Sanskrit loanwords in Hindi, as well as major Indian place-names have established forms in English, often quite different from the original spelling (Snell gives examples of महोव र being “Gwalior” rather than Gvāliyar, इलाहाबाद rendered as “Allahabad” rather than Ilāhābād, and most bizarrely, “Mhow”, rather than Mahā for महोव). Also, the Romanisation of modern Hindi authors’ names is non-systematic and often a subjective choice, hence
personal variants of the same name are encountered, e.g. जोधरी caudharī transliterated as Chaudhari, Chowdhuri, Chaudhary, etc.\textsuperscript{15} 
In the case of abjad (consonantal) writing systems such as Perso-Arabic, the problem is even bigger. Urdu, just like Arabic and Persian, uses diacritics above or below a character to signal the unwritten short vowels and other characteristic such as double consonants. There are fifteen diacritics in total (Malik 2006: 13), yet they are rarely used in standard Urdu texts, which for non-Urdu speakers and computer systems alike, causes the problem of possible multiple interpretations.

Other particularities of the Urdu script include four different types of full characters:

1. Simple consonant characters \( \mathfrak{f} / f \) 
2. Dual behaviour characters \( \mathfrak{y}/i/ \) or \( \mathfrak{z}/\varepsilon/ \) 
3. Vowel modifier character \( \mathfrak{u}/\~{n}/ \) [nūn ghunna, word-final only nasal \( n \)] 
4. Consonant modifier character \( \mathfrak{h}/h/ \) [do-chashmī he, adding aspiration)]

(based on Tafseer et al., 2010).

Although in Persian the distinctions between the three types of \( s \) and \( z \) is historic, and there is no real phonetic difference in the modern language, the different orthography is preserved. Due to extensive borrowing from Arabic and Persian combined with the fact that the original foreign spellings are retained in Urdu, a situation arises when different Arabic and Persian graphemes map onto a single Urdu phoneme (e.g., \( \text{ض, ظ, ص} \), all map to /s/).

Just like Hindi and Urdu, Persian also has its informal Romanised form used in online communication (an example is presented in Fig. 4.2). It is commonly called Pinglish, also Pingilish, Finglish, Fingilish, or Finglisi. There are many online converters from Fingilish to Farsi. Interestingly, the opposite phenomenon of English being written in the Persian alphabet, called Enersian, has arisen in Iran.

\textsuperscript{15} This example comes from a practical guide to transliterating Devanagari by Rupert Snell from the University of Texas in Austin, 
http://hindiurduflagship.org/resources/learning-teaching/transliterating-devanagari/.
Obviously, in Ketelaar’s time, no such tools existed; nevertheless, Ketelaar’s work can be seen as pioneering in representing Hindustani sounds to a European reader. His system has been first analysed by Chatterji in 1935. His main findings are summarised below.

4.2.3 Chatterji’s analysis of Hindustani transcription
In his article from 1935 Chatterji (1935: 71-78) provides a detailed analysis of Ketelaar’s phonemic spelling. He comes to the conclusion that the vowels Ketelaar heard seemed to have been very much the same as found in Western Hindustani. Chatterji’s observations are summarised in the table below. The table presents Chatterji’s description of Hindustani sounds, his analysis of Ketelaar’s representation and his modern transliteration of Ketelaar’s words. The standard transliteration of Devanagari (ISO 15919) and tentative IPA values are my addition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindustani sound</th>
<th>Standard transliteration</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>Ketelaar’s representation</th>
<th>Examples with modern transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ã [a]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>[ə]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>sachtī (saxtī) beetha (bēta)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ä [aː]</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>[aː]</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>benaje (bēnāti) somsje (sāmjihe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindustani sound</td>
<td>Standard transliteration</td>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Ketelaar’s representation</td>
<td>Examples with modern transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>[ɪ]</td>
<td>aa</td>
<td>baab (bap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ao</td>
<td>naom (nām)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ae</td>
<td>gaëlī (gālt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ay</td>
<td>kay tsoeke (khā cukā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>auw</td>
<td>derriauw (darya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>karromet (karāmāt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>poeranne (purānā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>gin (gin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ie</td>
<td>tiesra dien (tisrā din)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>duwanna (diwānā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>[ɪ]</td>
<td>ie</td>
<td>tier (tōr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-e (final)</td>
<td>teeri (tērt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-y (final)</td>
<td>alamgiere (’ālamgīrē)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>bhay (bhat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>sust (sust)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>bod (but)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>poeranne (purānā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>[ʊ]</td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>poerobe (pūrub for pūrub)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ee</td>
<td>deete (dētā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>tsyē (cāhiye)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ae (exceptional)</td>
<td>toesjae (tujihe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ō</td>
<td>ō</td>
<td>[oː]</td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>dhoobi (dihōbī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>gorra (ghōrā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>disjeroe (jōrā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>auw</td>
<td>kauw (khāō)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai (modern sound of [ae] [aeː])</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>[ɛː]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>me (ma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ey</td>
<td>peyssa (paīsā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>paedda (paidā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au [ɔ],[ɔː]</td>
<td>au</td>
<td>[ɔː]</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>kon (kaun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oo</td>
<td>oor (aur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ou</td>
<td>doure (daurō)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a+h [ac]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bhen (bāhīn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pelle (pāhlīn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ney (nāht)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brabber (bārābar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ghlas (xālās)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vowel insertion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>boellana (bhulnā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasalised vowels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>issekā (iskā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>innenkon (inkō)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-kon (kō)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-son (sō)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindustani sound</td>
<td>Standard transliteration</td>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Ketelaar’s representation</td>
<td>Examples with modern transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>[k]</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>kaam (kām)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ks</td>
<td></td>
<td>kk</td>
<td>poekkar (pukār)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh</td>
<td>kh</td>
<td>[kʰ]</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>lackrie (lakṛī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>taxier (taqṣīr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>[ɡ]</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>kapprel (khaṟpreḷ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nh</td>
<td>[ŋ]</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>khawungae (khāṅgā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qh</td>
<td>[q]</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>kghattae (khāṭṭā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>gh</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>dukhī (duqhī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>raag (rākh)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td>girre (girā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td>jachte (jāṭā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td>ghir (gịr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ɡ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>c (or č)</td>
<td>[tʃ]</td>
<td>tsj</td>
<td>tsjockjedaar (caukṭdar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tsj</td>
<td>tsjand (caṇḍ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ts</td>
<td>tsitter (cittar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sch</td>
<td>mirrītsch (mirīc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>kenste (khaḷcṭā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tj</td>
<td>tsjettja (caccā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>[tʃʰ]</td>
<td>tsj</td>
<td>tsoetsjonga (puṭṭhāṅga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tsj</td>
<td>tsjinnal (chūnṇal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ries (ṛṛch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>[dʒ]</td>
<td>dsj</td>
<td>dsjate (jāṭā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sj</td>
<td>sjawaab (jawāb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ds</td>
<td>ne dsante (na jāṭṭā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dz</td>
<td>dzamah (jāma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dj</td>
<td>hadjam (hajjām)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pāssieste (pustṭjā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindustani sound</td>
<td>Standard transliteration</td>
<td>IPA</td>
<td>Ketelaar’s representation</td>
<td>Examples with modern transliteration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṛ</td>
<td>ṛ</td>
<td>rr</td>
<td>dourr (daur)</td>
<td>karwa (karwa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṛh</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>boudia (burhiā)</td>
<td>orhena (ōrhnā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t–th</td>
<td>t, th</td>
<td>t, th</td>
<td>haat (hāth)</td>
<td>batthie (battī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d–dh</td>
<td>d, dh (but: interchange of aspirated and non-aspirated forms)</td>
<td>d, dh</td>
<td>doost (dōst)</td>
<td>faidah (fā’ida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b–bh</td>
<td>b–bʰ</td>
<td>[b–bʰ]</td>
<td>baab (bāp)</td>
<td>boelle (bhulē)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f (in words of non-Indian origin)</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>jaad (yād)</td>
<td>gaija (gāvā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ph (native Indian)</td>
<td>ph</td>
<td>ph</td>
<td>sichaya (sikhāyā)</td>
<td>jokoy (jō köī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>jachte (jāgtā)</td>
<td>beakarre (byāh karē)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>gulaab (gulab)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w (nasalised)</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>lakriewala (lakrīwālā)</td>
<td>mervan (mīhrwān)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w (nasalised)</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>hauwa (hāwā)</td>
<td>oeanse (wahāse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w (nasalised)</td>
<td>uw</td>
<td>uw</td>
<td>soorauri (sōrāwārī)</td>
<td>dsjamway (jāwātē)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>tisra (tīsrā)</td>
<td>peysa (peysā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>kesmet (kīzmēt)</td>
<td>darazje (daṟāzī)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>š (from Persian or Sanskrit)</td>
<td>[ʃ]</td>
<td>sj</td>
<td>sjamindaan (šama’dān)</td>
<td>nischan (nīshān)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sch</td>
<td>sahanai (šahānāi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In his analysis, Chatterji recognises some local dialectal influences on the phonological and lexical levels. Many of them, like the pronunciation of the \( h \), or employing the glottal stop for aspirate, come from Gujarati. Other, such as the "\( w \) sound after \(-ā\) in certain forms", apparently still in use in Ketelaar’s time but dropped in Modern Hindi-Urdu, can be traced back to Bengali forms, cf. Ketelaar’s ‘gauwena – Bengali gāonā – Hindi-Urdu gānā, to sing (Chatterji 1935: 76). But one thing Chatterji does not do is to pay enough attention to the Dutch spelling, which, given the variations in the three copies, might turn out to be more fine-grained that the table above would suggest. But in order to understand Ketelaar’s notation, we need to look at it in the context of the Dutch orthography standards at the time.

### Table 2: Chatterji’s model enriched by IPA and standard transliteration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindustani sound</th>
<th>Standard transliteration</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>Ketelaar’s representation</th>
<th>Examples with modern transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( h ) (Arabic pharyngal ( h ) - unvoiced fricative fallen together with Hindustani ( h ) - voiced glottal fricative)</td>
<td>( h )</td>
<td>[ɦ]</td>
<td>( h ) [initially] ( h ) [medially and finally dropped] ( h ) [final of Persian]</td>
<td>hiera (ḥtrā) bea (byāh) sja (ṣaḥ) hakmah (ḥakmah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘(voiced laryngal fricative form of ( b ))</td>
<td>ignored, or: aa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taalima (τα’lɪm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( -t ) ( -p ) (final)</td>
<td>-d -b (occasionally) frequent doubling of consonants</td>
<td>gied (ḡtɪ) baab (ḇāp) brabar (barābar) hasaab (ḥisāb) but: matsu (macchī) iset (īẓāt)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 17th century, the dialects of The Dutch Republic — officially known as the Republic of the Seven United Netherlands [Provinces] (Republiek der Zeven Verenigde Nederlanden) could generally be divided in three parts: Northern (Hollandic), Southern (Brabantian and Flemish) and Eastern (van der Wal 1994: 200). The latter was gradually turning into Nederduitsch, Low German, with mixed Dutch and German elements, and thus not considered as proper Dutch.
two centuries, standard pronunciation slowly took over a multitude of regional variants, creating what we now know as *Algemeen Beschaafd Nederlands*, Standard Dutch. Some forms were considered more ‘polite’, ‘proper’ or ‘civilised’ (*beschaafd*) than others, and as it happened, the pronunciation that prevailed was the one used in the rich and powerful province of Holland. However, some influences from relatively prestigious Southern dialects on the Standard Dutch can be distinguished as well, predominantly as a result of a large number of highly literate immigrants from the South: scholars, poets, printers and merchants, as well as teachers using ‘southern’ manuals in their Dutch and French schools (Van der Wal & van Bree 1994: 201, 204). This universally perceived ‘properness’ in pronunciation prepared the ground for the standardised spelling, much required by the blooming printing business. The initial spelling models came with the first Bible translations into Dutch. Yet the first methodological approach was a work from 1550 by a poet, printer and publisher from Gent, Joos Lambrecht (ca.1491-ca.1556-1557) entitled *Nederlâdsche Spellijnghe*, uutghesteld by vraghe ende antwoorde: *Tot onderwijs der jonghers voor haar earste begin* (‘Dutch Spelling, arranged in the form of questions and answers, for education of the young gentlemen, from its very beginning’).16 (Notably, this is probably the first case of a language book with the glossonym *Nederlands*, ‘Dutch’, in the title). 17 This work was followed by *De Orthographia linguae belgicae* (Leuven, 1576) by Antoon van’t Sestich (Antonius Sexagius, ca. 1535–1585), and the *Nederduitse Ortographie* (Antwerp, 1581) by Pontus de Heuiter (1535–1602). Finally, the most seminal work, which defined principles of the 17th century spelling, was published in 1584: *Twe-spraack vande Nederduitsche Letterkunst, ofte Vant spellen ende eyghenscap des Nederduitschen taals* by Hendrik Laurensz Spieghel.


17 cf. Ooms and Van Keymeulen (2005: 24). The question of endonyms (names by which a language is known by its own speakers or writers, as defined by Lubliner 2006) and exonyms (names given to a language in other languages—*ibidem*) in case of the Dutch language is quite complicated. In general, Ketelaar uses the form *Nederduits*, which he often shortens to *daijts* (especially in the language ‘titles’ in his vocabulary table).
In spite of the aforementioned standardisation efforts, the seventeenth century spelling is still rather heterogeneous. Just like any language change, the agreements on writing were slow to happen, even between the philologists themselves. Particular writers and poets also had their own preferences when it came to spelling. To give one example: the double aa prescribed by Twe-sprack was used by P.C. Hooft (1581–1647) but not by Joost van den Vondel (1587–1679) who preferred ae, just like several other writers after him (Moonen, 1706; Verwer, 1707; ten Kate, 1723; de Haes, 1764, quoted in te Winkel 1901: 103). In the South of The Netherlands, the spelling ae survived until 1864, partially as a way to mark the distinction from the North (ibid.). Without established and widely accepted orthography rules, nobody seemed to strive for consistency; as a result, even the same author may be using different spelling for the same word in one text, or even in one sentence. Although the variations are particularly visible in less formal texts and not in literary production (cf. Rutten & Van der Wal 2014: 7-9, 19-23), such inconsistencies are also to be found in Ketelaar’s Instructie, possibly pointing out to its informal origins. Let us look at the main spelling tendencies in the three copies.

Doubling of consonants and reducing (‘verenkeling’) of long vowels

The two underpinning principles of modern Dutch spelling date back to the early 16th century: the uniformity principle, saying that forms of the same word should be spelled the same way regardless of their sound context, and one etymological, which favoured spelling reflecting etymological origins of words (Van der Sijs 2005: 86). Furthermore, foreign words would preserve their spelling (however, there were numerous exceptions to all these rules.) This first principle put an end to the phonetic spellings such as hant – handen, and at the same time partially dissociated the phonetic form of the word and its written image.

But there was yet another old rule which, for the same reason, was causing trouble in writing: the rule governing the doubling of consonants and ‘halving’ (verenkeling) the vowels. Originally, double consonants were pronounced longer, and words like bede and bedden differed only in this respect. In Old Dutch, the vowel in the open syllable got lengthened, adding an extra phonetic distinction: now, both “e” and “d” in bede and bedden sounded differently. This redundancy led to shortening of the pronunciation of double consonant in Middle Dutch; from now on, the double consonant (pronounced as single) would only serve to indicate in writing the shortness of the preceding vowel.

The rule of thumb that holds to this day was simple: if the first vowel was short, the consonant would be doubled (mug – muggen); if it was long, the consonant would stay single. On the other hand, the long vowels in an open syllable would be written with one character (taken, roken), but in a closed syllable the vowels would be written as double (taak, rook). With the differences in pronunciation gradually minimised, attempts were made throughout the 16th century to uniform the spelling to double vowels in all position: taak - taaken, etc. One notable proponent of it was
Petrus Leupenius (1607-1670) in his *Aanmerkingen op de Nederduitsche taale* (1653), for which he was rebuked by Vondel (te Winkel 1901: 104).  

We still see a big influence of this approach in the *Instructie*. In the UMS, the open syllable is quite regularly spelled with double vowel: *kleed – kleederen* (DHMS: *kleeden*), *waater*, *salaade*, *booter*, *knoopen*, *schrijvkaamer* (but: *kamer*), *laaken*, *schootel*, *kooper*, *zaadel*, *reegen*, etc. On the contrary, all these words are spelled with a single vowel in DHMS.

**Consonants**

*CK*

In 1550, Lambrecht was still writing *ic*; the *Twe-spraack* recommended using *k* in front of all native words, limiting the use of *c* to foreign loans, and keeping the *ck* at the end of a syllable.

The predominant tendency in Ketelaar is to use the *k* in the initial position, except for words of foreign origin (UMS: *cubebe – also to be found under k, crocodil*, foreign spellings such as *couleur*, etc.). In DHMS, the words *coningh*, *coopman*, and *cooper slager* are still spelled with a *c* (although *konings visch* as well as *kooper* and *kooper slager* are also to be found under *k*). Similarly, *canneel* reappears under *k* as *kanneel*. In total, there are 32 words starting with *c* in the DHMS versus 21 in UMS. In DHMS, as well as in UMS, *ck* appears commonly yet inconsistently in other positions (*ik – ick; dicke melk – dicke melck; bank – banck; werkje – werckje; weetsieke – weetsiecke; gebruickt – gebrijkt; opmerking – opmerckingh*).

*G and GH*

Already de Heuiter (1581) in his striving for simplicity advocated dropping the *h* from the *gh*. However, the recommendation from Spieghel’s *Twe-Spraec* concerning *g* was more conservative: to keep the *gh* in all positions except for *ng*. It was not until Arnold Moonen’s *Nederduitse Spraekkunst* from 1706 that the *gh* almost disappeared, except from a few cases at the end of words.

Although in all three copies of the *Instructie*, *gh* in place of modern *g* is still quite common at the end of the word (*wijnigh – weinigh*), DHMS retained most of the *gh* spellings, even where UMS and PMS have already *g* (*ghij lieden – gijlieden – gyliden; sigh – sig, magh – mag but: regte – reghte*).

**G, GH and CH**

---

18 Ironically, Vondel’s remarks printed behind his tragedy *Lucifer* from 1654 were entitled “Noodigh Berecht over de nieuwe Nederduytsche misspellinghe” (emphasis added) and witness Vondel’s own usage of doubled *o* (*grooter*, etc) and *e* (*Heere, etc.*: in open syllables.

19 Some other of de Heuiter’s innovative ideas included: skipping the *c* from *ch* (wahlen) except for the ending *sch* (which he later reduced to *s: Nederlantsche–Nederlandse*), replacing the *oe* with the French *ou* (*bouk, noumen*), not using *w* after diphthongs ending in *u* (thus writing *ew* instead of *eew*) and introducing *in* to express the guttural nasal *n* (*klainc, haingen*) (cf. te Winkel 1901: 102).
In the times of the *Instructie*, g was still used in place of modern ch. In both DHMS and UMS we find examples with g (also as gh) in such position: *voorsigtigh, nagt, pragtigh, doghter*, or *nogh*. More interestingly, UMS has also a case of modern-looking ch in *rechtwaardigh*, right next to *reght* and *regts* (p.57), and *rechter voet* next to *regter* (*Index*, p.[xiii]), and *lucht* where DHMS still has *lught*. PMS in most cases resembles in this respect the UMS.

*S and Z*

*S* and *z* are interchangeable; DHMS gives the impression to be the most progressive in using *z* for *s* in the body of text (*zoo*–*soo*: *zigh*–*sigh*; *Jezus*–*Jesus*, but: *suijver*–*zuijver*), however, the *Index* lists only 20 words starting with *z* versus 46 in the UMS.20 As a general rule, *z* is always followed by a vowel.

**SCH**

*Sch* in the 17th century was much more common than today. We see it also in Ketelaar: *waschen*–*wasschen*–*was*[s]ehen, *vleesch*, *mensch*, *visch*. The opposite phenomenon, the reduction of *sch* to *s*, also occurs: *arabisch* – *arrabis*, *valsch* (but: *valse geld*)–*vals*–*valsch*.

**T and D**

The spelling of *d* and *t* at the end of the word in verbal forms is quite inconsistent both in DHMS and in the UMS: *geschied*–*geschiet*, *held*–*helt*, *verbastert*–*verbasterd*, *genoemd*–*genoemt*, *gemengelt*–*gemengeld*. Mostly in PMS, *dt* occurs at the end of some nouns: *eent*–*eent*–*eendt*; *geld*–*geld*–*geldt* (but: *lood*–*loodt*–*loodt*).

**QU and KW**

The spelling *qu* in Ketelaar is limited to eight words: *quacksalver*, *quaade tijd* (but: *kwaed–kwaad*), *quartet*, *queen*, *quepeer*, *quetsen*, *quick zilver*, *quijnen*. *Kw* is present in only one word: *kwaed–kwaad* and in its derivative *kwaader* (UMS). Moonen (1706: 11) disproves of any attempts to change writing of words starting with *qu* to *kw*–as “onnodge nieuwigheit” (‘unnecessary innovation’) and writes *quaede* himself (*idem*: 12). Not surprisingly, also François Halma, who published Moonen’s work, in his own *Woordenboek der Nederduitsche en Fransche taalen* makes a remark under the empty section *KW*: *Alle de woorden die met KW beginnen, moet men zoeken op QU* (‘All the words starting with KW should be searched under QU’ – Halma 1729: 355). PMS has the spelling *kwaed*.

**V and F**

In the three copies, we find both spellings, e.g.: *brief*–*briev*–*briev*; *gestooft*–*gestooft*–*gestoovd*. UMS has a 3rd person sg verbal form with *v*: *schrjv*–*schrjft*. This form occurs sporadically in Dutch books until the 19th century, when it starts being disallowed in learners’ grammars.

---

20 This difference, however, looks less dramatic if we subtract 16 words taken from the grammatical part of the UMS (mostly various expressions with *ziet*,'sit', which DHMS does not include at all.)
X
Although x is not a separate letter in the alphabetical Index, we find it in a couple of words such as zulx, blixem, wax, wax doek, dagelix–dagelicx, and interestingly, in a Brabant-looking diminutive stucxen (DHMS, UMS).

Y
DHMS and UMS mostly have ij; PMS prefers using y for ij (sy, gylieden). In some cases, the presence of dots above the y next to the same word spelled with y (esp. in UMS) suggests that the author did not attach much importance to distinguishing between the two forms.

Vowels
In general, the long a is spelled as ae in DHMS and PMS, and as aa in UMS (traegh–traaggh). In PMS even the name of Ketelaar is spelled with ae on the title page.

i for j: iaer, or vice versa: (iets–jts; inde–jnde; ik–jk)

u and o are interchangeable (DHMS preference is o): konsten–kunst–konstig, fondament–fundament.

UMS has a strong preference for double vowels: (laten–laaten; ondernomen–ondernoomen; medelijden–meedelijden) but there are a few exceptions: Taefel–Tafels–taafels; geboorte–geborte; ooijt–oijt.

Diphthongs
There are big discrepancies in the spelling of the diphthong ij–ei (wijnhgh–weinigh; onderschijt–onderscheijt–verscheyde; lujaert–leuaard; rijsende–reijsende). In the spelling of kleijnen–kleene–kleyne, the form from UMS suggests that ee was already slightly diphthongal.

Summary
Small but significant differences in orthography between the three manuscripts are not surprising, especially if we consider that the three copies were produced at least sixteen years apart by three different people. Ketelaar, not a native speaker of Dutch, may have been the originator of some word and spelling choices (even though he
may have been familiar with Dutch since his youth in Elbing). The copyist of the DHMS Isaacq van den Hoeven may have introduced his own spelling. He also avoided misspellings in words with clear etymology (columnen; superlativa), which appear in UMS (colomben and subperlativa in UMS, columben, superlativa in PMS: columpne). On the other hand, in the Paris copy, the young copyist Gideon Boudaen replaces some ‘old school’ spellings with more ‘modern’ ones and also introduces some corrections (conjugeeren vs. conjungeeren in DHMS and UMS).

Although the limited size of Ketelaar’s text does not allow for hard conclusions to be drawn as to, for example, the dating of the text or the origin of the UMS writer on the basis of the variation in spelling, the brief overview above shows certain systematic trends in the three manuscripts. Besides giving a good impression of what these manuscripts look like to readers who may not be able to or will not consult them themselves, these spelling variants are important elements to consider before making any assumptions on the relationship between signs and sounds in the Instructie. Since, further in the text, Ketelaar uses the same Dutch orthography for writing down phonemically foreign words, understanding such sign-sound relationships are crucial for the study of his Persian and Hindustani phonology.

Two factors may facilitate such study: firstly, the Persian grammar of Ketelaar heavily draws upon an earlier grammar entitled Elementa Linguae Persicae written by John Greaves (Johannes Gravius, 1602–1652) and published in London in 1649. Whilst the relationship between the two will be explored in detail in Chapter 5, below I summarise Ketelaar’s approach to Romanisation of Persian words presented by Greaves. The second component to help reconstruct Ketelaar’s notation system is a contemporaneous Persian–Hindustani–Dutch vocabulary in which the anonymous author uses a very similar yet more systematic approach also using Dutch orthography. Let us look at them in this order.

4.4 In search of Ketelaar’s methodology of Romanisation

Although there is no special chapter on phonology in the Instructie, Ketelaar makes a couple of remarks on it in the Introduction. The first one is of a general nature and concerns regional variants in speech:

[…] ook werd de moorse naar verscheijdentheijt, der landen, differentelijk gesprooken, in bengaale bagneger, poeroeb[?], en gousouratta, helt men veel naar de

21 According to van Tielhof (2002: 175-176), Dutch merchants in Danzig formed a small yet influential economic group from the 16th to the18th century and consequently, Dutch was a commonly understood international trade language. De Jong-Keesing confirms that “Dutch remained the dominant trade language in the Baltic during the whole 18th century” (1939: 192-193). It is therefore entirely plausible that Ketelaar, a son and a grandson of Baltic merchants, grew up having contact with this language.

22 The number of examples from PMS in the comparison below is smaller than from the other two manuscripts, mostly due to the fact that the two longer texts, Opdracht and Voorreede (the introduction and the dedication) were skipped in PMS (cf. Table 3.1).
benjaanen taale, maer ontrent Agra, Dillie, Lahoor, Kassmier, word de moorse taale op het suiverste gesproken.

‘and the Moorish is spoken differently in various parts: Bengal, Baghnagar23, Purab [East] and Gujarat tend to lean towards the language of Banias, but around Agra, Delhi, Lahore and Kashmir the Moorish language is spoken at its purest.’

The second one, sounding more like a complaint, is more serious and more specific: the unclear pronunciation of native speakers makes it very hard to write the sounds down using the Dutch alphabet:

[…] veele woorden zijn bijna onmogelijk, soo wel in ‘t persiaans, als hindoustans, naer de reghte uijtspraak in duijtsche letters te stellen, vermits veel letters van beyde genoemde taalen maar halv en binnens monts werden gepronuceerd, dierhalven die taalen sonder goede opmerckingh der spreekers moijelijk regt te leeren vald.

‘Many Hindustani and Persian words are almost impossible to be written down with correct pronunciation in the Dutch letters, because a lot of letters in these two languages are pronounced only half and inside the mouth, and consequently, without close observation of speakers it is very difficult to succeed in learning properly.’

For his dictionary, Ketelaar does not use any local script but decides to trust his ear and render the foreign sounds in a phonemic transcription only. Incidentally, his spelling happens to use Dutch orthography, and therefore certain sounds will be unfamiliar to non-Dutch speakers. On the contrary, the method of transcription of Persian words in Ketelaar’s grammar differs from the transcription he used in the dictionary: the examples in the grammar are based on a written source, i.e. words presented by Greaves in Perso-Arabic characters. For that reason, we may assume that the transcription/transliteration of these Persian words should be closer and more precise to the target word than of words that Ketelaar wrote down solely from hearing. If that part had been written before the Hindustani grammar, the Romanisation method of Hindustani words might have been guided by Ketelaar’s experience with Persian. In any case, an analysis of the transliteration may offer clues as to how the Hindustani words were pronounced at the time, or at least how Ketelaar heard them. Last but not least, in spite of Ketelaar’s obvious proficiency in Dutch, his non-native background (with its Prussian/German/English/Polish influences), although hard to pinpoint, may have also played some role.

4.4.1 Romanisation of Greaves’ Persian

The grammatical part in Greaves (1649) does not contain any transliterations, but only words in Perso-Arabic script. However, in the first section (pp. 1-14) he presents the Persian writing system in great detail. What is remarkable, in his Romanisation is that he tries to find phonemic values (potestas) of Persian sounds in various European languages. And so, according to Greaves, Se equals the Spanish ç or the English S; Gim ǧ is like the French G or the Italian j; Che ǧ is the English Ch;
Cha چ is also transliterated as Ch and χ (presumably Greek Chi)\textsuperscript{24}; Zheژ is like the English Zh or the Italian Tz; Shin ش is the English Sh or the French Ch; Sad ص equals the English Ss and the Italian Zs; Ain א is A or the Hebrew י (Ayin); Gain ガイ – the English G; Kaf ک equals “C or K”, and finally Ghaf گ can be Kh or Gh.

Below is the original Greaves’ table summarising the alphabet together with names of letters and the Romanisation he chose for them:

\textbf{Figure 4.3:} Greaves’ rendition of the Persian alphabet with European equivalents.

On the pages where the value of letters and details of Persian orthography are explained, we find Persian examples of words in both Perso-Arabic and Latin script. They offer further insight into what Greaves’ Romanisation would look like in practice. The discussion on vowels starts with explanation of vowel diacritics, Fatha [fatha] (marking A or E), Damma [damma] (O or U) and Kesra [kasra] (i; often very short e). “A bright a” is written as <â> (yâr, socius ‘member’, pâs, rubigo); “dark o” (adamion, homines ‘men’, osmon cœlum ‘heaven’). Damma as well as Va ۆ b can be both <ou> and often <û> (goush, auris ‘the ear’, ۆr violentia ‘violence’). Kesra and ی have the value of i, or the English ie (îz acutus ‘sharp, acute’, suârie equitatio ‘riding’). For Shin ٝ Greaves decides to use the English sh; yet most interesting is his choice to represent Kh چ as Ch (chisht later) and the French spelling for Gim گ (gienc bellum, ‘war’). The latter can be slightly confusing, especially in the spelling of words like Giezma ژ (ژ jazm, ‘amputation’) for sukûn – the diacritic (ٰ) that is placed

\textsuperscript{24} In Greek, χ is voiceless uvular fricative; the Persian چ is voiceless velar fricative.
over a letter marks the absence of a vowel. In the two expressions on page 12 we can see an example of the use of ch, h, and sh; note that the long a is not marked in one spelling (amadi, corr. āmadi), and in the other case marked with ā (Sāhebe):

Hali chubi darem (Hal-e khubi darem)  
Chush amadi Sāhebe man (Khosh āmadi sāheb-e man)

The table below shows Ketelaar’s transliterations of Greaves’ Persian words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name (Greaves/MP)</th>
<th>Persian script</th>
<th>Standard transliteration</th>
<th>IPA</th>
<th>Form in Ketelaar’s grammar</th>
<th>Greaves’ words in Modern Persian spelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>hamza</td>
<td>ʼ</td>
<td></td>
<td>[ʔ]</td>
<td>bidār</td>
<td>bidaar aferiden osmoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elif/ afe</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>[æ/ø:]</td>
<td></td>
<td>aferiden</td>
<td>aferidan ṣamān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Be/ be</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td></td>
<td>bedari</td>
<td>bidār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pe/ pe</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>[p]</td>
<td></td>
<td>pier</td>
<td>pīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Te/ te</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>[t]</td>
<td></td>
<td>tandrost</td>
<td>tāndust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Se/ se</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>[s]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Gim/ jim</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>[dʒ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>sjoen[e]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Che/ če</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>[tʃ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>tsje tsjic</td>
<td>čeh čeh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hha/ he(-ye hotti)</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>[h]</td>
<td></td>
<td>heija</td>
<td>hayā’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cha/ xe</td>
<td>x (or kh)</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>chaimij chonden sjaaghdaar</td>
<td>khaima خهم خوادن شاخدار</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dal/ dāl</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>[d]</td>
<td></td>
<td>danisten</td>
<td>dānestin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Zal/ zāl</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dānestin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Re/ re</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>[r]</td>
<td></td>
<td>ronden</td>
<td>rāndan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Ze/ ze</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>[z]</td>
<td></td>
<td>seden as</td>
<td>zadān az</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Zhe/ źe</td>
<td>ź</td>
<td>[ʒ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sin/ šin</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>[ʃ]</td>
<td></td>
<td>sjuma jesjon, isjoen</td>
<td>šumā šābah šābān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not surprisingly, the same term and spelling is found in Erpenius’ Arabic grammar (cf. Erpenius 1613: 16). The alphabet and names of letters are based on Hashabeiky (2005: 64); transliteration is presented according to Deutsches Institut für Normung (DIN31635) standard; IPA is based on Omniglot.com. Modern Persian form of Greaves’ words (in most cases identical with Greaves) and its transliteration come from Steingass (1892).
Although the sample of Persian words and expressions included in Ketelaar’s grammar is too small to draw wide-reaching conclusions about his entire transliteration system, some preliminary observations can be derived from it. Thus, the consonants familiar to the Dutch ear be, pe, te, dal, re, fe, kaf, gaf, lam, mim, nun are rendered by the same letters <b, p, t, d, r, f, k, g, l, m>; ze is transcribed as <s>. In the examples available, <š> in was consistently rendered as <sj> (although the word siyāh starting with sin was also transcribed as <ṣja> which could cause a confusion in pronunciation). The only word containing the letter jim is transcribed using an identical grapheme <sj> sjoen[e]. Khe is transcribed as <ch> or <gh>, che – as <tsj>, he as <h>, ā as <ā>. There are no examples of words containing the remaining consonants of the Persian alphabet. In spite of lack of a larger corpus, a few general tendencies are also visible in the rendering of Persian vowels. The long /a/ is transcribed as aa or a:

maal  مال
bidaar بیدار
danisten دانستن

| 17 | Sad/ ṣâd | ص | [s] |
| 18 | Zad/ ṣâd | ض | [z] |
| 19 | Ta/ tâ (teyn) | ط | [t] sjert شرط |
| 20 | Sa/ zâ (teyn) | ض | [z] |
| 21 | Ain/ eyn | ع | [v/q] |
| 22 | Gaim/ qeyn | غ | [v/q] |
| 23 | Fe/ fe | ف | [f] afiriden أفریدن |
| 24 | Kof/ qâf | ق | [q] |
| 25 | Kaf/ kâf | ك | [k] kandan کندن |
| 26 | Ghal/ gâf | گ | [g] angebien انگیم |
| 27 | Lam/ lâm | ل | [l] maal مال |
| 28 | Mim/ mim | م | [m] maal مال |
| 29 | Nun/ nun | ن | [n] nikie نیکی |
| 30 | Va/ vâv | و | [v/u/ow] doest دوست |
| 31 | He/ hâ or he-ye havvaz | ه | [h] chih چه |
| 32 | Ye/ yâ or ye | ی | [y/ø/e] chaimij خیمی |

Table 3: Transliteration system of Persian words from Greaves in Ketelaar’s grammar
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daden  دادن  dādan
afериден  افریدن  āfrīdan

but more often as <ö> or even <oe> (/u/), especially before n or m:

ronden  راندن  rāndan
chonden  خواندن  khvāndan
sjumorden  شماریدن  shumāridan
oemeden  امدن  āmadan

The short /a/ is transcribed both <a> and <e>, the latter being much more frequent; <ö> also appears, especially before n or m:

sjert  شرط  sharṭ
ronden  راندن  rāndan
konden  کندن  kandan

Long /i/ is usually transcribed i or ie [i]:

diden  دیدن  didan
bidaar  بیدار  bidār
pier  پیر  pīr

Or, in some cases, e:

cadar  بیداری  bīdārī

/o/ sometimes as <ö> but mostly as <oe>:

goestfen  گوسفند  gosfand
doest  دوست  dost

/u/ as <ö> or <∅>:

tandrost  تندرست  tan-durust
gosjaden  کشادن  gushādan

/u/ as <oe>

toe  تو  tu

long /u/ as <œ> /u/:

asmoomen  آزمومن  āzmūdan
booden  بودن  būdan
Is it important to note that Greaves, even though he provided the transliteration only for a few words in the first chapter, used vowel diacritics for all Persian words throughout his book, which means that Ketelaar had the option of studying the system and the individual words himself. Otherwise, he might have relied on a speaker of Persian to pronounce the words for him (or else, he could have just record the pronunciation he heard around him). Since the notation of vowels is inconsistent and diverges from the spelling, the second option seems more probable. In what concerns the rendering of consonants, Ketelaar seems to be using a completely independent system, based on the Dutch pronunciation (cf. \( sj \) vs. \( sh \) for \( sin \); \( sj \) vs. \( g \) for \( jin \)). The one interesting case is the decision to choose the same \( ch \) as Greaves did for \( xe \), yet it seems to be more a coincidence than a borrowing, especially since \( <ch> \) has a value of [x] in Dutch anyway, and besides, alternative forms \( gh \) and \( g \) are used for the same value (e.g. \( sjaaghdaar \) for \( shāḵẖ-dār \); \( goda \) for \( lãz khudā \) in the glossary). Although it is not possible to draw more detailed conclusions on whether Ketelaar might have used any clues form Greaves for his transcription, the fact is that his notation in the glossary is definitely idiosyncratic and quite different to what Greaves’ one might have looked like (cf. Ketelaar’s \( goesje \) vs. Greaves’ \( goush \), for کوش ‘the ear’, or the use of \( ck \) where Greaves recommends “c or k”, e.g. \( chosck \) for خوشک, ‘dry’). Moreover, even if Ketelaar’s notation lacks consistency, and sometimes a couple of different letter combinations are used to render the same sound, in practice his strategy may be working better than for instance Greaves’ suggestion to use the same \( <ch> \) (but with different values: once English, and once Greek) for two totally different phonemes [ʃ] and [x].

4.4.2 Writing down the sounds of early 18th century Persian and Hindustani in Dutch: the anonymous author’s method

As we saw above, Ketelaar, who most likely was not yet familiar with the local script, used only a phonemic transcription in the adapted Dutch spelling. However, there exists a Dutch document that may hold the key to reconstructing the Hindustani sounds, somehow inexpertly recorded by Ketelaar. It is the anonymous Persian–Hindustani–Dutch glossary, *Vocabularium Persico-Belgicum* (Leiden University Library, MS LTK 589), which is believed to have been composed in the second half of the 17th century, so around the same time as Ketelaar’s *Instructie*. It contains both Perso-Arabic notation of Persian and Hindustani words, as well as their pronunciation in Dutch orthography. Because of this double base for the transcription (original spelling and the Dutch orthography), this text offers perfect comparative material for studying historical phonology. Although it is beyond the scope of the present study to conduct an in-depth analysis, I will present a brief description of the system used by the anonymous author in order to show its potential for a comparative study of phonemic notation by Ketelaar and other Dutch authors.
In order to be able to make comparisons, I am using the Urdu forms as Romanised in Platts’ dictionary from 1884 (in brackets). Platts’ is comprehensive and closest in time to Ketelaar’s highly acclaimed scholarly work. His use of both Naskh and Devanagari scripts (for words of Indic origin) makes it an even better reference. However, Platts’s Romanisation rules are quite modern and universal in comparison to the 17th century anonymous author’s, or Ketelaar’s. For that reason, we should not expect the 17th century phonemic notation to match exactly the Hindi-Urdu transcription. Instead, it loosely follows Dutch orthographic conventions, revealing some clues on the perceived pronunciation.

The anonymous author of *Vocabularium Persico-Belgicum* is strongly consistent in his phonetic transcription. His method is not purely phonological nor purely a transliteration; rather, he combines the two to achieve the required effect. His knowledge of Perso-Arabic alphabet allows for a more precise rendition of Hindustani and Persian sounds.27 He frequently uses orthographic clues to perfect the pronunciation, such as the /h/ at the end of a word even when it is not pronounced, which also serves to mark the quality of the vowel (in general, to keep the /a/). For example: bermeh (H bermā, P barmāh) ‘drill’, -walah (H wālā, P wālā) ‘suffix of possession or relation’.

Also the length of vowels is rarely problematic – they are correctly recognized in the grand majority of cases; ā is usually marked as aa: aasmaan (P āsmān) ‘heaven’, ā: rāh (ārāh) ‘way’, seldom there is just a: bara (H bārā, प बारा) ‘air, wind’, panie (H पानी) ‘water’. Just like in Ketelaar’s work, the i is most frequently rendered by ie: salie (H साली) ‘sister in law’, and also by i: zemin (P zamīn) ‘earth’. But one of the most striking similarities to Ketelaar is the systematic use of e for a: bettie (H बत्ती) ‘wick’, dem (P दम) ‘breath’, thenda (H ठंडा) ‘cold’, gegen (S गगन) ‘atmosphere, sky’, nefes (A نفاس) ‘breath’; in fact, he uses it even more often than Ketelaar, apparently in all unstressed short vowel positions. Only occasionally, we find o or i in place of a: hobaab (A हबाब) ‘a bubble’, pilleh (P पल्ला) ‘stairs’.

In contrast to Ketelaar’s system, post-alveolar fricative [ʃ] as well as affricates /tʃ/ /dʒ/ are well mapped and easy to recognise and distinguish from one another: tsj (H čīm in Urdu; छ in Hindi) as in tsjekkie (H čakkī) ‘mill’, also: [tʃʰ] tsjihatie (H छाती) ‘bosom, breast’; dj or dzj for [dʒ] (ज जिम) ‘jim, breast’.

27 Very often, Hindustani and Persian use the same word, yet sometimes it is spelled slightly differently, even if the dictionary would keep the same spelling in both languages, e.g. gabaab–ghabaab (कबाब) ‘roast meat’). Although we cannot rule out that it may be down to an individual speaker’s pronunciation, or result from the lack of consistency on the side of the writer, it may also reflect an actual difference in pronunciation of loanwords at that stage.

The author identifies the Arabic-origin sound ع ‘eyn’ (the voiced laryngeal fricative [ʕ]) and marks it with ôä: sjôäleh (A شلش شعله Shulsh Shulsh) ‘flame’, sâäkeh (A صاعقه صاعقه Shulsh Shulsh) ‘lightning’, or with an apostrophe possibly suggesting a glottal stop: mak’ad (A مقعد Maq’ad) ‘buttocks’, however not consistently: arak (A عرق اراق Arq) ‘sweat’. He understands the difference between voiced and devoiced consonants: he contrasts Hindustani daant (H دانت Danat) with Persian dend (Dندند) ‘tooth’.

The Perso-Arabic alphabet with its diacritical marks for vowels must have inspired the anonymous author to enrich his own transliteration with extra diacritic signs. He frequently uses a circumflex accent over vowels such as a, o, as well as over oe and ie; he adds diaeresis over a (e.g. roœäh, from A روئح روح روئح روح Roœäh Roœäh ‘the soul’). Another interesting innovation is use of the Persian-looking three dots under certain consonants, such as t, d, to mark retroflex plosive [ʈ]: peet ̤̣ (S پيت Piet Piet) ‘belly’, d̤̣ebbiwalah (d̤̣بی ١٢ wālāh Debī Wālāh) ‘tax collector’ and above r for the retroflex flap consonant ̣ːr (H بربورا بربورا بربورا Burbarā Burbarā) ‘a bubble’.

By comparing and contrasting the use of Dutch orthography by the anonymous author and by Ketelaar, we may be able to identify Dutch phonological clues that unite them. I offer some initial suggestions regarding Ketelaar below.

4.4.3 Dutch phonological clues in Ketelaar

In addition to the orthographic rules abstracted by Chatterji, we find a few features in Ketelaar’s Romanisation method, which result directly from his using the Dutch phonetic system as a starting point.

The issue length of vowels in Dutch is disputable; some phonologists prefer to talk about ‘tenseness’ instead, or in addition to, perceived length of a vowel (cf. Moulton 1962: 300). With the exception of modern borrowings, vowel length is always paired with a change in vowel quality. In Ketelaar, /a/ is frequently represented by e: magtep (maktab), kerra (karā), destpanna (dast-pañāh). This may be the influence of the Dutch phonetics where the short a is generally lax and pronounced as [a]. There must have been a reason why e was repeatedly chosen to represent the unstressed Hindi-Urdu a; and it must be its perceived similarity to the lax Dutch [ɑ], subjectively closer than [a] would be.

28Target word not sure; one possibility is ḍabīr, “A reaper’s remuneration or allowance (usually a tenth of the harvest)” – Platts 1884: 561.
In Dutch, a pair of consonants is pronounced exactly the same as one single consonant; in Hindi-Urdu, most native consonants may occur geminated. The reduplication of consonants, frequently used by Ketelaar, does not always correspond with the double consonants in Hindustani, but rather seems to be a device to mark the quality (tenseness or length) of the preceding vowel (cf. Dutch rat–ratten; pad–padden), which may be one way of understanding the quality of long vowels: *caffila (qāfila), ghanna (kẖāna), ghalla (kẖālā)*.

The use of double vowels *ee* and *oo* does not reflect the Dutch pronunciation in which they are moderately diphtongal (Moulton 1962: 297), but rather indicate [an open] vowel quality: *lootha* (lōtā); *langootthi* (langoṭī), *pees* (peć).

*S* is sometimes used to express [*ʃ*], or even [*tʃ*]: *piskerrie* (pičkāř, ‘a squirt, syringe’; *Pees, peć*). There are two possible explanations: the first one is based on the perception of fricatives by Dutch speakers, who hear [*s*] and [*ʃ*] as more similar to each other than, for example, American-English listeners, a phenomenon researchers attribute to a pattern of alternation in Dutch phonology involving these sounds (e.g. [*tas*] ‘bag’ and [*tʃas*] ‘little bag’) (Johnson and Babel 2007). On the other hand, the patterns of pronunciation of sibilants in India vary by the region, by register and even by the speaker (Cardona and Suthar 2003: 665). In Gujarati, for example, there is also a reduced system in use where [*ʃ*] and [*s*] do not contrast at all (ibidem).

Ketelaar’s understanding of Hindustani phonology can best be observed in one very interesting wordlist that he included in his book: *Naast Gelijkende Hindoëstanse Woorden*, or “words resembling each other”. In fact, it can be seen as one of the earliest methodical compilations of series of minimal pairs devised for a foreign language learner (see also 8.4.2). An in-depth study of the list, taking into account Ketelaar’s notation habits, would be highly valuable for a possible reconstruction of Hindustani pronunciation of the time, but is beyond the scope of the present study.

---

29 The Arabic-origin diacritic ٌ shaddah, added above the letter, is used to mark consonant gemination (*tashdhīd*).
30 Quoting other analysts, Johnson and Babel (2010: 129) note that “[*s*] and [*ʃ*] do alternate in diminutive forms like ‘girl’ above *meisje* [*ʃ*] (*poes* [*s*] ‘cat’ – *poesje* [*ʃ*] ‘kitten’, *tas* [*s*] ‘bag’ – *tasje* [*ʃ*] ‘small bag’) and in connected speech when [*s*] and [*ʃ*] are adjacent across word boundaries (*was je* [*ʃ*] ‘were you’, *zes januari* [*ʃ*] ‘January the 6th’).
4.5 Conclusions and desiderata

In order to read correctly a 17th century text, learning palaeography is just a first step. To read a multilingual historical text, understanding the language of description is the real key. The nuances of standardisation, historical and regional spelling variations, historical phonology – all these constitute a foundation of any serious study of historical sources. If we want to know how a certain word sounded in 17th century Persian or Hindustani, it is necessary to first find out how a certain combination of letters was pronounced at the time in the metalanguage of the phonemic description, as such values often change over time. Approximating the historical pronunciation to that of a modern word is methodologically a poor technique, and does not allow any serious chance of the reconstruction of the original sounds. However, a different approach is available: historical descriptions of Hindustani could be studied by historical phonologists of the respective metalanguages, and their results compared in cross-linguistic perspective. An analysis of inaccuracies and types of mistakes with a concomitant emphasis on the similarities should help us evaluate the level of success of the individual authors. Only then some trends may become visible, offering reliable insights into the early Hindustani phonology.

Until such research project happens, we are left with workable shortcuts. Rather than using modern language as a standard, I suggest using earlier dictionaries for comparison purposes, like I did in my chapter, which will make us gain over a hundred years – a third of the time gap between us and these earliest philologists. At the same time, contemporaneous sources should be consulted whenever possible – a common-sense suggestion that is all-too-seldom implemented.
5. Ketelaar’s Persian grammar: models and influences

The aim of this chapter is twofold: 1) to establish if and to what extent Ketelaar’s Persian grammar is an original work (which I will do by comparing it with other related 17th century texts), 2) to use this comparative task as an opportunity to describe the content of the Persian grammar in the *Instructie*, which has, hitherto, not been done.

5.1 Early Persian studies in Europe

Although Persian studies in Europe have a very long tradition, the question as to who actually was the author of the earliest Persian grammar written in Europe is still debatable. Older sources ascribe it to Giovanni Battista Raimondi (Raymundus of Cremona, 1536–1614), a director of the *Typographia Medicea* (Medici Press for Foreign Languages; Lach 2010: 528), whose various texts on Persian linguistics are dispersed in various Italian libraries. Scholars nowadays seem to agree that it was actually Raimondi’s collaborator, one Flamino Clementino Amerino (life dates unknown), who compiled the earliest grammar in 1614 based on Raimondi’s works. The manuscript, entitled *Ianua Linguae Persicae*, is preserved in the Vatican Library (MS Vat. Pers. 24, cf. Orsatti 1996: 559-6.) The earliest printed grammar, however, was written by a Dutch Orientalist Lodewijk de Dieu (1590–1642) and published in Leiden in 1639 under the title *Rudimenta linguae Persicae*. De Dieu, who studied theology and Oriental languages in Leiden with Thomas van Erpe (Erpenius, 1584-1624) and Jacob van Gool (Golius, 1596-1667), was a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church and his primary interest was the translation and interpretation of the Bible. In fact, the *Rudimenta* was written as an introductory linguistic help added at the request of the printers to a translation of the lives of Christ and St. Peter (*Historia Christi*, and *Historia S. Petri*, Leiden, 1639) (de Bruijn 1995: 397-398). De Dieu’s grammar was shortly after followed by *Elementa Linguae Persicae* written by John Greaves and published in 1649 (already mentioned in Chapter 4). Greaves was an English mathematician, astronomer, “measurer of all things” (Shalev 2002: 555), who travelled extensively in Europe and the Middle East, notably to measure the Pyramids and to fix the latitudes of Istanbul, Rhodes, and Alexandria. During his studies in Leiden, he befriended van Gool, through whom he gained access to Leiden’s impressive Oriental book and manuscript collection – and later himself became a collector.

---

1 For an overview of Iranian studies in the Netherlands, see De Bruijn (1987).

2 Nevertheless, this was not the only grammar written by De Dieu: some ten years earlier, he published a comparative grammar of Semitic languages entitled *Grammatica linguarum Orientalium, Hebraeorum, Chaldæorum et Syrorum inter se collatarum* (Leiden, 1628).

3 http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/jhi/summary/v063/63.4shalev.html
The next grammar of Persian, *Grammatica linguae persicae*, was published by the Propaganda Fide in Rome in 1661. Its author, the Italian Carmelite missionary Ignatius of Jesus (Ignazio di Gesù, lay name Carlo Leonelli, 1596-1667) spent over 30 years in the Near East, of which twelve in Persia (Orsatti 2004). Among other works on Persian compiled by Ignatius of Jesus was an unpublished Latin-Persian dictionary, and also an unpublished work to be used in the teaching of Persian and Arabic, *Scrinium Duarum Linguarum Orientalium* (Orsatti, *ibidem*). In 1680, yet another contribution to the study of Persian was published, this time in Vienna. Its author, François (Franciszek) à Mesgnien Meninski (1623?–1698), was a Polish Orientalist and diplomat, originally from the French Lorraine. His *opus magnum*: four volumes of *Thesaurus linguarum orientalium, Turcicae, Arabicae, Persicae* included also a sketch of the grammar of Persian. Seven years later he published *Complementum Thesauri linguarum orientalium, seu onomasticum Latino-Turcico-Arabico-Persicum*. Almost simultaneously, another grammar of Persian was published in Vienna, a work of Johannis Baptista Podestà (1625–1688), an oriental secretary to the emperor and professor of Oriental languages in Vienna. His *Cursus grammaticalis linguarum orientalium, arabicae scilicet persicae et turcicae* (between 1686-1703) incited a curious episode recorded by Alexander Chalmers (1759–1834) in his *General Biographical Dictionary* (1812: 52 ) when Meninski got into a “violent conflict” with Podestà regarding the quality of opponents’ respective work. In 1684, another Persian grammar was published in Vienna, by the Officina Jansonio-Waesbergiana: *Gazophylacium linguae Persarum, triplici linguarum clavi italicae, latinae, gallicae, nec non specialibus praeceptis ejusdem linguae reseratum*. It was compiled by Angelus a Sancto Josepho (Ange de Saint-Joseph, lay name Joseph Labrosse, 1636-1697) as he himself described it, a fruit of fourteen years study in Esfahan with Balthasar the Portuguese (Lusitano, life dates unknown). The online catalogue description from Charlotte Du Rietz Rare Books (who in February 2017 offered an uncut copy for € 3800) gives more detail on the publication: “In 1680 he [Labrosse] tried to have his work published in Paris without success. A few years later in Amsterdam he arranged with the printing himself. The small Arabic types used in this work Labrosse bought at the Elzevier sale in 1681. The large Arabic types found on the title page and eight times within the text were cut by Le Bé in 1599. These types were used only occasionally in Paris until the end of the 18th century and it seems that this is the only time they are used outside France.” There were eight more Persian grammars published between the years 1700–1800 in Europe. After that, as Windfuhr (1979: 24) summarizes it, “there has been a virtually never-ending ‘deluge’ of grammars. (...) They have appeared in such rapid succession that, if one included the re-editions

---

7 Further Du Rietz refers readers to catalogues: Schwab 672. Smitskamp PO 345. Vater 279.
of many of them, there would be long stretches during which almost annually a grammar of Persian was published”.

However, one grammar has completely eluded scholarly attention. It was quite likely the last grammar of Persian written in the 17th century: the one overshadowed by its famous twin - the first grammar of Hindustani, both combined in the volume of *Instructie off Onderwijsinge der Hindoustanse en Persiaanse talen [...]* (“Instruction or Tuition in the Hindustani and Persian languages”) by Joan Josua Ketelaar. But how did the book come about? Did Ketelaar compose a brand new grammatical description, or did he, like many other authors of linguistic texts of its type, model his *Instructie* on some earlier work?8 To be able to retrospectively trace his models and influences would provide a better understanding of intellectual exchange channels and dissemination of linguistic knowledge in pre-modern world.

### 5.2 Searching for the models and influences: the discovery process

My initial suspicion regarding the originality of Ketelaar’s work sprouted from my obsession with details, as the clues for identifying Ketelaar’s inspiration were hiding in his puzzling definitions, awkward terminology, and other traces and comments in the text. Not being a native speaker, I spent long hours closely reading the Dutch text of the grammar, trying to analyse every word that sounded unclear. What did Ketelaar mean by defining pronouns as ‘the finished thing’ (*een g’ejindige Zaek*)? How to explain the use of the word *gestalte* (‘figure’) in the following definition: *De gestalten zijn maar tweederleij, eenigh en meer als een*9 (UMS: 83), where the meaning is evidently ‘number’ — typically expressed in the Dutch of the time as *getall* or *numerus*? What are *wederomhalige* pronouns – reflexive (as the intuition suggests), or maybe relative (from Latin *referre*, ‘to bring back’)? Sifting through a pile of 17th century Dutch grammatical works failed to reveal similar expressions which might help me determine the intended meaning; even extensive *De Geïntegreerde Taal-Bank* (Dutch historical dictionaries online, http://gtb.inl.nl) could not provide all the answers.

---

8 Proper attribution of authorship seem not to have been of much concern neither to medieval writers, nor to the early modern grammarians. As Zwartjes (2014) demonstrated in the case of the Turkish grammar of Jean Baptiste Holdermann (1694-1730) translated into Spanish by Juan Antonio Romero in 1799, passages or even the whole text including the dedication could have been translated and adapted to the local context without mentioning the source. It was only when writing became an occupation, and the position of the author became highly esteemed, that plagiarism became considered an offence (cf. Mallon 1989).

9 ‘There are two figures, singular and plural [lit. ‘more than one’]’.
The first clue came more or less by pure serendipity, as I pored over a number of early modern books. While I was comparing the treatment of the verbal system of Persian with other contemporary grammars, the **Gazophylacium linguae Persarum** by Angelus a Sancto Josepho revealed a very familiar-looking passage on the Second Future tense (see the left column – line breaks added):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Gazophylacium</strong></th>
<th><strong>Instructie</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solent nonnulli futurum secundum, quod compositum vocant, adjungeret; verum id nullo cum dispendio omitti potest: fit enim a verbo خواھم volo ab infinitivo, elisa ن nota ejus, quae alibi etiam excidit (...)</td>
<td>Sommige pleegen mede een tweede toekomende (twelke sij het t’samen gevougde noemen) hierbij tevoegen, ’t welk om enige reeden kan voorgeslagen worden, en word gemaakt van t woord chaham (ik wil) en van het oneijndige met het verstooten van N: desselve nota, de welke elders mede verderft (UMS: 86).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The similarities are striking, and indicate a direct translation. A comparison of the two grammars clearly reveals that the entire chapter on the verb in Ketelaar’s *Instructie* is almost identical to that of Angelus’ *Gazophylacium*. Either Ketelaar had access to Angelus’ book, and used it freely, or the two authors used the same source. In other chapters, Ketelaar presented nouns, or declensions, in an entirely different way from Angelus. Also, the examples throughout the book were different from Angelus’ — either a proof of Ketelaar’s original input, or an indication that the search for models was not over yet. Another questionable aspect is the date: there is substantial evidence to believe that Ketelaar wrote his *Instructie* in the first few years after his arrival in India in 1683. Angelus’ book was published in 1684; that would be an example of a rather quick dissemination for a predominantly missionary book, since missionary grammars in general had a very limited distribution. On the other hand, the *Gazophylacium* was published in Amsterdam and it was advertised also to merchants, as we can read on the title page: *Opus Missionaris Orientalibus, Linguarum Professoribus, Sacrorum Bibliorum Scrutatoribus, Mercatoribus, caeterisque Regionum Orientalium lustratoribus perutile, ac necessarium* (‘The work very useful and necessary for the Missionaries in the

---

10 Some suggest adding here a second future, which they call compound, which can be omitted in certain cases, and which is made by the word *chaham* (*I want*) and the infinitive without the letter N - the same letter that disappears in other cases.

11 Angelus dedicated his book to Pope Innocent XI, as a tool in the sacred war against the Turks and Islam; it came a year after the great victory at the Battle of Vienna, when the joined European troops of the Holy League under the command of King John III Sobieski of Poland defeated the Turkish army, earning Sobieski the name of the Savior of Vienna and the European civilization.
East, professors of languages, scrutinizers of the Holy Bible, merchants, and for all inspectors of the Eastern Regions.’) That Ketelaar had access to the text in India just a couple years later is not impossible, but seems unlikely.

Further comparisons with Persian grammars of the period reveal that Angelus was not innocent of unattributed borrowing himself: without quoting the source, he had copied and published whole passages from *Elementa Linguae Persicae* by John Greaves (1649). Angelus’ claim, in his introduction, that his book was a fruit of his fourteen years of studies in Esfahan, under Balthasar the Portuguese (Lusitano) and others, did not seem entirely credible.

What therefore is the relationship between the three texts? The obvious difference between the three works is their use of languages: *Gazophylacium* and *Elementa* are written in Latin, with Persian words written only in Perso-Arabic script without transliteration, whereas the *Instructie* is written in Dutch, with Persian words spelled phonemically in Roman script using the Dutch orthography. A further contrast to the other two authors is that Ketelaar entirely omits spelling and phonological descriptions of Persian “consonants and vowels”, focusing only on the “noun and verb” (declensions and conjugations). A paragraph-by-paragraph comparison of the three books strongly suggests that both Ketelaar and Angelus used Greaves as their basis. It seems almost certain that Ketelaar used Greaves’ book directly, because all the examples in both texts are identical (notably *Homo quantò melior ove / een mensch is beeter als een schap; melle dulcius / soeter als honing*) — something that Angelus changed in his book.\(^{12}\) In a number of places, it becomes obvious that both authors accessed Greaves’ text independently from each other. For example, when speaking of conjugation patterns, Angelus reduces them *ad duas regulas* (‘to two rules’), and both Greaves (1649: 47) and Ketelaar talk of *paucas regulas / ‘weinige regulen’* (‘few rules’), which most likely excludes cross-referencing between Ketelaar and Angelus. The fundamental difference is, however, that while Angelus presents an original treatment of the noun, the two main chapters in Ketelaar (on noun and verb) are based on Greaves.\(^{13}\) In the following section I will compare them in more detail.

---

\(^{12}\) The question remains, however, whether Ketelaar had access to the original book, or to a fragmented unattributed copy of it.

\(^{13}\) It may be worth mentioning that Greaves himself modelled his *Elementa* on Thomas Erpenius’ *Grammatica Arabica* (1613). Not only the general structure and the order of elements, but also the formulations of some rules and definitions are quite similar (cf. the definition of pronouns: ‘Nominis vicem subeunt pronomina’, Erpenius 1613: 109; ‘Pronomina sunt quae vicem nominis subeunt’, Greaves 1649: 35). Greaves himself refers the reader to Erpenius’ text for further clarification on certain topics (Greaves 1648: 4).
5.3 Ketelaar and Greaves: the scope of similarities and differences

Ketelaar’s reliance on Greaves’ text raises important questions regarding the extent to which the Instructie mirrors the Elementa Linguae Persicae. When even personal-sounding comments, which looked like it may have been written by Ketelaar himself, turn out to be a translation of Greaves, the reader may naturally ask: is Ketelaar’s Persian grammar just a direct translation? What kind of adaptations did he do – if any? To answer these questions, I will compare the content of the two texts, highlighting the formulations that indicate direct borrowing.

Greaves’ book starts with several elements which we do not find in Ketelaar’s work. He presents a definition of grammar as being *ars bene loquendi*, ‘the art of speaking well’, p 1. and its two main parts: *Etymologia* and *Syntaxis*. He also mentions *Vox* (voice) with its two components: *Litterae* and *Syllabae*. *Litterae* being either consonants or vowels (*Consonae vel Vocales*). Next (pp. 2-3), Greaves presents a table with 32 Persian consonants with their value or meaning (*potestas*), the Persian name (*Nomen*), and their initial, median and terminal forms (*Figurae*). The next seven pages are devoted to the description of forms or shapes of consonants (*figura consonarum*), and to their phonetic/phonemic values (*Potestas, seu valor figurarum*), and order (*Ordo Consonantium*). The next section (pp. 11-14) deals with vowels and “accidents of letters” (*De Vocalibus, & Literarum accidentibus*). After a brief note about two grammatical numbers, singular and plural, and a remark that dualis is never used by the Persians, not even in words of Arabic origin, Greaves moves on to declension patterns. In the Instructie, the Persian grammar is dealt with in chapters 45 and 46 (UMS). The first of the two chapters *Van d’declinatie der Persiaanse Taale* (‘Of the declensions in Persian language’) treats the declension of Persian. Here we start seeing parallels between Ketelaar and Greaves.

5.3.1 The noun

In the section *Declinationes*, Greaves presents two declension groups: one having a plural ending *ān*, the other one *ḥā* [*hā*]. Their characteristic ending (*nota characteristica*) in Dative and Accusative is *rā*, and the other cases remains invariable. The declension paradigm shows the words *Pater-Patres* and *Coelũ - Coeli* (‘father’ and ‘heaven’ in sg and pl).

---

14 Cf. “E: dog de wijle zulx vande geleerde meest werd overgeslagen, soo hebbe het van sijn eijen voorbeeld afgescheijden, en deselve in dese plaats op dat’er niets mogn_komen te ontbreekent ter nedergesteld” – UMS: 85[89] (‘Although most scholars skipped this, I have isolated it into my own example and I’m putting it here so that nothing is missing.’) and Greaves’ “Verum, cum a Lexicographis omittatur, neque in paradigmate, quod Constantinopolis accepit, mentio eius fit., ab ipso paradigmate removi, atque in hunc locum, nequid desideraretur, seposui” (1648: 58).

15 All forms in Greaves are only given in Perso-Arabic script; the transliteration of Greaves I am using in this chapter was kindly made by Dr Elmira Kazemi Mojaveri.
Ketelaar begins with a distinction of two declension groups according to a noun’s plural ending (-on or -ha). He admits that only two cases, Dative and Accusative have a termination -ra, and in all the remaining cases the nouns don’t change their form. He follows this up with two examples, namely pader (‘father’) and osmoon (‘heaven’). The additional comment (p. 80): de meeste Persiaanse woorden, werden bijde Persen op beide manieren in pluralie, of meerder getal veranderd (‘most Persian words are pluralized by the Persians in both ways’) is dubious, if not simply incorrect, according to other contemporary grammars (De Dieu 1639: 44). Ketelaar seems to be saying that there are no differences in usage between -on and -ha and illustrates it with two examples, broeder (“brother”) and vrundschap (“friendship”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singularis</th>
<th>Pluralis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>broeder</td>
<td>broeders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>brader</td>
<td>braderon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>vrundschap</td>
<td>vruntschappen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian</td>
<td>doest</td>
<td>doeston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in Greaves this point is more developed. Talking about plural forms, he expresses his doubts about the habit of using two different suffixes indiscriminately:

Multa nomina sunt quae utrásque terminaciones -on & -ha in Plurali, idque indifferenter, obintent: ut fratres, frater, braderan, braderha & braderon, & dost, doest, doestha. In lexico Perso-Turcico scriptum reperi, Omnia passim nomina pro libitu usurpare posse in plurali numero: quod ego, si in aliquibus concesserim, in omnibus aegrè animum induco. (Greaves 1649: 27)

‘Many are the nouns that take the two terminations [on] & [ha] indifferently in the plural: [dust] friend[ship], [dustán] and [dusthā] friend[ship]s, [bardar] brother, [bardarān] and [bardarāhā] brothers. The dictionary of the Persian-Turkish states that all nouns without difference can take [on] and [ha] in the plural, as one wishes, which I admit in some cases, but I have difficulty to accept this for all cases.’

16 De Dieu makes a distinction in the use of the two, saying that the second termination for plural, -ha is used especially for substantives “sive abstractis sive concretis, sive animatis sive inanimatis” (‘abstract or concrete things, animate or inanimate’).
17 It would be interesting to know which Turkish-Persian dictionary Greaves was frequently referring to in his grammar. If he meant a European one, the only possible candidate from the published works would be some multilingual dictionary, such as Hieronymus Megiser’s (1554-1618) Thesaurus Polyglottus (1603). However, Orsatti (1995: 526) dismisses this work as containing only a few Persian words, most of them published before by Bonaventura Vulcanius (1538-1614), who got them from Raphelengius. On the other hand, a combination of Persian and Turkish was quite common in the Middle Eastern lexicography, dating back to 1300, and having been preceded only by Persian-Arabic. Şüdeş (2012: no pagination) states that “by the 17th century about eleven Persian-Turkish dictionaries had been compiled, the most famous of which is Lesān al-ʿAjam (1076/1665) by Hasan Šoʿir“. Incidentally, Orsatti (1995: 526 n.13) makes a comment on precisely the same topic: listing the sources of
Ketelaar does not mention such objections to the non-discriminant use of the two suffixes, an omission which could be explained by his tendency to keep his grammar simple and practical. However, the relationship with Greaves is visible in another detail: although vrantschap is a correct translation of Latin amicitia (‘friendship’) used by Greaves, the Persian word dust (Romanised in Steingass as dost) actually means ‘friend’. ‘Friendship’ is dostī (Steingass 1892: 544). It is highly unlikely for such an error to be coincidental, and it strengthens the hypothesis that Ketelaar modelled his grammar on Greaves.

Although Greaves enumerates the three degrees of comparison: positivus, sive absolutus, comparativus, superlativus (‘positive or absolute, comparative, superlative’) and gives their definitions, Ketelaar never mentions the positivus or the definitions, presenting directly how these forms are made. Greaves adds a note on the privation suffix kam and the intensifier bisyār (‘very’ or ‘many’). When Ketelaar talks about the comparative particle as (az, than) – the equivalent of the Dutch dan, or als, the two examples are very similar to the examples from Greaves:

Wanneer in een reeden dan, off als, agter een Comparativum werd gesteld, zoo voegt men in plaats van dan, off als, as: gelijk vervolgens werd aangewezen:
Exempel: Een mensch is beeter als een schap: sjannert as ghustsui beter
Soeter als honingh, as angebien sierreter (p. 81)

‘When in the speech than is put after a comparative, then it’s replaced with as, as indicated in the following [example]: A man is better than a sheep; sweeter than honey’.

Although Greaves does not directly reference it, his examples Homo quantō melior ove? and melle dulcius are most likely drawn from the Bible. Melle dulcius comes from the Book of Judges 14:18: “Quid dulcius melle, et quid fortius leone?” (“What is sweeter than honey? And what is stronger than a lion?” – The Latin Vulgate as quoted in the biblehub.com). Homo quantō melior ove? has its root in a parable from Matthew 12:12: “quanto magis melior est homo ove!” (The Latin Vulgate

Castelli’s Persian-Latin dictionary included in the second volume of his Lexicon heptaglotton, she remarks that one of the three manuscript copies of Logat-e Ne’mat-allah belonged to Thomas Greaves, brother of John. However, by comparing the note on the use of plural suffixes from Elementa (pp. 25-27) with the information on pluralisation from the Logat (quoted as f. 302 of the Venice Ms), she concludes that John did not know about this manuscript, and that the Lexicon Perso-Turcicum he refers to on pages 27 and 51 was probably some other work.

18 Als (used here in the examples beter als..., soeter als... – ‘better than’, ‘sweeter than’) in modern Dutch is only used in the positive degree (e.g. zo rood als een kreeft – ‘as red as a lobster’). Used in comparative degree (instead of the most common dan, ‘than’, e.g. sneller dan het licht – ‘faster than the light’) is considered either a colloquial form, or a regional variant.
version), which in King James Bible is translated as “How much then is a man better than a sheep?” (ibid.). In Ketelaar’s example, ‘a sheep’ is replaced by ‘a horse’ which suggests that Ketelaar either did not recognize its biblical connotation, or deliberately removed it. Greaves’ third example from ‘the camel and the eye of the needle’ parable is also absent from Ketelaar’s discussion.

In the section on adjectives, Ketelaar explains the use of suffixes -ter and -ien (in) for the formation of comparative and superlative degrees. Interestingly, the first two examples: swart–swarter–alderswaarst; sja–sjatter–sjatterien (‘black–blackener–blackest’) and ouwd–ouder–alderouwst; pier–pieter–pieterien (‘old–older–oldest’) are the same as in Greaves (p. 28-29), but the third one: ghoebe–beether–beetherien; goed–beter–alderbest (‘good–better–best’) is Ketelaar’s addition. The choice of this example is strange as the Persian adjective خوب khūb (‘good’) is presented with its irregular comparative form bihtar, and therefore not following the rule.

Further in the same chapter, we find a couple of paragraphs dealing with derivations. On page 80, Ketelaar states that verscheijde Substantiva komen van de adjectiva meede toedoen van de letter i: (‘some nouns come from adjectives by means of adding the letter i: [at the end]’) and gives examples of goed–goetheyt (‘good–goodness’), nieck–nikie; wacker–wackerheyt (‘wakeful–wakefulness’), bidaar–bedari; nijdigh–nidigheijt (‘angry–anger’) hassed–hassedi; gesond–gesondheijt (‘healthy–health’), tandrost–tandrosti. (Bonus bonitas and vigil – vigilantia are among Greaves’ examples of nominal derivation on page 22.) On page 81, Ketelaar makes a note on the formation of adjectives from nouns by using the suffix -dār to express “possession or capacity”20 with the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch (English transl.)</th>
<th>Persian (MSP)</th>
<th>Dutch (English transl.)</th>
<th>Persian (MSP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>een baard (‘beard’)</td>
<td>ries (rīsh)</td>
<td>gebaard (‘bearded’)</td>
<td>riesdaar (rīsh-dār)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schamte (‘shame’)</td>
<td>heija (ḥayā)</td>
<td>beschamt (‘ashamed’)</td>
<td>heijadaer (hayā-dār)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hooren (‘horns’)</td>
<td>sjaagh (shāḵẖ)</td>
<td>gehoorend (‘horned’)</td>
<td>sjaaghdaar (shāḵẖ-dār)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schult (‘debt’)</td>
<td>kares (qarz)</td>
<td>schuldenaer (‘debtor’),21 karesdaar (qarz-dār)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet Ketelaar’s presentation of derivations is, to say the least, highly selective. In general, Persian has a very rich morphology, frequently employing derivational agglutination. In his discussion on the noun (de Nomine, pp. 16-23), Greaves mentions many other ways of word formation, but among them, we also find the examples seen above (sanus–sanitas; barba–barbatus; verecundia–vereundus;...

---

20 “Camelus per foramen acus facilius transibit, quam dives in regnum Dei ingrediatur” (Greaves 1649: 29), “For it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.” (Luke 18:25, http://www.drbo.org/).

21 -dār در is the present stem of داشتن dāshtan, ‘to have’ and acts as indicator of ownership in compound words.

21 Noteworthy is the last example where the purposed adjective from schult (‘debt’) is schuldenaer (‘debtor’ – a noun) rather than verschuldigd (‘indebted, due’).
cornu–cornutus; debitum–debitor). 22 In comparison to almost five pages of ways of word formation by the use of affixes in Greaves, Ketelaar presents only two cases.

On page 29, Greaves discusses cardinal and ordinal numeral adjectives (De Nominibus Numeralis; cardinalia vel ordinalia). We don’t find a corresponding discussion of these categories in Ketelaar, probably because he already had two sections of his vocabulary (36 and 37) on getal (‘number’) and order getal (‘ordinal number’).

The introductory sentence to Ketelaar’s chapter on declension of pronouns (Declinatie van de Pronomina, p. 81) is slightly unclear: De pronomina, off voornamen, beteekent deselve, een g’eijndige Zaek (‘Pronomina, or pronouns, mean the same, a finished thing’). Ketelaar mentions here four types of pronouns: personelyk (‘personal’), bewyselyk (‘demonstrative’), bestetelijke (‘possessive’) and wederomhalige (possibly: ‘relative’) – the latter term being hard to find in any other early modern Dutch grammatical source (more on this in Chapter 7.1). 23 The original sentence in Greaves sheds some light on what Ketelaar must have been trying to say in both cases:

Pronomina sunt quae vicem nominis subeunt, et certam finitamque rem, vel personam, adsignificant; suntque quadruplicia. Personalia, Demonstrativa, Relativa, et Possessiva. 24 (Greaves, 1649: 35)

‘Pronouns are these which replace nouns, and mean a certain and definite thing or person. There are four types: Personal, Demonstrative, Relative and Possessive’.

So, Ketelaar’s g’eijndige Zaek is ‘a certain and definite thing’, and is simply an explanation of definite pronouns referring to any specific person or thing. The same passage confirms that by wederomhalige (UMS: 81), Ketelaar must have meant relative pronouns.

---

22 Greaves distinguishes two types of derivation: verbal and nominal (Derivatium Verbale et Nominale). There are many subtypes of verbal derivation, among others coming from the infinitive such as scire–sciencia (‘to know–knowledge’). Nominal derivations can come from nomine substantivo (‘substantive’) or from adjectivo (‘adjective’). From the substantive come Nomen Actoris (by the use of suffix -gir as in <nāhī–nāhī-gir>, piscis–piscator, ‘fish–fishermen’), as well as Diminutivum, Possessivum & Gentle (diminutives, possessives, and names of nationalities). From adjectives, one can derive nomina qualitatis, and from substantives and adjectives alike abstracta (‘abstract nouns’) can be formed. Ketelaar chose to include only the possessives and the abstract nouns.

23 In his grammar, De Dieu quotes five types, adding interrogative pronouns.

In Ketelaar, as with Greaves, the three persons singular are *men* (‘I’), *ton* (‘you’) and *u* (‘he’). In plural, he gives *ma*, *sjuma* (*شُمَا* shumā) and *jesjon* (also spelled *isjoen*, for *ایشان* ʾišān). The declension patterns are presented with a Dutch reflexive form *ons* ‘us’ instead of *wij* ‘we’ in nominative plural, probably by mistake. Although Ketelaar does not provide any additional explanation, two other declensions follow. From Greaves we know that the first one comes from the Persian Pentateuch, and the second one presents the paradigm for the demonstrative pronoun *jen* (*این* ḫīn, ‘this’, the demonstrative pronoun for nearer object).

The name of the following section, *Pronomina*, really ought to have been called *possessiva*. Describing possessive pronouns, Ketelaar suggests that instead of using some special form, the Persians simply juxtapose the noun with the ordinary personal pronoun in nominative:

> Wanneer de Persiaanen sullen zeggen, mijn ziel, uw verbond, zijne rijkdommen, etc. so gebruyken sij in plaats van mijn, *ik*, voor uwe, *gij*, voor sijne, *hij*, in plaats van onse, *wij*, en soo voort, gelijk vervolgens kan gesien werden:

> ‘When the Persians will say “my soul”, “your alliance”, “his riches”, etc; they use instead of ‘my’ –‘*I*, for ‘your’–‘*you*, for ‘his’–‘*he*, for ‘our’–‘*us, and so forth, as can be seen in the following:’

>mijn ziel (‘my soul’) – *sjoene men*
> uw verbond (‘your pact’) – *sjert toe*
> zijne rijkdommen (‘his wealth’) – *maal oe*
> onse vader (‘our father’) – *pader ma*
> ulieder hand (‘your hand’) – *deste sjuma*
> haarlieder hutte (‘their tent’)– *chaimij isjoen*

Again, we find exactly the same examples in Greaves (*anima mea, pactum tuum, divitiae ejus, pater noster, manus vestra, tentorium eorum* - p. 38). However, Ketelaar does not tell the whole story, as Greaves in addition to the structure described above, adds three endings used to construct possessives: -*am*, -*at*, -*aš* (yet he does not mention any plural forms). We do not find them in Ketelaar. The last group in this section are interrogative pronouns, even though Ketelaar does not name them as such. He simply declares:

> De pronomina, die de Persen in’t ondervragen gebruyken zijn *re*,* 27* off *kij*, en *tsje*, off *tsjie*, want altijd met het substantive woord zegge, in sig selven bestaande, het is groeynde, als volgd:

> wie is het27 – *as kiest*
> wat nieuws – *tsje cheir*
> wat hebt gij gedaan – *tsje cardi*
> welke twee laaste afsonderlijk werden uitgedruckt. (UMS: 82)

---

25 In the PMS the whole section is under the “Declensions of pronouns”.
26 -*re* is a misspelling of Greaves’ (p. 38) -*kih* – the author’s mistake rather than a copyist’s error, as all three manuscripts have the same form. In the examples, the form used is -*ki*.
27 In DHMS: *wien*. 

‘The pronouns used by the Persians for questions are: re [ke], or kij, who, and tsje or tsjie. [chh] “what” because it is always pronounced as growing in with the verbum substantivum, as follows:

- who’s this? – as kiest
- what’s new? – tsje cheir
- what have you done? – tsje cardi.

of which the last two are expressed in an exceptional way.’

In fact, only the first example demonstrates the rule from the comment, and the last two actually contradict it, as the verb is shown as separate from the interrogative pronoun. It is probably what Ketelaar was trying to say in the last line: afsonderlijk uitgedrukt (‘expressed in an exceptional way’, or ‘as an exception’). But when we compare with Greaves, the explanation is easy: Ketelaar’s text is missing two lines, which created the confusion. The whole fragment in Greaves reads as follows:

His subnectenda sunt pronomina, quibus in interrogando Persæ utu

nempe <ki> vel <kih> quis; & <cheh> vel <chi> quid. <Ki> semper cum

verbo substantivo <ast>, in unam dictionem coalescit; ut <az kist> cujus

est? <maraa kist keh> Quis est qui me? <Cheh> sive <chi> plerunque

separatim exprimitur, ut <cheh khabar> quid novi? <chi kardi> quid

fecesti? sed cum <ast> eodem modo conjungitur, ac <ki> h.e. Eliph excidit,

ut <chist> quid est?

These pronouns are added which are used in questions by the Persian: namely [ki] or [kih] who; and [cheh] or [chi] what. [Ki] always grows into one expression with verbum substantivum [ast], wherefore: [az kist] whose

is [it]? [maraa kist keh] Who is (such) as me? [Cheh] or [chi] is mostly

expressed separately, as [cheh khabar] what’s new? [chi kardi] what have

you done? But together with est it is linked the same way like ki, that is

with Eliph discarded, as chist what is? (Greaves 1649: 38-39)

Interestingly, neither DHMS nor PMS mention this somehow obscure remark on verbum substantivum, although they present the same examples. It may point to them being later versions than the text of the UMS.

5.3.2 The verb

The second major section in the Instructie dealing with Persian grammar is chapter 46: Van de Conjugatie der Persiaanse Taale (‘Of conjugations of the Persian language’). In the opening paragraph, Ketelaar invokes the authority of “the most learned Persians” to support his statement on the infinitive:

Het Infinitivum, of oneijndige werd bij de geleerste Persjanen als den

wortel, en oorspronck van alle mannieren en tijden, g’agt d’welke altijd in
den, of ten uitgaat (UMS: 83)

28 This is assuming that Ketelaar did not understand that verbum substantivum is not just any verb but a verb of existence, i.e. “to be”.
‘The Infinitivum, or the infinitive, is [considered] by the most learned Persians the root and origin of all moods and tenses, and always ends in -ten or -den.’

This turns out to be a translation of Greaves’ sentence:

Radix, seu thema, omnium Modorum & Temporum, a Lexicographis Persicis, Infinitivus ponitur. (Greaves 1649: 43-44)

‘The infinitive is proposed by the Persian lexicographers as root, or theme of all modes and tenses.’

It is interesting to see what Ketelaar meant by ‘most learned Persians’, or, or to put it more accurately, how he understood ‘Persian lexicographers’. His reluctance to use the word ‘lexicographer’ is consistent with his general tendency to avoid complex scholarly terminology which might be too obscure for his non-expert mercantile audience. (Furthermore, the omission of the comparison with Hebrew confirms Ketelaar’s tactic of dropping most references to other languages, so plentiful in Greaves.) What’s more, when we look at Greaves’ chapter De Verbo (‘Of the verb’), we notice the whole introductory part explaining the grammatical definitions and divisions which Ketelaar skipped. Greaves divides verbs into Verbum Activum (‘active verb’), Passivum (‘passive’) and Neutrum (‘neutral’), and discusses seven Verbo accidunt (‘accidents of verb’): forma (verbal suffixation), figura (‘figure’, or composition), species (‘species’, i.e. morphological derivation), conjugatio (‘conjugation’), modus (‘mood’), tempus (‘tense’), persona (‘person’), with their further classifications. He mentions one conjugation and three moods: Indicativus (‘indicative’), Imperativus (‘imperative’) and Infinitivus (‘infinitive’). As we said above, Ketelaar picks up the topic from the definition of the latter, and continues to mention five tenses, promising to explain them later (sommige van het infinitivum herkomen, een eenige wat moeyelyker, als hier naar zal aangewezen werden– ‘some derived from the infinitive, and some more difficult, as it will be shown hereafter’).

When talking about grammatical number, Ketelaar uses an unexpected word: gestalte instead of getalle:

De personelijke [persoenen - DHMS: 74, PMS: 140] zijn driederleij. De gestalten zijn maar tweederleij, eenigh en meer als een. De gestalten gevende, off wegh wijzers der persoenen, sijn in alle tijden even eens, behalen de persoenen van’t singualirs, van’t preteritum perfectum, off voorby sijne perfectum, dat in plaats van ed; op een es: uijtgaat. (UMS: 83)

29 One of the few exceptions is the passage where Ketelaar mentions ‘den begeerlijken tot de turckse taale (‘those wishing to learn the Turkish language’): rather random in Ketelaar, references to the Turkish language or Perso-Turkish lexicon are frequent in Elementa (Greaves 1649: 27; 51; etc.).
There are three persons. There are only two numbers [lit. figures], singular and plural [lit. ‘more than one’]. Giving the form, or indicating the person, [figures] are identical in all tenses except for persons of singular in praeteritum perfectum, or past perfect, which end in -es instead of -ed‘.

The remark on -es replacing -ed does not make much sense in Persian. Here also Greaves’ text elucidates the intended meaning, lost in Ketelaar:

Personae tres sunt, & duo Numeri, Singularis, & Pluralis. Duoem Persae non usurpant. Literae formativae, sive indices personarum, in omnibus Temporibus eadem sunt, si tertiam solum personam praeteriti perfecti excipias in numero singulari, quae terminatur in <d> ab Infinitivo <dan>, in <t> ab Infinitivo <tan>. (Greaves 1649: 44)

‘There are three persons and two numbers, singular and plural. Dual is not in use among Persians. Formative letters, or indicators of person, are the same in all tenses, with the only exception of the third person sg. in the Perfect tense, which takes the ending [d] from the infinitive [dan], and [t] from the infinitive [tan].’

It confirms that the ‘number’ is the word Ketelaar needed, and also shows that de gestalten gevende (‘giving form or shape’) is Ketelaar’s translation of Litterae formativae (I will return to this in section 7.2). It also shows that in all three copies, the t is misspelled as s, which, considering the similarity between the handwritten shapes of the two letters, must have resulted from a copying mistake at some earlier stage.

The next section in the Instructie, van’t maaken der tijden (‘On the formation of tenses’) is clearly based on Greaves Formatio Temporum (p. 45). Ketelaar starts with the present tense:

Het Jegenwoordige word op veelen hande maniere onderscheijden gaande het oneijndelijke als gesegt altijd in den, of ten, uijt, om uijt dese terminatie30 dan het jegenwoordige te maeken is het de grooste moeijte, en difficultteijd, in de geheele Persiaanse taale welke verandering in weijnige regulen zullen reduceren

‘Present can derive in many ways from the infinitive, as said before always ends in -den, or -ten. To make present tense out of this ending is the hardest thing and difficulty in the whole Persian language, and these modifications will be reduced to a few rules [here].’

The parallels with Greaves are very clear:

Praesens ab infinitivo varie deducitur. Infinitivus, ut jam dictum est, definit in [den], aut [ten]. Ex his terminationibus Praesens rite eformare, praeciu Lingua Persicæ difficultas est. Nos hanc varietatem ad paucas regulas reducemus.

---

30 In the UMS misspelled as ‘triminatie’.
The present is derived from the infinitive in various ways. As already stated, the infinitive ends in [den] or [ten]. To duly form the present from these terminations is the main difficulty of the Persian language. We will reduce this variety to a few rules.

The first rule says that infinitives ending in \(-[den]\) change their syllabic ending \(-[den]\) in \(-[em]\), in the first person singular of the Present Tense. Examples include:

- *tellen* (‘to count’), *sjumor – ik telle* (‘I count’), *sjumor en roepen* (‘to call’), *chonden – ik roepe* (‘I call’), *chon en vervolgen* (‘to pursue’), *ronden – ik vervolge* (‘I pursue’), *miron en graven* (‘to dig’), *konden – ik grave* (‘I dig’), *miskonem*

Not surprisingly, Greaves has the same examples, however, the first two examples of 1st person sg. have the prefix *mi-*, missing in Ketelaar.

The vocalic mutation/harmony is also observed:

Deselve buijginge mede, dewelke in *jden*: ofte *jyden* uitgaen in het eijndelijke. ins gelijks, veranderen mede *iijdem*, *jn* em: in het presente [...]’

‘The same inflection when ending in \(-[jden]\) or \(-[jyden]\), similarly alters \(-[iijdem] \) for \(-[em]\) in the Present (...)’

Examples include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch (English transl.)</th>
<th>Persian (MSP)</th>
<th>1st person sg, present tense (Dutch &amp; Persian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>sniijden</em> (‘to cut’)</td>
<td><em>boriden</em></td>
<td><em>ik snijde</em> (‘I cut’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>weyden</em> (‘to graze’)</td>
<td><em>tsijriden</em></td>
<td><em>ik weijde</em> (‘I graze’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dogh die geene welke *oe*: int midden voor *dhen* hebben veranderen in het Jegenwoordige, *den*, in *Jem*, en *oe* werd mede in *a*: verandert. (UMS: 83-84)

‘But the ones that have the middle \(-[oe]\) before \(-[dhen]\), exchange in the Present tense \(-[den]\) in \(-[jem]\), and \(-[oe]\) changes into \(-[a]\).’

The examples for the above rule are as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch (English transl.)</th>
<th>Persian (MSP)</th>
<th>1st person sg, present tense (Dutch &amp;Persian)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>beproeven</em> (‘to test, to try’)</td>
<td><em>asmoeden</em> (ażmūdan)</td>
<td><em>ik beproeve</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>prijsen</em> (‘to praise’)</td>
<td><em>cetoenden</em></td>
<td><em>ik prijse</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

31 *Horiden* in the UMS seems to be the copyist’s mistake.
Ketelaar’s second example does not follow the rule it is supposed to illustrate (the same incorrect form micetoendem appears in all three copies). Unsurprisingly, Greaves has the same examples with the second one, laudare, laudo (‘to praise’) having Persian forms <sotūdan>, <misetaiam> (p. 46).

Next, a selection of irregular verbs is presented (soodanige woorden die naar de gemelde sleur niet werden geconjugeerd – ‘such words that are not conjugated according to the aforementioned routine’), which Greaves calls anomala (‘anomalous’, ibid.) with seven examples (UMS: 84):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch (English transl.)</th>
<th>Persian (MSP)</th>
<th>1st person sg, present tense UMS, Dutch &amp; Persian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>toonen (‘to show’)</td>
<td>nemoeden (nomoodan DHMS; namoodan PMS) (numūdan, namūdan)</td>
<td>ik toone minomeijem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zijn (‘to be, to become’)</td>
<td>sjuden (shūdan)</td>
<td>ik ben misjuem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geven (‘to give’)</td>
<td>daden (dādan)</td>
<td>ik geeve midhem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slaan (‘to hit, to strike’)</td>
<td>seden (zadan)</td>
<td>ik slaa misenem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sien (‘to see’)</td>
<td>diden (dīdan)</td>
<td>ik sie mibinem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komen (‘to come’)</td>
<td>oemeden (āmādan)</td>
<td>ik kome mijajem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scheepen (‘to create’)</td>
<td>aferiden (āfrīdan)</td>
<td>ik schepe mi afferinem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>openen (‘to open’)</td>
<td>gosjaden (gushādan)</td>
<td>ik opene mi gosjajem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greaves allocates the next couple of pages to exposing his “Rule no. 2” (Reg. 2) to describe irregular verbs. It contains six different cases plus additional ‘exceptions to exceptions’, which explains why Ketelaar, clearly not willing to go into so much detail, honestly says: De tweede regel, geeft soo veel exceptiees, en moeijten in sigh dat de selve voorbij ga. (p. 84) (‘The second rule has so many exceptions and difficulties that we’ll pass on it here’), and passes on to the formation of other tenses (p. 49 in Greaves). Again, he translates Greaves almost word for word, reassuring the reader that

Wanneer men het jegenwoordige, en oneyndige kan [...] dan isser omde andere tijden te formeeren geen de minste swaarigh , want tot het voorgaande imperfectiva, ‘t perfectiva, en meerder als perfectiva, werden gemaakt, van het oneijdige, en het toekomende, als gebiedende maniere komt van’t jegenwoordige.

‘Once one knows the present and the infinitive [...] then making other tenses on their base presents no difficulty whatsoever, as the past imperfect, past perfect
and plusquamperfect come from the infinitive and the present, just like the imperative comes from the future tense.

(cf. Greaves: Cognitis, Presenti, et Infinitivo, in reliquis temporibus deducendis nulla est difficultas (p. 49) ‘Once you know the present and the infinitive, there’s no difficulty in deducing other tenses’)

Het perfecte (‘the perfective’)32 is made from the infinitive with the change of the ending -n into -m, which is illustrated on five examples (eten ‘to eat’—chorden, ik heb gegeten ‘I have eaten’—chordem, etc.). According to Ketelaar, ‘t Onperfecto (‘the imperfective’) is made by adding -mi in front of the perfective. Het meer als perfectum (‘the pluperfect’) comes from het deijlatige33 des verleedens, en het jsing selven bestaande word boeden (‘a part of the past tense and the verbum substantivum ‘boeden’, ‘to be’), where the part coming from the past accords with the infinitive, changing n to he. The examples are: ik had gegeten (‘I had eaten’)—chori boedem; ik had geweten (‘I had known’) — donisti boedem. (Greaves has the same examples).

Speaking of the Future tense, Ketelaar explains that Het toekomende werd gemaakt van Jegenwoordige met het weg werpen van mi: aen voorstellen van bi: off be: (‘the Future tense is made from the Present [tense] by removing -mi and adding -bi or -be at the front.’) Then, he translates word for word a note from Greaves saying that “Some suggest adding here a second future, which they call compound, which can be omitted in certain cases, and which is made by the word chaham (I want) and the infinitive without the letter N - the same letter that disappears in other cases.” (p. 50-51).

Next, Ketelaar, just like Greaves, recognizes that the imperative is identical to ‘the Future’, except for the second person singular that takes an ending -i. Also, speaking about the Imperative, Ketelaar takes the opportunity to quote the euphonic rules from Greaves:

merckt hier ann dat be: in het gebiedende uijt oorsaake van beter klanc, als bi: off bi: al bo: kan werden gepronueerd, gelijk sulx met de volgende vocalen, en Consonanten over eenkoomt, egter in de persiaanse tale meest bo: gesegd werd, gelijk mede b: met i: voorgesteld werden indien het woord begint met a: in welke gevalle word a: des woords gemeenlijk overslaan (UMS: 86)

‘Note that for the sake of better sounding -be can be pronounced as -bi, or -bi as -bo, similarly these also agree with the following vowels and consonants, in fact in Persian they are most commonly pronounced as -bo, and similarly, -b gets -i when the word starts with an -a, in which case the -a is skipped altogether.’

Greaves’ Imperativus Negativus (the Negative Imperative, sometimes called Prohibens or Preventive), is translated as de ontkennende gebiedende maniere. It is made by use of negative prefixes ma or na replacing bi (word geformeert van mi: negeerende

32 This is perfective in Dutch but the equivalent of Simple Past in English.
33 Deelaghtige in DHMS.
notulo, off het deelken na: in de plaatse van be:). The examples are: eet niet (‘don’t eat’) – mashor, ook nashor; weet niet (‘don’t know’) – madon, of nadon; kom niet (‘don’t come’) – maijia, nia. A short note follows: Inde eerste worstelingh begint van a: word he: verandert, als: kom niet – nia, maya; voor – nai, ma. (p. 87). The sentence is hard to understand without comparing the original in Greaves (p. 51): ‘If the first radical letter starts with a, then h changes to i, as <maiala> and <naiä>, “don’t come”, instead of <ma h?ä> and <nai ä>.

Towards the end of Ketelaar’s Persian grammar is a full table of conjugations of the ‘perfect word’ chorden (“to eat”), in all numbers, persons, and tenses. However, Ketelaar never explains what he understands by ‘perfect word’ (I will come back to this in Chapter 7). Greaves does not define it either and only makes a functional distinction between perfecta and anomala:

Paradigma خوردن ut jam dictum, regula & norma est ad quam aliorum Verborum declinatio dirigenda est; quod si aliqua ab illo canone aberraverint, quae admodum paucà sunt, anomalà censenda sunt. (p. 60-61)

‘The paradigm of <khordan>, as already mentioned, is the rule and the norm, which governs the declension of other verbs; the ones that deviate from this canon, which are very few, are considered irregular.’

Ketelaar paraphrases it to a simple statement:

naar dese maniere van spreken, ofte conjugereen moet de conjungatie van andere woorden, al schoon dat deselve perfect sijn, ter eenemaal geboogen werden. (UMS: 88)

‘According to this way of speaking, or conjugating, the conjugation of other words has to be inflected [once and for all], as long as they are perfect.’

The order of paradigms (jegenwoordige (‘Present’), ‘T voorbij sinde imperfecte (‘Past Imperfect’), T voorbijjyne meer dan perfecte (‘Pluperfect’), Het toekomende (‘Future’), Het tweede toekomende of te samen gevoegde (‘Second Future’ or ‘Composite Future’), het gebiedende (‘Imperative’), het oneijndige (‘Infinitive’) follows the order of Greaves’ conjugation paradigms (Presens, Praeteritum imperfectum, Praeteritum perfectum, Praeteritum plusquamperfectum, Futurum, Futurum secundum vel Compositum, Imperativus, Infinitivus). The only elements left out from Greaves are Participium presens (‘present participle’) with the forms خوردن and خورده Edens, Participium præt.[eritum] qui edit, qui esus est (‘past participle’) خورده, and a note on the formation of Gerundia (‘gerunds’).

The second comment on negation comes at the end of the chapter:

De leugenachtige woorden die den begeerlijken tot de turckse taale veel moeyelijk heeden baaren, pleegen van de persen verandert te worden, door een vorsettinig van Neij, ofte na: twelke is den letter der logen, en groeijd met het selve woord in een reeden tesamen. (UMS: 86[90])
The “falsifying words” that cause a lot of difficulties to the apprentice of Turkish language,34 are created by Persians by prefixing naij, or na, which is the particle (lit. ‘the letter’) of a lie [or ‘falsification’] and grows into that word becoming one.

A comparison is made with the Latin negative verb nescio (‘I don’t know’, a similar combination of the negative particle and a verb: non scio):

Alwaar ’t eenemaal op deselve maniere na: (dat is niet) in’t Persiaans met donis, ten tsamen werd gevoegd, gelijk nescio in’t latyn (ibidem).

‘where in the same way na (i.e. not) is joined with donis, similar to nescio in Latin.’

The example shows the words eeten (‘to eat’) and weeten (‘to know’) (UMS: 86[90]):

- eeten (‘to eat’) – chorden
- niet eeten (‘do not eat’) – na chorden
- weten (‘to know’) – danisten
- niet weten (‘do not know’) – na danisten

Although the sense is preserved, the note, so awkwardly translated by Ketelaar, sounds much clearer in the original Latin by Greaves:

De Verbis negativis
Verba negativa, queae linguae Turcicae studiosis multas paruint molestias, a Persis reddi solent per praefixionem نه vel ن quod iis litera negationis appellatur, & in unam dictionem cum ipso Verbo coalescit; ut نخوردن, non edere, دانستن, scire, nescire. Ubi codem plane modo hoc est non, Persice cum ندانستن coadunatur, quo ne in Latina voce nescire. (p. 59)

Greaves makes two other points on negation, adding five examples, but Ketelaar does not mention any of them. Greaves continues on with a section De Verbis Imperfectis, sive anomalis (‘Of imperfect, or irregular verbs’, p. 60), which includes the conjugation paradigms for Verba substantiva esse بودن (būdan, ‘to be’) in the same six tenses used for verba perfecta, and the forms for infinitive, imperative, participle, gerund and future subjunctive. In the Instructie, the verbal paradigm of boeden (without mentioning that it is an irregular verb) is shortened to the present tense, past perfect, imperfect, pluperfect and future (p. 87[91]).

34 The negation in Turkish is notoriously complicated, and the negative verbs are usually dealt with separately in Turkish grammars of that period (cf. Zwartjes 2014). The negation can be verbal, using the negating suffix -me at the verb stem (however, to express ‘future’, the auxiliary verb ol has to be used), nominal – using the negating marker değil, or existential, where existence is expressed by the particle var and non-existence by yok (Van Schaaik 1996: 21-25).
Ketelaar ends his Persian grammar with verbal paradigms of two verbs: *chorden* (*xordan*, ‘to eat’) and *boeden* (*būdan*, ‘to be’). Although we find the same paradigms in Greaves, there are some differences.

The forms for *‘T Jegenwoordige* (Present) look as follows:

| Ketelaar (UMS: 87)            | Greaves (p. 52) in MP transliteration
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| i veet (‘I eat’)            | *michorem* (DHMS: *mi choorem*) man *mixoram*
| gij eet (‘you eat’)         | *to chorem* (DHMS: *to chorie*) *to mixori*
| h ij eet (‘he eats’)        | *oe chorem* (DHMS: *oe chooret*) *to *mixorad*
| wij eet (‘we eat’)          | *ma chorem* (DHMS: *ma choorem*) *ma mixorim*
| gij lieden eet (‘you eat’)  | *sjuma chorie* (DHMS: *sjuma choried*) shomā *mixorid*
| zij lieden eet (‘they eat’) | *isjoen choren* *shon* mixorid

Even though in the examples on page 84 Ketelaar – just like Greaves – uses the prefix *mi-* for all verbs in the present tense, in this paradigm he decides to drop it. What may look like a simple mistake or omission (especially when we notice the *mi* and not *man*, ‘I’, in the first person sg), may also have a more interesting origin. But let’s look at the remaining conjugations. Ketelaar’s *‘T voorbij sijnde imperfecte* (‘Past imperfect’, or simple past) and *‘T voorbij sijnde perfecte* (Present perfect/ Præteritum perfectum) have virtually identical forms:

| Ketelaar (UMS: 87)            | Greaves (p.52)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ik at (‘I ate’)</td>
<td><em>mi chordem</em> <em>mixordam</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij at (‘you ate’)</td>
<td><em>to chordi</em> <em>mixordi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h ij at (‘he ate’)</td>
<td><em>oe chord</em> <em>mixord</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wij aaten (‘we ate’)</td>
<td><em>ma chordiem</em> <em>mixordim</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij lieden aat (‘you ate’)</td>
<td><em>sjuma chordiet</em> <em>mixordin</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zij lieden aaten (‘they ate’)</td>
<td><em>isjoen chordend</em> <em>mixordand</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35 All forms in Greaves are only given in Perso-Arabic script; the transliteration of Greaves I am using in this chapter was kindly made by Dr Elmira Kazemi Mojaveri. Note the use of *x* as an alternative for *kh*.
36 On the aspectual nuances and history of nomenclature for *praeteritum*, see Binnick (1991: 10-13).
37 Translation according to the grammatical form; on the non-equivalence of use the past tenses in Dutch and English Past Simple and Present Perfect Tense see Aarts & Wekker (1987: 205-215).
wij hebben gegeten (‘we have eaten’) chordiem xordim
gij lieden hebt gegeten (‘you have eaten’) chordied xordid
sylieden hebben gegeten (‘they have eaten’) chordend xordand

This must be a mistake, since on page 85 Ketelaar gives a definition on the formation of the imperfect with the prefix mi-. T voorbijsijnde meer dan perfecte (Plusquam perfect) is the same in Ketelaar and in Greaves:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ketelaar (UMS: 87)</th>
<th>Greaves (p.53)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ik had gegeten (‘I had eaten’) chordi boedem xordeb budam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij had gegeten (‘you had eaten’) chordy boedit xordeb budi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hij had gegeten (‘he had eaten’) chordij boed xordeb bud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

wijlieden hadden gegeten (‘we had eaten’) chordi boedid xordeb budid
gijlieden had gegeten (‘you had eaten’) chordij boedid xordeb budid
sylieden hadden gegeten (‘they had eaten’) chordy boedend xordeb budand

However, when talking about the future tense, Greaves presents two different forms, and Ketelaar uses one – completely dissimilar to Greaves’:

Het toekomende (Future) / Futurum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ketelaar (UMS: 88)</th>
<th>Greaves (p.54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ik sal eeten (‘I shall eat’) bochorem mixoram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij sult eeten (‘you will eat’) bochorie mixori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hij sal eeten (‘he will eat’) bochoried mixorad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wij sullen eeten (‘we shall eat’) bochoriend mixorand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Het tweede toekomende (second future)/ Futurum 2um vel Compositum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ketelaar (UMS: 88)</th>
<th>Greaves (p.54)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ik wil eeten (‘I shall eat’) bochorem (DHMS: cahem chord) xaham xord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij wilt eeten (‘you will eat’) bochorie (DHMS: chalie chord) xahi xord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hij wilt eeten (‘he will eat’) bochoried (DHMS: cahed chord) xahad xord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wij willen eeten (‘we shall eat’) bochoriend (DHMS: chahiem chord) xahim xord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij lieden wilt eet (‘you will eat’) bochoried (DHMS: chahied chord) xahid xord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sylieden willen eeten (‘they will eat’) bochorend (DHMS: chahen chord) xahand xord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inasmuch as Greaves’ description is technically correct, his *Futurum Secundum* belongs to formal/written language. Ketelaar’s form is not entirely correct as it is missing the modal verb “will” (the full form should be: *mixoham boxoram*, or *michoham bochorem* according to his spelling). However, this future tense form based on subjunctive form of the main verb is less formal and occurs both in written and spoken language. According to Prof. Hashabeiky, this is a convincing argument that Ketelaar was very much relying on data from a native informant speaking a dialectal variety of modern Persian (personal communication).

The last form of the verb ‘to eat’ mentioned by Ketelaar is nothing less but *het toekomende, ofte door het voorleedene toekomende van het vooren gevougte*, Future Subjunctive, which Greaves calls *Futurum, sive Praeterito-futurum, Subjunctivi*. Again, the two authors quite agree as to the forms here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ketelaar (UMS: 86[90])</th>
<th>Greaves (p. 58)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indien ik sal gegeten hebben ('when I’ll have eaten')</td>
<td>ager chorda basjem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indien gij sult gegeten hebben ('when you’ll have eaten')</td>
<td>ager chorda basji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indien hij sal gegeten hebben ('when he’ll have eaten')</td>
<td>ager chorda basjid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indien wij sullen gegeten hebben ('when we’ll have eaten')</td>
<td>ager chorda basjiem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indien gijlied: sult gegeten hebben ('when you’ll have eaten')</td>
<td>ager chorda basjiend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indien zijl: sullen gegeten hebben ('when they’ll have eaten')</td>
<td>ager chorda basjend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just like in Greaves, in the conjugation of the verb *boeden* [*būdan*], ‘to be’, in the present tense only the short, enclitic forms are presented:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ketelaar (UMS: 86[90])</th>
<th>Greaves (p.61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ik ben ('I am)</td>
<td><em>em</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij sijt ('you are)</td>
<td><em>ie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hij is ('he is)</td>
<td><em>ast</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wij sijn ('we are)</td>
<td><em>iem</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gjil: sijt ('you are)</td>
<td><em>iest</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syl: sijn ('they are)</td>
<td><em>end</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These enclitic forms are default and are more commonly used in both written and spoken language, while the full forms, which use the same stem *hast* (*hastam, hasti, hast, hastim, hastid, hastand*) are more stressed.
The imperfect (*Het voorbij sijnde Imperfecte*, Greaves’ *Præteritum Imperfectum*) is again missing the prefix *mi-* in Ketelaar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ketelaar (UMS: 87[91])</th>
<th>Greaves (p. 62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ik was (‘I was’)</td>
<td><em>mi bo[e]dem</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij waat (‘you were’)</td>
<td><em>to boedi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hij was (‘he was’)</td>
<td><em>oe boed</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wij waaren (‘we were’)</td>
<td><em>ma boediem</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gijlied: waart (‘you were’)</td>
<td><em>sjuma boedied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syl: waaren (‘they were’)</td>
<td><em>isjoen boedend</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prof. Hashabeiky speculates that the *mi* in 1s sg *mibodem* might be a colloquial or a dialectal form of the 1 person sg pronoun *man* (private communication, September 2017). The personal ending -*am* has also been transcribed as -*em*. Even *sjoema, isjoen* and *boedend* reflect the informal colloquial/dialectal forms of these words (in written Modern Persian: *shomā, īshan, būdand* – cf. Rafiee 2001: 25-26). This again confirms that Ketelaar must have had some native informants and he has transcribed words as he had heard them, hence inconsistencies and frequent mistakes. Greaves, on the other hand, has clearly abstracted his conjugation rules on the basis of written sources, as his presentation is very consistent and almost without mistakes. 

There is agreement again between Ketelaar and Greaves in the Present Perfect (*Het voor bij sinde perfecte/ Præteritum Perfectum*):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ketelaar (UMS: 87[91])</th>
<th>Greaves (p. 62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ik ben geweest (‘I have been’)</td>
<td><em>boedem</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij sijt geweest (‘you have been’)</td>
<td><em>boedie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hij is geweest (‘he has been’)</td>
<td><em>boed, et boedst</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wij sijn geweest (‘we have been’)</td>
<td><em>boediem</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gijl: sijt geweest (‘you have been’)</td>
<td><em>boedied</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syl: sijn geweest (‘they have been’)</td>
<td><em>boedend</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yet the two part ways again when it comes to Past Perfect, or Pluperfect:

---

38 According to Jeremiás (1996: 577), Greaves’ source “almost exclusively consists of classical texts, Sā di in most cases, the obligatory text for studying Persian”. His rules “are drawn from the sentence-corpus of classical texts and translations” and out of the three grammarians she compared (Greaves, Ludovicus de Dieu, and Ignatius di Gesù) he “seems to be the most well-versed in the philosophical writings on the subject” (*idem*: 578).
Here, the form given by Greaves is not in common use, although it is technically not incorrect. The form given by Ketelaar is correct but it is a passive form in Persian meaning “I had become”, from the verb \(\text{شدن} \) shudan, ‘to become’ (Prof. Hashabeiky, personal communication). Similarly, in the last tense presented by Ketelaar, Het toekomende / Futurum, he again conjugates the verb \(\text{شدن} \) shudan (accidentally repeating the form sawen for the 2nd and 3rd persons sg instead of sawem-sawi-sawed). He apparently believes that it means ‘to be’; while Greaves presents the subjunctive/futurum of the verb \(\text{بودن} \) būdan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ketelaar (UMS: 87[91])</th>
<th>Greaves (p. 63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ik had geweest(^{39}) ('I had been’)</td>
<td>sjoedi boedem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij had geweest ('you had been’)</td>
<td>sjadi boedie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hij had geweest ('he had been’)</td>
<td>sjadi boed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wij hadden geweest ('we had been’)</td>
<td>sjud boediem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gijlieden had geweest ('you had been’)</td>
<td>sjadi boedid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sijlieden hadden geweest ('they had been’)</td>
<td>sjadi boedend</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fact, after Greaves gives the conjugation paradigm for the verb shudan, “esse & fieri” ('to be; to become”) “from which passive verbs are formed” (p. 67) – but Ketelaar does not mention it, except for these two tenses put under the wrong verb. Ketelaar ends his grammar here, skipping pages 64-70: Second Future, Imperative, Infinitive, Participle, Gerund, and Future Subjunctive, and also passive verbs. The next 14 pages of Greaves’ Persian grammar cover other topics.

\(^ {39}\) The form “ik heb/had geweest” often occurs interchangeably with “ik ben/was geweest” until the 18th century, even in language manuals (cf. Martin 1762: 67; Holtrop 1789: 71). Kok (1649) and Ten Kate (1723) regarded both hebben or zijn as correct; van Heule was wholeheartedly against using zijn, and Moonen (1706: 144) was the first grammarian to opt for zijn (Kooiman 1954: 209, 212). By the second half of the 19th century, zijn had prevailed, pushing Brill to write: “het gebruik heeft gewild, dat men thans uitsluitend zegt: ik ben geweest, maar niet: ik heb geweest” (Nederlandsche Spraakleer 3, 1860, quoted after Kooiman 1954: 214). Soon after, using hebben is already regarded as incorrect: “In zamengestelde tijden komt zijn nooit met hebben voor. Nooit zegt men: ik heb geweest, ik had geweest, maar wel ik ben geweest, [...] ik was geweest” (van Langendonck 1861: 71).
such as impersonal verbs, participle, and four parts of speech of vox inflexibilis ('inflexible voice'): adverb, conjunction, preposition, and interjection. The last five pages (84-89) are devoted to syntax. On page 90, Greaves presents a table of Persian words that correspond in meaning and sound to English and Latin words. Ketelaar has a similar table, or rather two separate lists, on page 88[92] (they will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 8).

5.4 Conclusions

The text of Elementa Linguae Persicae by John Greaves is evidently the basis of Ketelaar’s Persian grammar. However, the text is shortened and simplified. In his adaptation, Ketelaar decided to focus on the most practical aspects, such as conjugation patterns and reduced theoretical deliberations of Greaves to a bare minimum (e.g. the ‘second rule of conjugations’ in Greaves with a plethora of additional ‘sub-rules’ and grammatical nuances is mentioned but not included in the Instructie.) Probably keeping in mind the audience he was targeting, he did not want to discourage his readers from learning the basic grammatical forms. The unusual grammatical terminology may be a result of Ketelaar’s lack of formal training as well as him not being a Dutch native speaker, yet direct influences of German or English, for example, are hard to identify. Yet what is more significant and intriguing, Ketelaar did not simply copy Greaves’ verbal forms, probably judging them too “bookish”, and instead, replaced them with more colloquial forms (including spoken forms of personal pronouns). Since there are not many studies on the Persian language used in the Mughal empire, this part of the material would benefit from a more in-depth analysis.

An important question imposes itself: what about his Hindustani grammar? Could an amateur with no training as a linguist spontaneously produce a fairly sophisticated description of a hitherto undescribed language? Or did he use models, just like in the Persian part? We will look for answers in Chapter six.
6. Ketelaar’s grammar of Hindustani: context, content, conception

As we have seen in Chapter five, Persian language was hardly a novelty in 17th century Europe. However, the language as it was known in the West may not have been exactly the same as Persian spoken in India. But why was Persian even used in the Mughal Empire? And what was its relation to another important language of the area, Hindustani? In the present chapter, I will sketch the linguistic situation in Mughal India to emphasize the role and position of the two languages. I will also briefly present the earliest European descriptions of Hindustani, which will help contextualise Ketelaar’s pioneering work. The main part, however, will be dedicated to the text of his grammar of Hindustani. Wherever possible, Ketelaar’s grammatical descriptions and definitions will be put in a comparative perspective, be it from the standpoint of the modern standard Hindi-Urdu (MSH-U), or other contemporaneous grammars. To conclude, I will analyse the textual evidence as to whether and to what degree the Hindustani part might have been modelled on the Persian grammar we have seen before.

6.1 Persian and Hindustani in Mughal India; the first European descriptions

The Persian language came to India in the Middle Ages and spread quickly through its literary culture. “All the Indian parrots will turn to crunching sugar with this Persian candy that goes to Bengal”, famously wrote Hafiz of Shiraz, referring to Indian love for Persian poetry (as quoted in Alam 2004: 123). In the wake of the Turkish conquest of north India, Persian came to flourish for over three centuries under the generous patronage of the Delhi Sultanate for Persian poets and writers. The north of India became a part of the Perso-Islamic world, highly influenced by Persian language and culture (idem: 117-118). When, in the 16th century, the Afghan sultans were succeeded by the Mughals, for a while it looked like Turkish might become the new language of the imperium. There is still no univocal explanation on how Persian managed to prevail in spite of the Chaghatai Turkish origin of the rulers. Alam puts it down to a convergence of reasons, one of them being the status and popularity of the language, and close cultural and intellectual ties that developed between the Mughals and Iran (idem 122-123). When the third Mughal emperor, Akbar the Great (1542-1605), finally reorganized the administration, he also formally declared Persian as the language of administration.

1 Olfert Dapper in his Asia, of Naukeurige beschryving van Het Rijk des Grooten Mogols quoting Terry says that Persian used in the Mughal Empire is somehow bastardised in pronunciation compared to “the original Persian”, and that “the same goes for certain words” (Dapper 1672: 81; see also 2.4.1).
From now on, the Hindu clerks, who previously worked in the local language, Hindavi \textit{(vide infra)}, had to learn Persian in order to continue their career. Persian had now practically become the main language of the imperium. One of its main strengths was the fact that in a sharp contrast to the local languages, it resisted change. To quote the Indian scholar and poet Amir Khusrau (1253-1325), “Persian parlance enjoyed uniformity of idiom throughout the length of four thousand leagues, unlike the Hindavi tongue, which had no settled idiom and varied after every hundred miles and with every group of people” \textit{(idem: 134-135)}. Another interesting development which happened alongside the growing prestige of Persian was that while for Hindus Persian was a relatively straightforward means to advance their career, for Muslims it had acquired “a kind of religious sanctity”, to the point of Jamal al-Din Inju, the first Persian lexicographer, asserting that “the Prophet of Islam knew and spoke Persian” \textit{(idem: 132)}. But Edwardes & Garrett (1995: 160) mention another language factor that enabled Akbar to establish his impressive administrative machinery:

The barrier, which at first divided the Moslem from the Hindu had, by the date of Akbar’s accession, been largely broken down, the mutual intercourse which naturally ensued, resulting in the evolution of a special language, Urdu, which was intelligible to both parties and gradually became the vernacular of the Muhammadans of India.

This new mixed language enabled inter-cultural communication, but at the same time incited deep ideological divisions in India. Even today, the origins and historiography of Hindustani are subject to political and ideological views. However, most scholars agree that the base of it was \textit{Khari Boli}, the “standard dialect” of Delhi. This base language spoken in pre-Muslim India absorbed the linguistic features (from phonological, to morphological, to lexical) of Persian, Arabic and Turkish (Rahman 2011: 80).

As a result, the linguistic situation in the North of India at the close of the 17th century was still quite complex. While the official language of the Mughal administration was Persian, a multitude of Indian languages were used locally, and the actual contact language of the area was the rapidly expanding Hindustani. The two languages often became combined in European dictionaries, grammars and literary translations (cf. Marsden 1827: 43; Ouseley 1831: 20-21; Maisonneuve 1872: 203). It fell upon the Europeans, who needed to learn this language for practical reasons, to produce the earliest written grammatical descriptions of Hindustani. Ketelaar’s \textit{Instructie} (1698) is the oldest dated study on Hindustani, followed shortly after by \textit{Grammatica Lingue Indianae Vulgaris sive Mogolanae} (1704) by the French Capuchin missionary François-Marie de Tours (†1709). The following grammatical work, \textit{Grammatica Hindostanica}, published in Halle in 1745, was the work of the German missionary and Orientalist Benjamin Schulze. Three decades later, Cassiano Beligatti (1708-1791) wrote \textit{Alphabetam Bramhhanicum seu Indostanum Universitatis Kasi}, printed in Rome in 1771, which is however only a description of Hindustani alphabet and sounds. Almost simultaneously, two British officers from the East India Company published,
Independently, first a grammar (Hadley 1772) and then a dictionary (Fergusson 1773) of “the Indostan Language”. After the foundation of Fort William College in Calcutta (1800), many other British grammars, designed specially for teaching, followed. In 1778, an anonymous Portuguese missionary work entitled *Grammatica Indostana* was printed by the Propaganda Fide in Rome (Désoulière 1982: 21-42 presents convincing arguments that its author was the Portuguese Jesuit father Matteu Rodrigues who died in Agra in 1748).

It is important to note that the European travellers and missionaries concurrently used various glottonyms (to name a few Latin ones: *Indostan*, *Moors*, *lingua Indostanica*, *Hindostanica* or *Hindustanica*; *lingua Indiana*; *lingua Mogolana*). According to Grierson (1916 IX-I: 43), the glottonym ‘Hindustani’ (or *Hindoostani*) – Persian in origin – was coined under European influence. And so, Gilchrist advocated this nomenclature:

Hindoostan is a compound word, equivalent to Hindoo-land or Negro-land, and too well known to require any description here. It is inhabited chiefly by Hindooos and Moosulmans, whom we may safely comprise, as well as their language, under the general, conciliating, comprehensive term of Hindoostanee, and which I have adopted for the above and following reasons. This name of the country being modern, as well as the vernacular tongue, in question, no other appeared so appropriate as it did to me, when I first engaged in the study and cultivation thereof. That the natives and others call it also Hindee, Indian, from Hind, the ancient appellation of India, cannot be denied; but as this is apt to be confounded with Hinduwee, Hindooee, Hindvee, the derivative form from Hindoo, I adhere to my original opinion, that we should invariably discard all other denominations of the popular speech of this country including the unmeaning word Moors, and substitute for them Hindoostanee [emphasis added], whether the people here constantly do so or not, as they can hardly discriminate sufficiently to observe the use and property of such restrictions, even when pointed out to them. Hinduwee, I have treated as the exclusive property of the Hindoos alone, and have therefore constantly applied it to the old language of India, which prevailed before the Moosulman invasion; and in fact, now constitutes among them, the basis or ground-work of the Hindoostanee, a comparatively recent superstructure, composed of Arabic and Persian [...] (Gilchrist 1802: I).

2 According to Goodwin (1890: 23: 435), Hadley (d. 1798) originally wrote his grammar in 1765. Hadley himself writes in the preface to his 1772 edition of *Grammatical Remarks* that he was shocked to find out that “a mutilated embryo” of his own “grammatical scheme” from 1765 was printed in London in 1770 under the title *A short grammar and vocabulary of the Moors language* (1772: vii). He blames the publication on a certain “industrious Mr. Henry Revell Jr” who happened to have a copy of Hadley’s original manuscript. This highly incorrect and lacking version was circulating in Bengal, which prompted Hadley to publish a correct edition “with his name set to these pages” “to prevent further accidents” (1772: viii). Three other editions of Hadley’s work were published before 1797. Hadley also published a short grammar of Persian in 1776.
Also Ketelaar in his introduction contrasts the speech of the Moorish Muslims, which he calls *hindustanki boli*, with the language of the true indigenous Indians, *hinduki boli*. McGregor (2001: 23-24) analyses this distinction in detail and identifies *hinduki boli* as a less common variant of *Hindavi* or *Hindui* (*ibidem*). The quotation below presents Ketelaar’s view on the linguistic situation he encountered on his arrival in India:

De taal by de hindoustanse, gousouratse, en bengaalse etc., mahometanen gebruikelijk, is meest affhangende, van het persjaans, door dien de taale der heijden, welkers landen, nu door de moors werd geregeerd, is de persjaanse, en heijdense tale, door den anderen gemengeld, en welke als nu bij de mooren word gebruikt, die door don banck hindoustanse boelie, off hindoustanse taale genoemt werd, hoe wel met recht, het verbasterd hindoustans mag geheeten werden, want de taale der moorsen mahometanaen verre met die van de reghte hindoustanse, off heijdense, is verschillende, en om tusschen die moore, en heijdense taale in’t noemen een verschil te maeken, soo noemt men der mooren taale, gelijk boven gesagt, *hindustani boli*, of Hindustani taale, maar oft der reghte hindoustans, off heijdense, is verschillende, en om tusschen de moore en heijdens tale een verschil te maeken, soo noemt men der mooren taale, gelijk boven gesagt, *hindustani boli*, of Hindustani taale. Also, the Muslim one is spoken differently between different regions, in Bengal, Bagnagar [Hyderabad in the Deccan], Poeroeb [?], and Gujarat they incline much to the languages of the Baniyas, but around Agra, Delhi, Lahore and Kashmir the Muslim language is spoken in its most pure way. And that of the common man from the first mentioned places is often not understood. But the proper Hindustani is most esteemed by the grandees, and after that way [of speaking] the following treatise is made.

‘The language used by Hindustani, Gujarati and Bengali Muslims is mostly based on Persian, through which the language of the Pagan [i.e. Hindu], whose lands are now ruled by the Muslims [, has been mixed], [it] is the Persian and Pagan language mixed together, and now used by the Muslims, which is usually called *Hindustani boli*, of Hindustani language, although it should properly be called corrupted Hindustani, because the language of the Moorish Muslims differs much from the proper Hindustani or Pagan one, and in order to distinguish between the Muslim and Pagan languages in their naming, they call the language of the Muslims, as mentioned above, *Hindustani boli* and that in use by the Pagans *Hinduki boli*. Also, the Muslim one is spoken differently between different regions, in Bengal, Bagnagar [Hyderabad in the Deccan], Poeroeb [?], and Gujarat they incline much to the languages of the Baniyas, but around Agra, Delhi, Lahore and Kashmir the Muslim language is spoken in its most pure way. And that of the common man from the first mentioned places is often not understood. But the proper Hindustani is most esteemed by the grandees, and after that way [of speaking] the following treatise is made. Persian is mostly used by the most prominent administrators.’ [transl. based on G. Kruijitzer]

Almost contemporary to Ketelaar’s, François-Marie de Tours calls it *Lingua Vulgaris, seu universalis*, a universal language of the Mughal empire as well as

---

3 For further discussion on the religious terminology (Hindus vs. Pagans) see 8.6.
neighbouring territories, including coastal areas.¹ This universal language is easy to learn yet possesses rules just like more noble and important languages.² De Tours recommends it for missionary work, as it already is widespread and used by merchants and travellers.

So, what did Ketelaar say about this universal language, which he was famed to have mastered? And how did he abstract the rules of its grammar: using some model of reference that he had at hand, extending the classification he already knew, or inventing his own categories? And how do his observations compare with those of his peers, and how do they fit in with with the modern language?

### 6.2 The Hindustani grammar – content description and analysis

The grammar of Hindustani is presented in chapters 47 and 48 (UMS). Just like in the Persian part, one chapter is announced as dedicated to declensions (Declinatie der Hindoustaanse Taale, p. 88[92]) and the other to conjugations (Conjugatie der Hindoustanse Taale, p.104[108]).³ In practice, the most important aspects – according to Ketelaar’s view – of nominal morphology are gathered under the heading “Declensions” and topics regarding verbal morphology (including syntax) can be found under “Conjugations”. Each of these chapters contains “subchapters” which have no actual numbering but are visually distinguished from the text by larger handwriting in the heading. In the following section, I will present Ketelaar’s original classification and topic and examples in the order in which they appear in the Utrecht manuscript of the Instructie.

#### 6.2.1 Declension paradigm

The chapter Declinatie der Hindoustaanse Taale (‘Declensions of the Hindustani language’) extends to eight pages (89[893] - 96[100]) and starts with a couple of rules:

> De declinationes, der hindoustanse taale zijn vierderleij, zoo wel in masculine, als feminine genere, d’eerste declinatie des manelyken gesegnegts, eindigt met lange A: nominativo singularie, en jn pluralie med & alwaar drie Casus, als genetivus, dativus, en accusativus, in singularias veranderd werden met bij voeging van ka: en kon: en word de letter N: agter het word kon: in alle tijden maar halv gehoorht,

---

¹ De Tours mentions also two other languages concurrently used in the area: Lingua Scientifica, or Sanskrit, restricted for the religious and legal use of the Brahmins, and lingua gentilitia – a local Indian language particular for each province. For more detailed description see Aranha (2015: 338-339).
² “Lingua Vulgaris, seu Universalis est illa, quae in uastissimo magni Mogolis, quod late patet_imperio, omnibusque ejus circumquaque uicionis, marisque littoribus usitatur, ita ut quocumque illarum terrarum, littorumq; peruenias, lingua istam, quam etiam Mogolamam et Indianam vocant, certus sis reperire; illaque medianta alias, ubi necessitas aderit, facilem possis discur.”  (De Tours 1704: 308r)
³ In the UMS, page numbering continues until page 88, after which it restarts at 85. Correct page numbers are added later in pencil, and these are marked here in square brackets (i.e. 85[89]).
off van der spreeker uitgesproken, in vocativo word alle tijd de letter E: voor en in ablativo, se: off sem, agter gevoegt. (UMS: 88[92]-89[93])

‘There are four types of declensions of the Hindustani language, both in feminine and masculine gender. The first declension of the masculine gender ends with a long A in the nominative singular. In the plural, all three cases: genitive, dative and accusative are changed in singular by the addition of ka and kon. The letter N after the word kon is always only half-heard, or [half] pronounced by the speaker. In the vocative, the letter E is always added before, and in ablative se or sem is added after [the word].’

In the first declension type, the examples for the masculine are: *beetha, een soon* (‘son’) and *kotta, de hond* (‘dog’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominativus</td>
<td>kotta</td>
<td>koette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitivus</td>
<td>kottaka</td>
<td>kottonka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dative</td>
<td>kottakon</td>
<td>kottonkon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusativus</td>
<td>e: kotta</td>
<td>e: kotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocativus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablative</td>
<td>kottase</td>
<td>koettese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominativus</td>
<td>koette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitivus</td>
<td>kottonka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dative</td>
<td>kottonkon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusativus</td>
<td>kottonkon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocativus</td>
<td>e: kotte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablative</td>
<td>koettese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without further explanation, two examples for both masculine and feminine are given for each of the four declension types, presumably having the same endings as masculine nouns. However, already in the two examples of the first declension of feminine nouns are: *boedia, een ouwde vrouw* (‘an old woman’) and *dhabia, een doosje* (‘box’) alternative forms are given in genitive and dative singular: -ka or -ki, and in genitive plural: -kon or -kum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominativus</td>
<td>dhabia</td>
<td>dhabiem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitivus</td>
<td>dhabia vel ki</td>
<td>dhabiak vel kun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dative</td>
<td>dhabia kon</td>
<td>dhabion kon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusativus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dhabionkon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocativus</td>
<td>e: dhabia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablative</td>
<td>dhabiase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nominativus</td>
<td>dhabiem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitivus</td>
<td>dhabionka vel ki</td>
<td>dhabionka vel ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dative</td>
<td>dhabionkon</td>
<td>dhabionkon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusativus</td>
<td>dhabionkon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocativus</td>
<td>e: dhabiem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablative</td>
<td>dhabiemse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rest of the declension types also depend on the noun endings. The examples of the second declension for masculine nouns are *admi, d’mensch* (‘man’), and *dobi, de wascher* (‘washerman’), and in feminine *beeti, de dogter* (‘daughter’) and *matti, de aarde* (‘earth’). The examples in the third declensions masculine are *aendhoe, een stier* (‘bull’), and *tamboe, de thent* (‘tent’). In feminine we have *dsjoeroe, de vrouw* (‘wife’), and *boehoe, d’schoondogter* (‘daughter-in-law’). In the fourth declensions, masculine examples are *baab, de vader* (‘father’) and *bhel, de oss* (‘donkey’). For the feminine, the examples are: *dhaijn, een toverhex* (‘witch’), and *ank, ’t oogh* (‘eye’). Except for one alternative ending in the genitive for *admi* and *baab* (-ka or -ke), the rest of the examples have exactly the same terminations.

In modern Hindi, the nouns are characterised by categories of gender (masculine and feminine), number (singular and plural), and case (direct and oblique, and in some cases also vocative), expressed by affixation. Additionally, Hindi possesses several postpositions, which are used to express different functions (such as direct and indirect object, locus and agent), and which are classified differently by different authors. The declension type depends on the noun’s gender (masculine or feminine), each of which is subdivided in two declensional subtypes (Shapiro 2003: 262). For masculine, the first type includes nouns ending in -ā, the second – all remaining masculine nouns. For feminine, the third type encompasses nouns ending in -ī (with subtypes of -ī and -iyā), and fourth type – all the other feminine nouns (Stasik 1998: 44). Although there are two gender suffixes, ā for masculine nouns and -ī for feminine nouns, it is hard – if not impossible – to determine the grammatical gender based on the ending alone, as we can see in the table below. Grammatical gender of nouns referring to humans and larger animals usually agrees with their natural biological gender (Stasik 1998: 44) - regardless of the ending. Ketelaar seems to be basing his declension types solely on the noun ending (first group ending with -a, second with -ī, third with -oe [u] and the fourth type – nouns ending with a consonant). This pattern combined with the peculiar use of oblique, and the lack of oblique case for -ā nouns, Chatterji draws a conclusion that “Ketelaar wanted to reduce his Hindustani declension to a system – nouns in -ā, nouns in -ī, nouns in -ū, nouns in consonants, both masculine and feminine – and merely supplied a regular set of inflections which had some agreement merely with current forms” (1935: 79).

---

7 For example Mohanan (1994: 66) lists eight principal postposition serving as case markers: Ergative ne (ergative marker), Accusative ko (with), Dative ko (‘to’), Instrumental se (‘from, by, with’), Genitive kaal/[ke/kii] (possessive postposition), Locative 1 mē (‘in’, ‘among’), Locative 2 par (‘on, at’), Locative [& temporal] tak (‘till, as far as, up to’). Shapiro, however, is reluctant to declare such one-to-one linkage between a particular postposition and a particular case function as in many instances the choice of postposition is lexically determined (2003: 263). Schulze (1745: 22) solves this issue by extending the ablative with nine different postpositions: mere-me – in me, (‘in me’), mere-su, mere-me-su – ex me (‘from me’), merevaste – propter me (‘for, from me(?)’), mere sat – mecum (‘with me’), mere nesdik – apud me (‘upon me’), mere hastu – per me (‘by me’), mere ander – intra me (‘inside me??’), mereuper – super me (‘above me’).
It has to be noted that the final letter _n_ in the paradigm which Ketelaar describes as “partially heard” (halv gehoort) suggests nasalization – existing indeed in plural oblique cases and, in a small number of nouns of masculine I category, in all terminations (Shapiro 2003: 262). The reliance on the noun terminations as determinants of declension types may well come from Ketelaar’s familiarity with Persian grammar, where the nouns fell into two declension groups depending on their plural ending. In Greaves’ Persian, the only cases marked with suffixation were dative and accusative; Ketelaar decided to extend his suffixation paradigm to genitive, and also introduced the distinction according to the noun’s gender.

Schulze (1745: 8) introduces a simpler yet similar sounding classification: there are only three ‘proper’ cases, both in singular and plural. Genitive always ends in -_ka_; dative in -_ka_; Accusative like in Persian (more Persarum) is the same as dative. Vocative looks like nominative only with a particle _Je_. If nominative singular ends in _A_, nominative plural becomes _E_; if nominative singular ends with _E_, _I_, _O_, _U_, _EI_, _AU_, or with a consonant, then nominative plural is. François-Marie de Tours (1704: 42) mentions the following case terminations: nominative – _variable_; genitive – _ca_; dative – _caun_, accusative – _kete_; ablative – _soun_; vocative preceded by _he_.

---

8 Grammars contemporary to Ketelaar are cited with the original spelling/ phonetic transcriptions in their respective languages (French and Latin). All translations are mine.
De declinatie van de pronomen, off voornaamen, zijn vierderleij, als persoonlijk, bewijselijke, wederomhalige, en besittelijke. De persoonelijke zijn drie namentl: me; ik toe gij, whe, hij, (UMS 96[100])

‘Declension[s] of pronomen – or pronouns – are of four sorts: personal, demonstrative, relative, and possessive. The personal pronouns are three, i.e. me (‘I’), toe (‘you’), whe (‘he’).’

This mix-up of types of declensions with the types of pronouns is obviously a leftover from the sentence in his Persian grammar where he awkwardly translated Greaves’ definition. Here the definition is dropped and the four types of pronouns remain the same. The plural pronouns are also given but only in the declension paradigm: ham, tom, inne. The whole declension paradigm of pronouns is summarised in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>1st sg.</th>
<th>2nd sg.</th>
<th>3rd sg.</th>
<th>1st pl.</th>
<th>2nd pl.</th>
<th>3rd pl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>I (we, etc.)</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>toe</td>
<td>whe</td>
<td>ham</td>
<td>tom</td>
<td>inne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>of (me, us)</td>
<td>mere</td>
<td>teere</td>
<td>isseka</td>
<td>apne</td>
<td>tommare</td>
<td>inneka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>to (me, us)</td>
<td>muskon</td>
<td>teerekon</td>
<td>issekcon</td>
<td>hamkon</td>
<td>tomkon</td>
<td>innekon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>mera</td>
<td>teera</td>
<td>whe</td>
<td>hammara</td>
<td>tommare</td>
<td>inneka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>O! E:</td>
<td>E: me</td>
<td>E: toe</td>
<td>E: whe</td>
<td>E: ham</td>
<td>E: tom</td>
<td>E: inne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abl</td>
<td>from (me, us)</td>
<td>mese</td>
<td>toese</td>
<td>isse</td>
<td>[DHMS:</td>
<td>hamse</td>
<td>tomse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Declension paradigm of Hindustani pronouns (Ketelaar)

When compared to modern standard Hindi-Urdu (cf. Shapiro 2003: 265; Schmidt 2003: 321), the pronominal forms presented by Ketelaar are not entirely clear. He mixes direct and oblique forms, hence the unusual 3rd person plural inne, and does not always distinguish the honorific from non-honorific (apne presented as a genitive of ham). This last ‘mistake’, however, may be a result of the influence of

---

9 Probably the oblique, from जो in, “the formative of the oblique cases plural of the pron. yēh” (Platts 1884: 84). This would suggest that Ketelaar distinguished the plural from singular like in modern Hindi. Interestingly, the oblique forms mujh and tujh, absent from Ketelaar’s paradigm, appear later in the list of passive verb constructions (UMS: 123v-124r) as misja, toesja.
Gujarati where the pronoun for 1st person plural inclusive is *apne* (*ap* and *apne* for subject and object respectively, are used also in Gujarati in extremely formal speech to address a superior – cf. Cardona & Suthar 2003: 674-675). Grierson (1916: 8) also recognizes the Gujarati influence in the use of *āp* to mean ‘we’. For comparison: both François-Marie De Tours (1704: 51) and Schulze (1745: 26) give the form *ap* (sg) and *apen*/*appe* (pl) as a reflexive pronoun *ipse*/*ille ipse* (‘self’, ‘himself’/ ‘he himself’).

Technically, the pronoun used here for the 3rd person (*whe*) is a demonstrative: “*wōh*, or *wā* wāh – that, the; that person; that thing; – he, she, it” (Platts 1881: 1205). However, in modern Hindi, in the third person, demonstratives assume the function of personal pronouns (Shapiro 2003: 264). Interestingly, Ketelaar seems to be aware of this dual function, since when presenting the declension of pronouns, he originally translates *whe* in singular nominative as *die*, *dese*, *dat* (‘this, that’) but then makes a correction and superscribes *hij* (‘he’) (UMS: 97[101]):

![Figure 6.1: Dual translation of the pronoun *whe* (UMS: 97[101])](image)

Similarly, in the accusative case, the plural form *der lieden* (‘[those] people’, ‘them’) is corrected to *hem lieden* (‘them people’, or ‘them’) (ibid.).

Even though in the main paradigm, only the familiar or intimate form* toe* is given, an additional note explains the honorific usage of the plural (*pluralis maiestatis*):

> De plurale pronomina werden ook veel maal, in plaats van de singulare gebruikt, vermits zulk voor een hooglijke in t spreken g’agt werd, dog de woorden *apne*, ons. en inne, zijl: werden oijt anders dan in pluralis gebruikt, ook moet dit g’observeerden, dat de veelheid der pronomina in plaats van de enckelde, aan geen minder maar wel aan zijn meerder, en gelijke persoenen magh werden gebruukt. (UMS: 99[103])

> ‘Plural pronouns are often used instead of the singular, used to express the courteousness in speaking. In any case, the words *apne* (‘us’) and *inne* (‘you’ [pl]) are never used other than in plural. It must also be noted that the plural of the pronouns instead of singular may not be used for someone lower, but [only] for a person higher to oneself, or equal.’

10 Also in modern Urdu deictics have replaced the old third person pronouns, but just like in colloquial Hindi, there is no distinction between the form for singular and plural in the nominative case: *ye* is used for both ‘this, these’ and *vo* for ‘that, those’ (Schmidt 2003: 299, 321). They differ in the degree of distance (proximate and remote).

11 Platt remarks that *tī* is “used to imply depreciation or contempt; or by way of familiarity, or endearment; or, in addressing the Deity, to imply extreme reverence” (Platts 1884: 341).
The examples included show different pronouns used according to the rank of the person: in a relation of an inferior toward a superior, *tom* is required. However, when a superior addresses the inferior, *toe* is used. *Hami hammare* and *tomi tommare* can also be used for the singular, as in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMS–Hindustani</th>
<th>UMS–Dutch</th>
<th>(English translation of Dutch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>tom saheb he</em></td>
<td>ulieden is heer</td>
<td>(‘you are the lord’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tom meer saheb he</em></td>
<td>uw lieden zijt mijn heer</td>
<td>(‘you are my lord’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>toe sjacker he</em></td>
<td>gij zijt dienaar</td>
<td>(‘you are a servant’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>toe meer goelamhe</em></td>
<td>gij bent mijn slaav</td>
<td>(‘you are my slave’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ham</em></td>
<td>wij. ik, ook.</td>
<td>(‘we, also I’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hammare</em></td>
<td>ons [ook] mijn</td>
<td>(‘our, my’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tom</em></td>
<td>gijlieden, gij</td>
<td>(‘you [pl]/ you [sg]’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tommare</em></td>
<td>uw liedens, uwe</td>
<td>(‘your [pl]/ your [sg]’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Examples of the use of honorific and non-honorific pronouns (UMS: 99[103])

A short note on interrogative pronouns follows (UMS: 98[102]):

De pronomina, die de mooren in’t ondervragen gebruiken zijn *kja* wat, of *kjon* en *kon*, wie, etc.: en worden meest met een substantive woord vereenigd.

‘The pronouns that the Moors use in questions are: *kja* ‘what,’ or *kjon* and *kon* ‘who’, etc. and mostly are joined together with the substantive verb [verbum substantivum].’

The rule is illustrated with a series of examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMS–Hindustani</th>
<th>UMS–Dutch</th>
<th>(English translation of Dutch)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>konhe</em></td>
<td>wie is</td>
<td>(‘who is?’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>konhe_hoeder</em></td>
<td>wy is daar</td>
<td>(‘who is there?’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kondorte</em></td>
<td>wij loop ‘er’</td>
<td>(‘who is walking there?’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>konbolte</em></td>
<td>wy spreekt ‘er’</td>
<td>(‘who is speaking?’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kja ghabber</em></td>
<td>wat nieuws</td>
<td>(‘what’s news?’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kja_xjeijte</em></td>
<td>wat wiltje</td>
<td>(‘what do you want?’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kojon_neij</em></td>
<td>waar-om</td>
<td>(‘why not; certainly’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kiswaste</em></td>
<td>waar-om</td>
<td>(‘why’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kjon</em></td>
<td>hoe</td>
<td>(‘how’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kistere</em></td>
<td>wat wijs</td>
<td>(‘in what way’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kitte</em></td>
<td>hoe veel etc.</td>
<td>(‘how much, many’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the rule talks only about merging the interrogative pronoun with the *verbum substantivum*, the examples display three other verbs (‘to walk’, ‘to speak’, ‘to want’). The explanation for this inconsistency is easy if we revert to the Persian part, and indirectly to Greaves, who first mentioned the words “what” and “who”, of which the first always merged with the *verbum substantivum* ‘to be’. The four original examples from Greaves are repeated, but the other question words are included (why, how, in what way, how many) in addition to the original two mentioned in the rule. This points to the practicality of Ketelaar’s approach: useful words and expressions can easily be found in the text, and not just a general grammatical rule like in Greaves.

The possessive pronouns are presented without much introduction, and the first sentence starts exactly like its equivalent in the Persian part:

> Wanneer de moorsen hindoustanners willen seggen, mijn vader, mijn moeder, uw broeder, en uw suster, soo eijndigt het masculine pronomen gelijk vooren is aangewesen, met a: of e: en het feminine alle tijd, met de letter i: (UMS: 98[102])

> ‘When the Moor Hindustanis want to say: my father, my mother, your brother, and your sister, the masculine pronoun (like shown before) ends with *a:* or *e:* and the feminine always with the letter *i:*’

Ketelaar illustrates it with the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UMS–Hindustani</th>
<th>UMS–Dutch</th>
<th>English translation of Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>mirra bāb</em></td>
<td>mijn vader</td>
<td>(‘my father’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>terra baab</em></td>
<td>uw vader</td>
<td>(‘your father’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>meri maa</em></td>
<td>myn moeder</td>
<td>(‘my mother’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>teri maa</em></td>
<td>uwe moeder</td>
<td>(‘your mother’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hammare bhaij</em></td>
<td>onse broeder</td>
<td>(‘our brother’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tommare bhaij</em></td>
<td>uw lieder broeder</td>
<td>(‘your brother’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>hammari bhen</em></td>
<td>onse suster</td>
<td>(‘our sister’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tommari bhen</em></td>
<td>uw lieder suster</td>
<td>(‘your (pl.) sister’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>appen gorra</em></td>
<td>ons paard</td>
<td>(‘our horse’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>apne maal</em></td>
<td>ons goed.</td>
<td>(‘our possessions’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While this shows that Ketelaar correctly observed the agreement of possessive pronouns with the nouns they qualify for gender, number and case, and also captured their terminations, the pronominal forms are not the focus and have to be deduced from the examples. Besides, it would be interesting to know whether
Ketelaar was aware that this agreement rule extended to all declinable adjectives. The last two examples are quite interesting. The forms presented *apnen*, *apne* are in fact the reflexive possessive adjective *apnā* (“one’s own”). Platts (1884: 12) explains it: “– *apnā* is the uniform substitute for each and all of the possessive pronouns when they refer to the same person as the subject of the verb”. As such, it substitutes the possessive forms of personal pronouns and would be better translated here as “one’s own”, and not “ours”, as Ketelaar did. Just like most adjectives, *apnā* agrees with the noun it qualifies (Schmidt 2003: 321). According to McGregor (1987[1972]: 56) *apnā* is also used impersonally (without a referent in a sentence), or intensively, where it follows a possessive pronoun.

### 6.2.3 Negation

At the end of the chapter on pronouns, we find a note on *negerende woorden* (‘words of negation’):

> De Negerende woorden, bij de mooren gebruiklijk zijn, *na: neen, neij*, niet, ook *mat*, niet, dogh het laatste word noijt anders dan gebiedt gesproken en bywijlen soo aghter als voor een verbum gesteld. (UMS: 99[103])

‘The negative words used by the Moors are *na* and *nai*, and also *mat*, although the latter is only said as the imperative, and can be put sometimes before or after the verb’.

Ketelaar’s “negative words” are in fact the same as in Modern Standard Hindi–Urdu, where the negation is expressed by three particles: *mat*, *na*, and *nahi*. Of the three, *nahi* is the most versatile particle, also declared “the default negative particle in Hindi-Urdu” (Bashir 2003: 14 cited in Lampp 2006) and traditionally associated with the indicative (Lampp 2006: 7). Although *mat* and *na* are interchangeable, *mat* is stronger, or more emphatic, than *na*. Bhatia (1995: 12) goes a step further and classifies it as a “non-honorific” imperative. This is also the use Ketelaar presents in his examples (note the changing word order):

---

12 In Modern Standard Hindi, there are two types of adjectives: marked (which are declinable) with terminations -ā for masculine in the direct sg. and -e for all the other cases (i.e. obl. sg, dir. pl., obl. pl., voc. sg., voc. pl.). In Urdu, the paradigm is almost identical with the exception of the non-existent oblique plural suffix for adjectives (Schmidt 2003: 318). For feminine declinable adjectives, the suffix is always the same: -ī, in all the cases. Unmarked adjectives do not inflect, and they can have forms ending in consonants as well as vowels.

13 The other two other copies of the *Instructie* have *apne* in both cases, which suggests a transcription mistake in UMS.


15 *Na* can also serve as a question tag (Agnihotri 2013: 23).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindustani adjective</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>(English translation)</th>
<th>Hindustani noun</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>(English translation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ghoeb</td>
<td>goed</td>
<td>('good')</td>
<td>ghoebie</td>
<td>goedheijt</td>
<td>('goodness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gosse</td>
<td>boos</td>
<td>('angry')</td>
<td>gossie</td>
<td>boosheijt</td>
<td>('anger')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nenga</td>
<td>naekt</td>
<td>('naked')</td>
<td>nengaie</td>
<td>naektheijt</td>
<td>('nakedness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwanne</td>
<td>sot</td>
<td>('crazy')</td>
<td>dwannie</td>
<td>sotheijt</td>
<td>('craziness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sourauwer</td>
<td>sterk</td>
<td>('strong')</td>
<td>sourauweri</td>
<td>sterkheijt</td>
<td>('strength')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsjenga</td>
<td>gesont</td>
<td>('healthy')</td>
<td>tsjengahie</td>
<td>gesontheijt</td>
<td>('health')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sawaat</td>
<td>lecker</td>
<td>('tasty')</td>
<td>sawatje</td>
<td>leckerheijt</td>
<td>('tastiness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sghet</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>('hard')</td>
<td>sachtie</td>
<td>hardheijt</td>
<td>('hardness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alla</td>
<td>God</td>
<td>('God')</td>
<td>allahie</td>
<td>godheijt</td>
<td>('divinity')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andeer</td>
<td>duijster</td>
<td>('dark')</td>
<td>anderie</td>
<td>duijsterheijt</td>
<td>('darkness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dilgier</td>
<td>droevigh</td>
<td>('sad')</td>
<td>dilgierie</td>
<td>droefheijt</td>
<td>('sadness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sust</td>
<td>doff</td>
<td>('dull')</td>
<td>sustie</td>
<td>doffheijt</td>
<td>('dullness')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Examples of negative imperative with the particle mat
(UMS: 99[103])

6.2.4 Nouns. Degrees of comparison
The following section Van de Substantiva ('Of nouns') in fact deals only with formation of abstract substantives: de meeste substantivas komen vande adjectiva, met het agterstellen van ie ('most nouns come from adjectives by the addition of -ie' [the phonetic value of the Dutch ie being i]). This is a direct copy of a similar statement from his Persian grammar – incidentally involving the same termination – and even three examples are the same. Again, many more examples are added in comparison with the Persian part:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hindustani adjective</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>(English translation)</th>
<th>Hindustani noun</th>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>(English translation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ghoeb</td>
<td>goed</td>
<td>('good')</td>
<td>ghoebie</td>
<td>goedheijt</td>
<td>('goodness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gosse</td>
<td>boos</td>
<td>('angry')</td>
<td>gossie</td>
<td>boosheijt</td>
<td>('anger')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nenga</td>
<td>naekt</td>
<td>('naked')</td>
<td>nengaie</td>
<td>naektheijt</td>
<td>('nakedness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwanne</td>
<td>sot</td>
<td>('crazy')</td>
<td>dwannie</td>
<td>sotheijt</td>
<td>('craziness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sourauwer</td>
<td>sterk</td>
<td>('strong')</td>
<td>sourauweri</td>
<td>sterkheijt</td>
<td>('strength')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsjenga</td>
<td>gesont</td>
<td>('healthy')</td>
<td>tsjengahie</td>
<td>gesontheijt</td>
<td>('health')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sawaat</td>
<td>lecker</td>
<td>('tasty')</td>
<td>sawatje</td>
<td>leckerheijt</td>
<td>('tastiness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sghet</td>
<td>hard</td>
<td>('hard')</td>
<td>sachtie</td>
<td>hardheijt</td>
<td>('hardness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alla</td>
<td>God</td>
<td>('God')</td>
<td>allahie</td>
<td>godheijt</td>
<td>('divinity')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>andeer</td>
<td>duijster</td>
<td>('dark')</td>
<td>anderie</td>
<td>duijsterheijt</td>
<td>('darkness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dilgier</td>
<td>droevigh</td>
<td>('sad')</td>
<td>dilgierie</td>
<td>droefheijt</td>
<td>('sadness')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sust</td>
<td>doff</td>
<td>('dull')</td>
<td>sustie</td>
<td>doffheijt</td>
<td>('dullness')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Formation of abstract nouns in Hindustani (UMS: 100[104])
The discussion of adjectives under Van de adjectiva (or bijgevouged woorden) in the next section is limited to the presentation of degrees of comparison. According to Ketelaar, comparatives in Hindustani are made by preceding the adjective with the word issoe. He illustrates it by about a dozen of examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hindustani adjective</th>
<th>Dutch (comparative)</th>
<th>Hindustani (comparative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>swart ('black')</td>
<td>kalla</td>
<td>swarter</td>
<td>issoe kalla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ouwd ('old')</td>
<td>poeranne</td>
<td>ouder</td>
<td>issoe poeranna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goed ('good')</td>
<td>ghoeb</td>
<td>beeter</td>
<td>issoe ghoeb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>langh ('tall')</td>
<td>lamba</td>
<td>langer</td>
<td>issoe lamba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kort ('short')</td>
<td>tenga</td>
<td>korter</td>
<td>issoe tenga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bitter ('bitter')</td>
<td>karwa</td>
<td>nogh bitterder</td>
<td>issoe karwa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nabij ('near')</td>
<td>nasiék</td>
<td>nader</td>
<td>issoe nasiék</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diep ('deep')</td>
<td>gerra</td>
<td>dieper</td>
<td>isso gerra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dun ('thin')</td>
<td>pada</td>
<td>dunner</td>
<td>isso pada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dick ('fat')</td>
<td>moetha</td>
<td>dicker</td>
<td>issoe moetha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>droogh ('dry')</td>
<td>sucka</td>
<td>drooger</td>
<td>issoe sucka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duijster ('dark')</td>
<td>andeer</td>
<td>nogh duijsterder</td>
<td>issoe andeer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groot ('big')</td>
<td>barra</td>
<td>grooter</td>
<td>issoe barra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Positive and comparative forms

Further, he informs the reader that the superlatives are derived from the comparative by substituting the word issoe by sabsoe. Indeed, apart from adjectives borrowed from Sanskrit and a few Perso-Arabic adjectives that use morphologically derived suffixes used in literary style, in Hindi and Urdu there are no derivative affixes to express comparative and superlative degrees, and instead, “multi-word phrases including the postposition se” (‘from’) are used to form the comparatives (Shapiro 2003: 256). The superlatives can indeed be made by using the pronoun sab (‘all’) and the ablative postposition se placed before the adjective (Stasik 1998: 50). However, Ketelaar is clearly forcing a simplistic rule on the comparative; this may be encouraged by a straightforward formation of degrees of comparison in Persian. Again, the first three examples are the same as in his Persian part (and indeed, in Greaves) but many other adjectives are added. What’s more, there is one last

---

16 He probably means is se, the ablative postposition se with the dependent case of the pronoun yah.
17 Suffixes derived from Sanskrit and Persian (comparative/superlative: -tar/-tam, -tar/-tarīn) occur in those registers of Hindi (Shapiro 2003:265). There is also a “lower grade” made with the “deficiency” prefix kam (‘less’), but Ketelaar does not mention it. In fact, had he not skipped Greaves’ note on the privation suffix kem (1749: 29) in his Persian grammar, he might have noticed it in Hindustani.
observation on degrees of comparison at the very end of the chapter. The Hindustani word soe or se is used just like the Dutch dan or als (‘than’) (Ketelaar probably means the same postposition se, ‘from’, marking the comparative degree.) The first of the examples is very familiar: Een mensch is beter als een paerd (‘A man is better than a horse’) – admi gorrasoe ghoebhe. Copied in the Persian part from Greaves as “A man is better than a sheep”, by the time it made it to the Hindustani part, it has completely lost its biblical connotation. The second example is original: Een Eliphant is grooter dan een oss (‘An elephant is bigger than an ox’) hatti, bhelse barrahe.

6.2.5 Derivation

The next three notes deal with word formation. The first one is the formation of adjectives from nouns by using the suffix -daar or -gaar to express een besittinge off begaadheijt (‘possession or capacity’). Yet again, it is a direct calque from Persian part and Greaves (to the point where the two suffixes dār ‘having, possessing’ and گار gār, a suffix denoting maker or agent, are of Persian origin). The number of examples is far greater, yet the first couple of them are the same as in the original text. The second topic presents other suffixes by which “adjectives of possession” can be derived from nouns: tsje (-cī, as in Turkish-origin “top-ćī, a bombardier; a cannonier” – Platts 1884: 341), walla (wālā, a suffix of possession or agency), and daas.18

Ketelaar also gives a few examples of feminine nouns that exceptionally do not end in -i but -en, which happen when the masculine noun ends in -i, such as: dhobi – dhobin (‘washerman –washerwoman’), ghəradi – ghəraden (kharrađī: ‘turner–female turner’, or ‘turner’s wife’), malie– maalen (‘gardener – female gardener’). However, he remarks, the ending -en is pronounced “so softly” that the letter e is barely audible (nauwelijks gehoord werd).19

There is also an observation on the particle dsjie [jit],20 the role of which Ketelaar interprets as diminutive and endearing (as he presents it, a direct equivalent of the Dutch tje):21

---

18 Chatterji (1935: 80) points out two wrongly parsed examples, tierendas (‘an archer, a Bowman’ where ṭr is an arrow and ڭdāz means thrower, shooter) and daggabaas (‘cheat, traitor’ from Persian ġagā, deceit, and the suffix ژā bāz denoting an agent, doer), which according to him should be  التطبيق dāz and dagā-bāz, therefore not showing the affix -daas.

19 Platts (1884: 983) mentions two forms: H ږ�لا мālin, or мālan мālan, for a female gardener or flower-seller or the wife of a māli, a gardener, and dhobin, or dhoban (1884:550), for a washerwoman or washerman’s wife, but from Ketelaar’s transcription maalen, dhobin it is not always clear which form he actually meant. It is not impossible that Ketelaar observes here a pronunciation influenced by, or closer to, Gujarati feminine ending -o (vide Cardona and Suthar 2003: 678).

20 Chatterji (1935: 80) discusses here the form dsjie=جيب which he saw in Millius. In fact, the form dsjie comes from the Paris MS, where it replaced the dsje of UMS and DHMS.

‘The word *dsjie* is an amicable addition, used similarly to the Dutch *tje*, as in:
*baabdsje* dear father, *maadsjie* dear/mother; *baaijdsjie*, *bhendsjie*, dear/little brother, sister; *sahebdsjie*, *bibidsjie*: dear gentlemen, miss; *beethadsjie*, *beeti dsjie*, *doostnidsjie*: dear/little son, friend, girlfriend.’

Two loose remarks close the chapter on declension (UMS: 103[109]): the first one concerns the word *fallan*, being an equivalent of the Latin *et caetera*, which the Hindustanis use in particular *wanneer een dingh niet konnen off willen noemen* (‘when they cannot or don’t want to mention something’).22 The second remark regarding comparison has already been discussed in 6.2.4.

### 6.2.6 Conjugations

The next chapter entitled *Conjugatie der Hindoustanse Taale* (‘Conjugation of the Hindustani language’, pp. 104[108]-115[119]) starts with an explanation:

> De conjugatie der hindoustanse taale werd op der verscheijde manieren gepleegt, de tijden daar van zijn aght in het getal, als de tegenwoordige, de onvolmaekte, de toekom ende, de gebiedende, de gebiedende, en zomtijds ook plusquam perfecte, off meer dan volmaekte, de persoenen zijn driderleij, en de gestalte tweederhande maniere, als een, en meer als een werden geconjugeerd.

‘The conjugation of the Hindustani language is carried out in different ways. The number of tenses in it is eight: present, imperfect, perfect, future, second future, imperative, [imperative and] infinitive, and sometimes pluperfect. Persons are three, and the figure [number] is conjugated in two ways: singular and plural’.

---

One of the meanings of the Sanskrit-origin word जीव *jīv* given in Platts is ‘a beloved one, darling, sweetheart’ (Platts 1884: 414).

21 Vogel (1941: 26[668]) suggests that Ketelaar misunderstands this suffix, which in modern Urdu is just an honorific marker. It is worth noting, however, that Platts (1884: 411) defines *jī* as “a form of address, *a term of endearment or respect*” (emphasis added), with examples like “*bāp-jī*, Dear or honoured father” (1884: 117), therefore we cannot rule out that at some point and place, this suffix was used to express also affection. For more detailed discussion on Hindi terms of address cf. Misra (1977).

22 Platts’ (1884: 783) definition explains it in more detail: “*फलान* [fulān], vulg. *FULĀN*, adj. & s.m. Such a; such and such; a certain (man); —such a man, such a one; so and so; such a thing; —the unmentionable thing or part, *penis virilis*.”

23 The Paris MS (p. 112) and the DHMS (p. 86) have *drie verscheijde maniere* (‘three different ways’).
The first example of the verbal paradigm is the *verbum substantivo he: ik ben* (‘I am’). The infinitive is presented at the end, and has two forms:

\[
\text{hoea} – \text{zijn} \quad \text{‘to be’} \\
\text{hoeë} – \text{weesen} \quad \text{‘to exist’}
\]

There is only one verb form for all three persons in both the singular and the plural:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Tense’</th>
<th>Singular: <em>me, toe, whe</em></th>
<th>Plural: <em>ham, tom, inne</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td><em>he</em></td>
<td><em>hoe</em> [DHMS: hoeë]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td><em>hoea</em> [DHMS: hoeë]</td>
<td><em>hoe</em> [DHMS: hoeë]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td><em>hooestha</em> [DHMS: hoeëtha]</td>
<td><em>hoeethe</em> [DHMS: hoeëthe]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past perfect</td>
<td><em>hougea</em></td>
<td><em>hougea</em> [DHMS: hoegeë]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td><em>hunga</em></td>
<td><em>hunga</em> [DHMS: hungeë]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second future</td>
<td><em>hoonga</em> [DHMS: hoonga]</td>
<td><em>hoonga</em> [DHMS: hoöinge]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td><em>toe ro</em></td>
<td><em>tom ree</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a similar way, eight forms (present, imperfect, perfect, past perfect, future, second future, imperative, and infinitive) are given for five other verbs: *karna – doen* (‘to do’), *kghatte* – *ick eete* [sic] (‘I eat’), *piee – drincken* (‘to drink’), *gaue – singen* (‘to sing’), *hasta – ik lache* (‘I laugh’). The last verb presented is *hasta, ik lache* (‘I laugh’) with the following forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Tense’</th>
<th>Singular: <em>me, toe, whe</em></th>
<th>Plural: <em>ham, tom, inne</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td><em>hasta</em></td>
<td><em>haste</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td><em>hastatha</em></td>
<td><em>hastatha</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td><em>hassa</em></td>
<td><em>hasse</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td><em>hassonga</em></td>
<td><em>hassonge</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td><em>hassa</em></td>
<td><em>hasse</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td><em>hasta</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 The infinitive of the Hindustani verb ‘to be’ is *honā*. The forms given by Ketelaar must be somehow derived from that verb, or, since they are identical with the imperfect, there is also a possibility that a mistake (imperfect–infinitive) crept in.

25 In the future tense, the nasal from the first person is extended to the other persons, which, according to Chatterji, is a characteristic feature of the bāzār Hindustani from Bombay and Gujarat. Similarly, in the following example with the verb *karnā* ‘to do’, the variant with the nasal and without it resulted in miscategorising them as the two types of future tense (Chatterji 1935: 81). Incidentally, this verb has an additional tense form: *het tweede voolmaakte* ‘the second perfect’ (UMS: 106[116]). Those second perfect forms *kia, kie* are recognized by Chatterji as “kia, kie: active construction” (Chatterji 1935: 81).
Ketelaar makes a statement that *op dese voorgaande manniere werden alle de andere verbas mede geconjugeert* (*all other verbs are conjugated in the above way*).

After each conjugation pattern, Ketelaar puts a similar remark about Hindustani word order:

> Wanneer men wilt zeggen, ik wercke, off doe eenigh werck, soo word in alle tijden tusschen het pronomen, en het verbum *kaam* gesteld, namentlijk: *me kam karte* – ik werke; *me kam kartatha* – ik werkte [...] (UMS: 108[112])

> ‘When one wants to say, I work, or I do some work, then the word *kaam*, work, is put in all tenses between the pronoun and the verb, as in: *me kam karte* – I work, *me kam kartatha* – I worked [...]’

> Bij veele word ook het woord *khanna*, off kost tusschen het pronomen, en verbum gesteld. Exempel. *me khanne khatte* ik eet kost; gaande zoo voord. (UMS: 109 [113])

> ‘Many would put the word *khanna*, food, between the pronoun and the verb. Example: *me khanne khatte*, I eat food; etc.’

> Wanneer men wilt bij seggen wat men drinckt, soo moet het zelve tusschen beijden worden gevoegd, gelijk te vooren is aangeweesen, als Exempel: *me pani pietha* – ik drink waater

> *me angoerie ciraab pietha* – ik drink wijn. (UMS: 111 [115])

> ‘When one wants to say what one drinking, the same must be placed between the two words, as follows. Example: *me pani pietha*, I drink water; *me angoerie ciraab pietha* – I drink wine.’

At the end of the chapter, Ketelaar refers back to the ‘negative words’ (*leugenagtige woorden*, previously called *negerende woorden*, ‘words of negation’ - cf. 6.2.3) and shows their usage:

| na malum | ik weet niet | (‘I don’t know’) |
| neij hassa | ik lagh niet | (‘I don’t laugh’) |
| mat gauw | singh niet | (‘don’t sing’) |
| karro mat | doet niet | (‘don’t do’) |

Speaking of negation, Ketelaar gives three examples in the present tense for each person in singular and plural (*me neij dsjanta– ik weet niet* ‘I don’t know’, *ham neij dsjantae– wij weeten niet* ‘we don’t know’, etc.), and one example of negation in the future tense (*me neij marronga– ik sal niet slaan; ham neij marronge– wij sullen niet slaan*; ‘I/we shall not hit’). He closes the chapter with a remark on future perfect:
When one wants to say ‘when I'll have eaten’, though seldom used by the Moors, the words are jointed in the following way. Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>singularis / singular</th>
<th>pluralis / plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tad me kaijtsjoke</td>
<td>indien wij [sic] sullen gegeten hebben ('when we [I]’ll have eaten')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[DHMS: Ik, PMS: jk]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tad toe kaijtsjoke</td>
<td>indien gij sult gegeten hebben ('when you’ll have eaten')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tad whe kaytsjoke</td>
<td>indien hij sal gegeten hebben ('when he'll have eaten')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shapiro (2003: 266) defines the Hindi verbal system as “largely structured around a combination of aspect and tense”, where a fundamental axis is the category of aspect. Verbal constructions can be divided into aspectual and non-aspectual, each of which can occur in conjunction with any of the four ‘tenses”: present, past, presumptive, and subjunctive, thus creating twelve aspectual tenses (idem: 267). McGregor (1987[1972]: 16-27) distinguishes eleven commonly used forms in the indicative mode: 1) two present tense forms: general present and present continuous; 2) five past tense forms: imperfect; continuous imperfect; preterite; perfect; past perfect, 3) four future tense forms: simple future; future imperfect; future perfect; future continuous. A contemporary of Ketelaar, François-Marie de Tour presents verbal inflection forms of Praesens, Imperfectum, Perfectum, Plusquamperfectum, Futurum, Imperativus, Optativus and Infinitivus (1704: 42), thus not mentioning any durative tenses either (however, he gives inflected forms for feminine). A few decades later, Schulze (1745: 27) declares that Hindustani has only three tenses: Praesens, Praeteritum and Futurum, yet in the paradigm he specifies Praesens simplex and compositum, and gives additional forms for infinitivus, imperativus, conjunctivus, participium and gerundium.

### 6.3 Conjugation tables

At the end of the Hindustani grammar, an appendix with three types of tables is attached: The first and the longest, Tabula de werba [sic] conjungatiae (‘Table of verb conjugations’), contains conjugation forms of fifty-four verbs. For the first double page (16 verbs) the same eight verb forms as in the main text of the grammar are included (with two types of imperative and the infinitive), but the conjugation of the remaining verbs is reduced to five forms: present, past, future, imperative and infinitive. All tense forms are given only for the first person singular (ik leere; ik leese – ‘I learn’, ‘I read’, etc.) but as the introductory Instructie tot gebruik der volgende Tafels (‘Instruction for the use of the
following tables’) explains, it is enough to replace the pronoun ‘I’ with any other pronoun one needs, since

> de terminatie in de moorse taale eijndight op alle tijden soo als in singularie nominativo begint, ook verandert noijt in pluralie, behalven de pronomina, dies soo men het oneijndige, off jegenwoordige woord maar beken is, kan men alles ’gegene begeert woord naer aanwijsinge der volgende tafelen Conunjugeeren. (UMS: 116[120])

> ‘the terminations in the Moorish language end in all tenses like they start in nominative singular, and never changes in plural, except for the pronouns. Thus if one knows only the infinitive, or the present word, one can conjugate all the required word [forms] according to the indications in the following tables.’

It is a curious remark considering the – however slightly – different forms for the singular and the plural Ketelaar presents in the main body of his grammar. Both De Tours and the anonymous author of the 1778 grammar have in their conjugation paradigms two forms for most tenses (except for the present): one for singular, and another one for plural (cf. Désoulière 1982: 181-190; De Tours 1704: 54-85).

The second table (UMS: [123]-[124]) presents thirteen examples of Verbum Passive (‘passive verb’) conjugated in all persons and both numbers, as in: *ik word geleerd* (‘I’m taught’) – *misja sichte; gij word etc. (‘you are, etc.’) – *toesja sichte; hij word etc. (‘he is, etc.’) – *iskon sichte; wij werden etc. (‘we are, etc.’) – *hamkon sichte; gijlieden werd etc. (‘you are, etc.’) – *tomkon sichte; zijlieden werd etc. (‘they are, etc.’) – *innekon sichte*, and so forth. In the last table we find thirteen cases of *den Bijgevoeden, off ‘T saame voegende* (Chatterji identifies it as ‘the compound tense, or the future conjunctive’– (1935: 82), starting with a hopeful *als ik zal geleert zijn* (‘when I’ll have learnt’).

The list of ‘passive verbs’ in Ketelaar deserves Chatterji’s comment: “the proper passive apparently is not known or understood by the author” (1935: 82). Although the Dutch side contains passive forms (*ik word geleerd/ bedroogen/ gestlaagen/ gebrandaal/ getroosti/ gescholden/ getrocken/ gestookten/ bemind/ gehaat/ belooogen/ gesogt/ gevat* ‘I am taught/ deceived/ hit/ burnt/ comforted/ insulted/ drawn (pulled)/ pushed/ loved/ hated/ lied to/ wanted/ captured’), the Hindustani side does not present correct equivalents. Yet, the table holds a small surprise: it contains oblique personal pronouns, not mentioned in any other place. These

> Modern Standard Urdu, just like Hindi, has no morphologically marked passive, and a periphrastic passive construction is formed by the postposition of an inflected form of *jānā* ‘to go’ to the perfective participle of the main verb (Schmidt 2003: 331); *kiyā jānā* ‘to be done’; *dekhatt jānā* ‘to be seen’ (Stasik 1998: 126). The agent may be marked by a postposition *kē zartē* or *kē bāth* ‘by means of’ for humans, or *sē ‘from’ for inanimate (Schmidt: *ibid.*), but generally, Hindi passive constructions put emphasis on the object or on the action itself, and the agent is usually omitted (Stasik: *ibid.*).
forms are: *miska*, *toesja*, *iskon* for singular, and *hamkon*, *tomkon*, and *innekon* for plural. Chatterji (1935: 82) identifies them as *mujhe*, *tujhe*, *ekko*, *hamko*, *tumko*, and *inoko*.

The question of why Ketelaar is using them is interesting. In Hindi and Urdu, the oblique case form is generally used when the noun or the pronoun is followed by a postposition, and a direct case form when there is no postposition (Shapiro 2003: 262; Schmidt 2003: 315). In modern Hindi and Urdu, we observe so-called split ergativity: only intransitive verbs agree with the subject. The transitive verbs in the perfective aspect agree with the object, and the subject is followed by -ne (Schmidt 2003: 316). For Chatterji, the lack of the agentive -ne is one of the biggest problems with the system presented by Ketelaar, however, the historical development of ergativity in Indo-Aryan languages is even today still a point of discussion (cf. Butt & Deo 2001). From the survey of Old-Hindi writers made by Beames at the end of the 19th century we know that the ergative case marker -ne appeared relatively late, around 1600-1700 (Butt and Deo, *ibid*). The particle -ne is not mentioned by de Tours in 1704, but the perfective construction with it appears in 1778 as ‘pseudo-passive’ in the anonymous Portuguese Hindustani grammar (Zwartjes 2011: 88-89). This association with passive, popular in 19th century Western linguistics, may be a result of the agentive or instrumental features of the ergative (even though ergatives are often subjects of active sentences). The ‘passive’ forms we see in Ketelaar lack the marker -ne yet still resemble the ergative construction, especially in the use of the oblique pronouns.

### 6.4 The Hindustani and Persian grammars compared

Although they take a similar amount of space in the *Instructie*, and they visually mirror each other, the relationship between the Hindustani and Persian grammars has, to the best of my knowledge, never been studied. However, after the comparative (Greaves – Ketelaar) reading of the Persian one, and the overview of the Hindustani one, one question is self-imposing: are they based on the same model? The search for an answer has to start with a comparison of the structure of the two. In the table below, the left column contains an enumeration of grammatical issues in Hindustani presented by Ketelaar in the order of appearance, including the original wording whenever relevant. In the right column, the equivalent statements are selected from his Persian grammar. (It should be noted that the Persian part does not always follow its sequential arrangement in the manuscript, but is arrayed here to match the Hindustani order. The numbers in the column on the right indicate the original arrangement of topics.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H</th>
<th>Hindustani</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Persian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Declensions paradigm (four types)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Declension paradigm (two types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pronouns, of which four types are mentioned: personal, demonstrative,</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pronouns: “Pronomina zijn vier in’t getal, als pesoonelijk, bewyselijk, wederom halige, en besittelijke”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relative and possessive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“[..]Vierderleiij, als persoonlijk, bewijselijke, wederomhalige, en</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>besittelijke”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Three personal pronouns:</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Three personal pronouns:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“De persoennelijke zijn drie namentl: me: ik toe gij, whe, hij, en werden</td>
<td></td>
<td>“de persoennelijke zijn drie, als ik men gij ton, hij oe, en wederom op de volgende wijse gedeclineerd”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over gedeclineert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>op de volgende wijse”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Interrogative pronouns:</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Interrogative pronouns:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“De pronomina, die de mooren in’t ondervragen gebruiken zijn kja, wat,</td>
<td></td>
<td>“De pronomina, die de persen in’t ondervragen gebruiken zijn re, off kij, wie, en tsje, off [en] tsjie, want altijd met het substantive woord zegge, in zigh selven bestaande, het is groeyende”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of kjon, en kon, wie, etc.: en worden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meest met een substantive woord</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>vereenigt”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Possessive pronouns</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Possessive pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Negerende woorden</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Leugenagtige woorden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Most nouns come from adjectives by the addition of a letter -i</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Various nouns derive from adjectives by adding the letter -i,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“de meeste substantivas, komen vande adjectiva, met het agterstellen van</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Verscheijde substantiva komen van de adjectiva meede toedoen van de letter I”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>je”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adjectives: degrees of comparison. Examples: black, old, good, tall, etc.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adjectives: degrees of comparison. Examples: black, old, good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“de adjectiva off bijgevouge woorden, werden tot comparativa van het</td>
<td></td>
<td>“de adjectiva, ofte bij gevoegde woorden werden tot Comparativa met agter stellen van ter”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>voorstellen van het woord issoe”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Word formation: Adjectives can derive from nouns with the suffix</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Word formation: Some adjectives come from their nouns, when they mean possession or capacity, as in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>daar or gaar, when they express possession or quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Sommige adjectiva komen her van haar substantiva. Wanneer ’t beteekent, een besittingh off begaaffheijt” [-daar].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>’Sommige adjectiva komen her van haar substantiva. wanner ’t beteekent,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>een besittinghe, of begaaffheijt, met het agterstellen van_dar, off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gaar”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Feminine ending (note on exception)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Endearing particle dsjie</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Word fallan, being an equivalent of the Latin et caetera</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13 Particle *soo* or *soe*, used as *that* in comparisons. Example:  "Een mensch is beter als een paerd" ('a man is better than a horse').

14 Conjugation paradigm

15 Eight ‘tenses’:  "de tijden [...] zijn acht in het getal, als de tegenwoordige, de onvolmaekte, de volmaekte, de toekomende, de tweede_toekomende, de gebiedende, en oneijndige, en somtijfs ook plus quam perfecte, off meer dan volmaekte’ (‘present, imperfect, perfect, future, second future, imperative, infinitive and sometimes pluperfect’)

16 Three persons, two ‘figures’. "de persoonen zijn driederleij, de gestalte tweederhande maniere, als een, en meer als een werden gecjoneurde’

17 "Regel van het verbum substantivo he: ik ben"

18 The second future translated in Dutch with *willen* (‘to want’).

| 13 | Particle *soo* or *soe*, used as *that* in comparisons. Example:  "Een mensch is beter als een paerd" ('a man is better than a horse'). |
| 14 | Conjugation paradigm |
| 15 | Eight ‘tenses’:  "de tijden [...] zijn acht in het getal, als de tegenwoordige, de onvolmaekte, de volmaekte, de toekomende, de tweede_toekomende, de gebiedende, en oneijndige, en somtijfs ook plus quam perfecte, off meer dan volmaekte’ (‘present, imperfect, perfect, future, second future, imperative, infinitive and sometimes pluperfect’) |
| 16 | Three persons, two ‘figures’. "de persoonen zijn driederleij, de gestalte tweederhande maniere, als een, en meer als een werden gecjoneurde’ |
| 17 | "Regel van het verbum substantivo he: ik ben"
| 18 | The second future translated in Dutch with *willen* (‘to want’). |

Table 11: Ketelaar’s grammar of Hindustani and Persian – comparison of topics and formulations

### 6.4.1 Similarities

The above table reveals that all grammatical topics from the Hindustani part have their direct equivalents in the Persian part, and even the wording of the definitions is almost identical. Besides a couple of extra lexicographical remarks, there is no new grammatical topic introduced that could not be found in the Persian grammar. The fourfold classification of pronouns is identical, even though there is no mention or explication of relative pronouns further in the Hindustani text. The remark on interrogative pronouns forming one word with the verb following it (at least in the case of *verbum substantivum*) is repeated. The examples in the section on degrees of comparison partially overlap. When Ketelaar talks about the particle ‘then’, the first of the two examples he gives is a modification of the example from Persian. Moreover, the first three examples in the list of comparative degree (*swart, ouwd, goed* – ‘black, old, good’) are exactly the same in the Persian grammar. The two grammars use the word *gestalte* in the sense of ‘number’, a shared error, which in textual criticism would be regarded as very compelling evidence for a common origin of the
texts. The number of tijden (‘tenses’), although different at the first sight (declared eight in Hindustani versus five in Persian) is in fact identical. The apparent difference is a result of including in the count the infinitive and the imperative as tenses in Hindustani, and excluding the contentious ‘second future’ (tweede toekomende) in Persian. The Dutch translation of the ‘second future’ using the word willen ‘to want’ seems to be a calque from Persian.

### 6.4.2 Differences

However, by comparison, Ketelaar’s Persian grammar is more varied and extensive in the issues covered. To compensate for the imbalance in the number of topics (and consequently the length of the text), Ketelaar produces a larger number of examples in the Hindustani section: nineteen examples of declensions (versus four in Persian), and full conjugational pattern of six verbs (versus two in Persian). Chatterji, expressing his doubts about Ketelaar’s actual knowledge of Hindustani, states that “at times it looks as if he wanted to compensate his want of positive knowledge by theorising.” (1935: 78). Looking at the structure and content of the grammar, it is hard to shrug off the impression that Ketelaar tried to make up for a lack of original topics by multiplying the examples.

There are further differences linked to core grammatical issues. The declension paradigm is extended to four types (versus two in Persian), with added distinction for masculine and for feminine forms. Consequently, the remark on feminine endings is also a new addition, since there is no grammatical gender in Persian. As previously stated, the number of tenses, ostensibly augmented by three in the Hindustani section, is only a superficial difference. Another original addition to the Hindustani section are a couple of extra lexicographical remarks. The first concerns the honorific particle dsjie, which Ketelaar explains as endearing. In regard to the other supplementary word fallan ‘et caetera’, Steingass (1892: 1475) gives the Persian equivalent wa-ghairah. Nevertheless, Ketelaar does not mention either of them in his Persian section, which suggests that his knowledge of spoken Hindustani must have been better than his knowledge of Persian. It also shows that Ketelaar preferred to stick to the written model when working with Persian, whereas in he felt more at ease with spoken Hindustani.

---

28 What looks like an incorrect understanding of the Hindustani meaning may actually be a vestige of the historical usage. In Persian, the most frequently used diminutive affixes are -ak and -cheh, but there is also a form more similar to the Hindustani -j: چاپ چاپ. Steingass (1892: 352) translates it as ‘soul, vital spirit; mind; self; life’ and explains further: “in modern conversation a word of endearment, as āi āqā چاپ, my dearest master, amma چاپ, auntie dear”.

---
### 6.5 Conclusions

In the times of Ketelaar, Hindustani and Persian were two important languages of North India, and their mastering was crucial for the swift functioning of the Dutch East India Company *kantoor*. Persian was the language of administration of the Mughal court and therefore necessary for any correspondence; Hindustani was a link language of communication used in daily trade dealings, which explains why Ketelaar decided to include both of them in his language manual.

After a systematic comparison, it is clear that there is a significant overlap between the Persian grammar and the Hindustani grammar in the choice as well as formulation of topics. In fact, there is not much room for doubt that Ketelaar, who directly translated his Persian grammar from Greaves’ *Elementa Linguae Persicae*, consequently modelled his Hindustani grammar on a Persian one. Is his work worth any attention, then? I dare to maintain that it is. From the times of Aristotle, imitation was considered the foundation of all learning, and was treated as a necessary step rather than as intellectual property theft. Even in modern times, “borrowing—even plagiarism—is no sin to lexicographers” as Reed (1962: 95) famously remarked. “It’s not where you take things from — it’s where you take them to”, as a saying goes, and Ketelaar took the Persian model to formulate what turned out to be the very first grammar of Hindustani. His sections on Persian may not be original, but Ketelaar’s contribution to the historiography of linguistics remains rather significant. He wrote a combined grammar, describing two languages: Hindustani and Persian, and he wrote it in Dutch. He accompanied the two with practical tables for quick grammatical reference. Working only with oral material, and without any proper linguistic training, Ketelaar managed to create a practical language tool which would have been useful for his fellow merchants. He became the link between an academic Latin community in Europe and less educated merchants working overseas who only needed some practical knowledge of a foreign language. The simplifications of the treatment of grammatical topics and rules in Hindustani are pushed even further than in his Persian adaptation of Greaves, but his strictly pragmatic approach was always driven by the non-scholarly audience in mind. Unless it is a reflection of his lack of terminological apparatus, Ketelaar’s reluctance to use sophisticated language for communication with ordinary people is best justified by the quote from Saint Augustine included in the rules of the *Suum Cuique* Society, of which Ketelaar was once the Grand Master: *Melius est reprehendant nos grammatici quam ut non intelligant populi*:\(^{29}\) (MS LTK 373 f.2 v).

Therefore, to reach even deeper, and to fully understand Ketelaar’s work, it is vital to have a closer look at the metalanguage he used. Which of his terminological choices were deliberate, and which were incidental? Which ones drew from the Dutch grammatical tradition, and which were his own creation? The next chapter will focus on this aspect.

\(^{29}\) “Better to be corrected by grammarians than not to be understood by people.” St Augustin, *Enarrationes in Psalms* (138, 20).
7. Metalanguage

A close reading of Ketelaar’s Persian and Hindustani grammars may leave the peruser with a mixed impression regarding the author’s metalinguistic competency. On the one hand, they contain a plethora of Dutch and Latin grammatical terms, yet on the other, some oversimplifications and misnomers are easy to spot. Is Ketelaar’s inconsistent command of grammatical terminology determined by the needs of his intended non-scholarly readership? Or is it a reflection of a limited terminological apparatus resulting from his lack of higher education? Are all his terminological choices deliberate? And how do they fit in with the Dutch grammatical tradition? Because of the specificity of Ketelaar’s background (amateur linguist, not a scholar; not a Dutch native speaker; working overseas), his use of grammatical metalanguage requires a closer look. Fortunately, once we know the model he most likely used – Greaves’ Latin grammar of Persian – not only is it easier to understand certain expressions, but also it allows us to recognize the origin and different sources of Ketelaar’s terminology.

In the present chapter, I will gather and analyse the grammatical terms used by Ketelaar to attempt to find some answers to the questions that impose themselves: how similar are his metalinguistic terms to other Dutch grammars of the time? Has Ketelaar used many novel terms, not common in Dutch? If so, were they calques, or his own idiosyncratic creations? How closely were they based on the terms used by Greaves?

I will start with looking at Ketelaar’s use of Latin, and then I will scrutinise his strategies in the Dutch language. My main comparative source will be Ruijsendaal’s Dutch terminographical index of early modern Dutch grammatical works (1989). Other resources used in this part will be the De Geïntegreerde Taalbank (GTB) – a collection of digitized historical dictionaries of Dutch (http://gtb.inl.nl/) as well as other online historical sources and databases (mainly books.google.nl and De Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren, www.dbnl.org). The epilogue to the story will come with a look at the 1743 edition by David Mill, in which Ketelaar’s terminology was translated back into Latin. Its level of success will make a point about the textual transmission that traverses the language divide.
7.1 Grammatical terminology – Ketelaar’s use of Latin

Latin forms occur throughout the text with various, often (etymologically) incorrect, spellings (comparativus; subperlativa; conjugations; also in words not related to grammar such as colombe). The Latin inflected and uninflected forms are mixed liberally and used incorrectly, which raises questions about the level of the author’s active knowledge of Latin: Verbum Passive; van het Verbum Substantiva; pluralie; singularie, singulararis; conjugatie, conjugationes; declinatie, declinationes; in masculine en feminine genere. It is not inconceivable that forms such as the incorrect additional plural marker s in Verbas reflect Ketelaar’s intention to adopt the Latin word into Dutch.

Dutch terms are often used interchangeably with the Latin ones (des vrouwlijken geslajts; de feminis genere; in generis feminine; de pronomen, off voornaamen, etc.). Often, the preference is given to the Latin word, or Latin-based adapted word (substantiva; adjectiva; exempl). In other cases, Ketelaar does not use other forms than Latin, like with vocalen en consonanten – even though forms such as klinker or klink-letter, and me-klin(cker), mede-klinker, etc. were in use since the end of the 16th century (Ruijsendaal 1989: 346-349, 78-79). Furthermore, although terms such as val, naamval, and geval or gevall were popular among grammarians since the end of the 16th century, Ketelaar solely uses the Latin word Casus. In the section on nominal declension in Hindustani, Ketelaar adopts the Latin names of the cases; in one of the declension paradigms of Persian, however, Ketelaar inserts Dutch equivalents of Latin cases (see below).

7.2 Strategies in Ketelaar’s Dutch terminology

According to Ruijsendaal (1989: xxix), the foundations of Dutch grammatical terminology were laid in the period from 1568, the date of Johan Radermacher’s (ca. 1560–1620) Voorreden van de noodich ende nutticheit der Nederduytchcr taelkunste, to 1653, the publication of Petrus Leupenius’ Aanmerkingen op de Nederduitsche taale. For Ruijsendaal, Arnold Moonen’s (1644–1711) Nederduitsche spraakkunst from 1706 marks the start of the proper history of Dutch linguistics. Moonen, as a point of honour, refrained from using Latin terminology; his grammars starts with 13 pages containing 264 Kunstwoorden, in de spraakkunst doorgaens gebruikt, met hunne Latynsche benaeminghen (‘terms used throughout the grammar with their Latin names’). Even if the authors before him were not that orthodox, they usually tried to come up with Dutch equivalents for Latin terms – sometimes quite innovative. The size of Ruijsendaal’s corpus (nine works) is not large enough to make definitive statements about terminological trends, yet it clearly shows that some earlier terms were judged to be not good enough – or not catchy.
enough – to make later authors adopt them, hence they kept searching for an optimal translation, which resulted in the historical variations and innovations we observe today.

### 7.2.1 Dutch terms found in other sources

One of the main characteristics of Ketelaar’s metalanguage is that he didn’t seem too bothered about consistency. It is best exemplified when the same concept is repeated throughout the two grammars, of Persian and of Hindustani. And so, speaking of tenses, Ketelaar uses different names: the present tense is *het presente, gegenwoordige, tegenwoordige;* present perfect tense has also a few forms: *preteritum perfectum; voorbijzinde perfectum of volkomene; 't volmaakte (volmaekte); 't voorbijzinde volmaakte; plusquam perfectum is translated as het voorbij sinde meer dan perfecte; plusquam perfecte off meer dan volmaakte; meer als perfectum.* Many of these are found in other contemporaneous sources (e.g. Kók’s *meer-als-vol-maakte tijd – Ruijsendaal 1989: 239*).

Interestingly, even though Ruijsendaal (1989: 12-15) lists several Dutch equivalents of the Latin *Adjectivum* (from *bijvougelijcke naam, of bijnaam* of De Hubert 1624, to *byvouglic woort and by-woort* of Van Heule, to *by-woorpig woord* of Ampzing 1628), Ketelaar’s term *de adjectiva off bijgevougde woorden* resembles most an early form *bygevoegde woorden* used by Ampzing (1628). Another term from Greaves, *compositum* (referring to the Second Future) is translated by Ketelaar as *het t’samen gevougde* (Ruijsendaal found the same form in De Hubert 1624).

Most of Ketelaar’s names for cases (mentioned only once in the two grammars) resonate of earlier grammatical works in Dutch:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin Term</th>
<th>Dutch Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nominativus</td>
<td>namentlijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genitivus</td>
<td>geboortelijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dativus</td>
<td>gevelijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accusativus</td>
<td>beschuldiglijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vocativus</td>
<td>roepelijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ablativus</td>
<td>afnemelijk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ruijsendaal (1989: 200; 84-85; 349-350; 2) mentions the following forms: *Namelijk* (nominalis), first use: *Voorreden,* 1568. (The *Geïntegreerde Taal Bank* (GTB) includes the form *namentlijk* as the older version of *namelijk).*2 Gevelijk - related forms were used from *ghever of Twee-spraack* (1584) to *Geever of Leupenius* (1653); *Roepelijk: roeper,* used from *Twee-spraack* onwards; *Afnemelijk: afnemer - Kók* (1649), *Leupenius* (1653), et al. However, the other two forms used by Ketelaar, *geboortelijk and beschuldiglijk* are neither traceable to any Dutch grammatical text in Ruijsendaal, nor included as case names in any historical Dutch

---

2 http://gtb.inl.nl/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=WNT&id=M040652
dictionary from the GTB. They seem to be literal translations of the Latin words *genitivus* and *accusativus*.

### 7.2.2 Direct translations, periphrases, calques

When we compare Greaves and Ketelaar, we notice that certain Latin terms are replaced by periphrastic expressions. *Euphoniae gratia* is translated as *uijt oorsaake van beter klanck*; [verba] *anomala* as *niet naar de sleur geconjugeerd* – even though the term *Euphonia* was used in Dutch along with *soetvloijendheyd* by Ampzing (1628), Van Heule (1633) and Leupenius (1653), Moonen (cf. Poeraet 1708) uses *Welluidendheit, and Anomala* was also used alongside *afwijing* (Kók 1649, cf. Ruijsendaal 1989: 120; 31). Similarly, the Dutch term used for plural (besides the Latin form *pluralie*), *meer als een*, is a descriptive rather than a formal equivalent of *pluralis*. Verepaeus uses it to introduce the number in his questions-and-answers Latin grammar: “Wanneer gebruykt men *Numeris Singularis?* – Als de Substantiva, Pronomina, Verba niet meer als een beteken. [...] Wanneer gebruykt men *Pluralis?* – Als men meer als een beteken.” (Verepaeus 1770: 5). In regards to singular, it is usually expressed by early modern grammarians as *enckel, enkel, enkelvoud* (Ruijsendaal 1989: 292-294). Ketelaar most often uses the Latin-sounding *singulaaris, singularie*, yet on one occasion translates it to Dutch as *eenigh* and another time as *een*. Although *eenigh* is attested by GTB as used in the sense of *enkelvoud*, the form *een*, however, seems to be an oversimplification. This descriptive strategy may be motivated by the overarching purpose to make the grammar more accessible to a common reader, or it may simply result from Ketelaar’s lack of Dutch grammatical vocabulary. Some of the terms, however, may hint to other than Dutch origin.

Since at least the *Voorreden*, the term *lettergreep* to denote a syllabe was commonly used alongside *sillaba, silbe, or zilbe* (cf. Ruijsendaal 1989: 307-308). In GTB, *silbe* is considered a Germanism (cf. Schönfeld 1921). The adjective form we find in Ketelaar: *sijlabische* is not quite usual in Dutch. Ruijsendaal (*ibid.*) quotes the adjective *silbige* (as in *koortsilbige* and *langsilbige woorden*) used by Van Heule (1633); in Google Books, the term *Syllabisch* [*Alphabet*] (to describe the second type of Ethiopian writing system next to pictographs) appears for the first time in

---

3 The calques used by early Dutch grammarians for accusative are *anklagher, beklagde gevall, beklagde geval, aenklager*, but not *beschuldiglijk* (Ruijsendaal 1989: 6-7). For genitive, they use *ba(a)rer, 't geeijgende gevall, genitivus, genityf* (idem 142-144).

4 *Genitivus*, literally ‘of or belonging to birth’, from *genus* – ‘birth’, ‘descent’, ‘origin’, hence case ‘expressing possession, source or origin’. *Accusare* means ‘to accuse’, hence *accusativus* can be translated as ‘belonging to an accusation’. In fact, it is a wrong translation of Greek *πτῶσις ἀιτιατική* (*ptōsis aitiatikē*) lit. the ‘causal’ case, *or* case ‘of that which is caused’. This confusion arose from the similarity to the Greek verb *aitiasthai* ‘to accuse’ (the Greek root *aitia* means both ‘cause’ and ‘accusation’, cf. www.etymonline.com). A better translation would have been *casus causativus*, causative (*ibid.*)

5 http://gtb.inl.nl/iWDB/search?actie=article&wdb=WNT&id=M015596&lemmodern=enig&Betekenis_id=M015596.sense.2
1774 in a book translated from French; the GTB lists the word *syllabisch* only as a musical term in 1847. Could this be a trace of a Germanic influence in Ketelaar’s terminology? Similarly, the term *leugenachtige woorden* used by Ketelaar has a possible Germanic origin. Historically, *negatio* was typically expressed in Dutch as *ontkenning*, with an older form of *negativus: benenend*, used in *Twee-spraack* (Ruijsendaal 1989: 193). The only term resembling Ketelaar’s from Dutch grammars quoted in Ruijsendaal (*idem*: 113) is *loochenen* – ‘to negate’ from Van Heule (1625). Interestingly, *Lexicon Germanico-Latinum* from 1734 quotes the term *die leugnung* as *negatio*. It is possible that Ketelaar saw some German grammars before he came to the Netherlands, possibly still at school in his native Elbing. In any event, some of his terminological choices remain even more obscure than these mentioned above.

7.2.3. Idiosyncratic terms and expressions; misnomers

When Ketelaar mentions four types of pronouns, the term he uses for one of them, *wederomhalige* (corresponding with Greaves’ *relativa*, ‘relative’) – is hard to find in any other early modern Dutch grammatical source. The closest term is *weêr-keerighe* – a name for relative pronouns, which appeared in Kók in 1649 (Ruijsendaal 1989: 261). Gijsbert Rutten suggests that it may be Ketelaar’s own invention: “The *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* has the verb *wederomhalen* with the meaning ‘to get back’ and also ‘to remember’. It’s composed of *wederom* i.e. ‘again’ and *halen*, which has many meanings, a.o. ‘to get, to take’. So it’s a very good term for relative and reciprocal pronouns, which ‘bring back’ elements that were earlier mentioned in the discourse” (personal communication).

As we have seen in the Persian grammar, there is also a terminological confusion regarding the form and the number: *gestallte* vs. *getalle* (*forma* vs *numerus*). (The same word *gestalte* is used in place of *getalle* again in the Hindustani grammar: *de gestalte tweederhande maniere, als een, en meer als een [werden geconjugeerd] - UMS: 104 [108]). Then, in the following sentence, *gestalte* is used in its proper meaning – ‘a form; a figure’. A comparison with Greaves’ text confirmed that ‘number’ is the word Ketelaar expressed as *gestallte*, and that *de gestalten gevende* (‘giving form or shape’) is Ketelaar’s equivalent of *Litterae formativae.* In Dutch

6 De Pauw (1774: 151-152).
7 *Littera* (or: *litera*) *formativa* is the term used also in relation to Hebrew grammar by Johann Buxtorf in his *Thesaurus grammaticus Linguae S. Hebreae* (1620: 77) and by De Dieu in *Id est Grammatica linguarum orientalium, hebraeorum, chaldaeorum, et syrorum (...)* (1628: 279). The opposition of radical letters, which occur only as part of a root, and servile letters had long been established in Hebrew grammatical tradition. Münster 1537 talks about the division between radical and servile letters (p. 103-101 of Google book; no page numbers on original) and presents an example of a word where the first three letters are ‘fundamental’ and the other three servile. *Compendium Hebraicae Grammaticae* was based on various works of (“varii et optimis libris”) of Elia Ludei (Elias Levita, 1468-1549), German-born Jewish grammarian and poet. The fourth part of his grammatical dissertations from 1520 treated on servile letters. It was translated into Latin by Sebastian Münster (source: [http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/9864-levita-elijah](http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/9864-levita-elijah)).
grammatical descriptions from the 17th century (Leupenius 1653; Kók 1649), *getallen* is mostly used as *Figura Litterae*, the form of the letter (capital, small, printed, etc.) (Ruijsendaal 1989: 128-131), or as *Figura Verborum* (*Simplex vel Compositum*), referring to simple or compound verbs (De Dieu 1639: 38). Whether it is Ketelaar’s idiosyncratic use of the term, or whether he is confusing two similarly sounding words – it is hard to say.

Throughout the text, Ketelaar’s use of established grammatical terminology is uneven. He ignores the word *affixum*, which at the time quickly gained popularity with the development of studies of Hebrew, Arabic and Persian in Europe (Jeremiás 1996: 279), and which Greaves employs abundantly. When he translates *radix seu thema* (‘root or theme’), the first word has some foundation in Dutch (wortel was used by Leupenius in 1653), but the provenance of the second one is harder to determine. *Oorsprong* (‘origin’) may refer to etymology (cf. Ruijsendaal 1989: 211), yet the Latin *thema* for grammarians of Hebrew meant “the traditional starting-point of the paradigm, e.g. the first person singular, present indicative active, in Latin and Greek” (Law 2003: 249). Somehow, Ketelaar connected that meaning of “initial” with “origin”.

On the other hand, Ketelaar does not shy away from more complex grammatical constructions. When presenting forms of the *futurum exactum*, or future perfect (in Dutch: *voltooid tegenwoordig toekomende tijd*) with the example *indien ik zal gegeten hebben* (‘if [provided that] I’ll have eaten’), he translates the Latin *Futurum*, seu *Praeterito futurum Subjunctivus* as *het toekomende, off bij het verleedene, het toekomende van het boven gevoegde*. When he mentions this form again, he rephrases it as *het toekomende, ofte door het voorledene toekomende van het vooren gevoogte* (UMS: 86[90]). Finally, in the Table of Conjugations, the list of examples of this form starting with a hopeful *als ik zal geleert zijn* (‘when I’ll have learnt’) is called *Bijgevoeden Tijd*, off *‘T saame voegende* (Chatterji identifies it as “the compound tense, or the future conjunctive”, 1935: 82). In the explanation how to create this subjunctive form, past participle (Greaves’ *participium praeteriti*) is translated as *het deijlagtige* [DHMS: deelaghtige] van het verleedene – a form reminescent of *verleden deelwoord* of Van Heule (1625) and Kók (1649) (cf. Ruijsendaal 1989: 224-225). Another part of the same definition includes *Verbum Substantivum*, which Ketelaar regularly expresses in Dutch as *het in synselven bestaande woord* (in Dutch grammatical tradition since at least Van Heule 1625 rendered as *zelfstandig werkwoord* — cf. Ruijsendaal 1989: 340). This slightly awkward translation must be coming from the etymological meaning of *substantivum* as ‘standing by itself’ or ‘being in itself, self-existent’. Incidentally,
the question arises whether Ketelaar understood that *verbum substantivum* means only a “verb of existence”, as he also uses the same term *verbum substantivum* for the verb “to eat” in the paradigm for the Hindustani verb *kghatte*, *ik eete* (UMS: 108[112]). In the DHMS, this passage sounds: *Van het Substantivum verbum of in sig selfe bestaande woord kghatte, Ick eete* (DHMS: 88); PMS has dropped the word *substantivum* (PMS: 113) therefore, we cannot rule out it is a mechanical copying error in other copies. Yet similar doubts arise when we observe the use of *verbum perfectum*; Ketelaar never explains it, and he seems to be under the impression that *perfective* basically means ‘regular verb’. In Greaves, *verbum perfectum* (p. 52) is probably understood just like in the Hebrew grammatical tradition, as a verb whose triliteral, or quadriliteral consonantal root remains unchanged when inflected.10 The same goes for the related *eerste worstelingh* [*worteling* PMS: 144] – the translation of Greaves’ *prima radicalis* (‘first radical letter’, p. 51; see also the discussion in 5.3.2.)11 In Ketelaar’s defence we have to admit that Greaves never clearly explains or defines it either, probably considering it a well-known concept from the Hebrew grammar. In other cases, for example in the list of *verba der eerste conjugatie* (UMS: 74) where the ‘verbs of the first conjugation’ turn out to be... verbs in the first person singular, the mistake may be more a result of a nonchalant approach to grammatical nomenclature rather than a fundamental misunderstanding of terminology.

Ketelaar does not seem to differentiate between the two meanings of the word *verbum*: ‘verb’ versus ‘word’, and repeatedly uses the latter, along with the Latin form *verbum* (cf. *Conjugatio verbi perfecti edere* (Greaves p. 52) is translated as *van de perfecte woord chorden, eeten* (UMS: 87); *a verbo volo – ’t woord chaham* (ik wil) (UMS: 86); *het substantive woord* (UMS: 82). Hindustani conjugation paradigms are consistently introduced as *Reegel van het verbum [...]*). In fact, the Dutch term ‘werkwoord’ coexisted with ‘woord’ as an equivalent of ‘verbum’ already since the *Twe-Spraack* (1584; cf. Ruijssendaal 1989: 330), quickly gaining preference among Dutch grammarians in the 17th century, yet we don’t find a single occurrence in Ketelaar.

---

10 “Verbum, cuius tres, vel, si quadrilitterum sit, quatuor litterae consonantes semper integrae manent, *perfectum* dicitur; *imperfectum*, cuius una vel duae litterae in conjugatione et inclinatione saepe deficiunt.” (‘A verb whose three – or four, if quadriliteral – [root] consonants always remain unchanged, is called *perfect*; *imperfect* is whose one or two letters regularly disappear in the conjugation and inflection.’) – Roorda (1831: 88).

11 It is not sure if *worteling* means *wortel* (as in *radix = wortel* = ‘root’), or whether it is a derivation of the verb *wortelen* (‘to be rooted’).
Before the recent edition of Bhatia and Machida from 2008, Ketelaar’s *Instructie* was published only once, in 1743, when it was translated into Latin by David Mill as a part of his *Miscellanea Orientalia*. However, in the same book, directly after the Hindustani grammar, we find a sketch grammar of “modern Persian used in Hindustan”, entitled *Rudimenta Linguae Persicae Hodiernae, prout in usu est in Hindustania, aulisque Regum Mohammedorum in India* (Mill 1743: 489-503). Bodewitz (1994-1995: 129) attributes it to Ketelaar, but limits himself to analysing how the number of pages reflect relevant sections from the *Instructie*. Mill himself mentions Ketelaar’s name only as the author of the Hindustani grammar, and never declares the source of the Persian one. As far as I know, this text has never been adequately studied; therefore I will present its brief description here.

Mill starts his grammar with two very short chapters on consonants and vowels, drawing many comparisons with Arabic. He introduces five classes of ‘letters’, according to manner and place of articulation: *labiales* (labials), *laterales* (laterals), *sibilales* (sibilants), *gutturales* (gutturals), *palatinae* (palatals) and *linguales* (linguals). This is clearly the model used earlier by the Arabs and imitated by the Jews, and later copied in Western grammars of Arabic and Hebrew (cf. Zwartjes 2011: 252-254, 256-260). Not surprisingly, the following two chapters on declensions and conjugations are almost a word for word translation of Ketelaar. Remarkably, Mill replaces the phonemic transliteration with words in Persian script only. This may be a deliberate nod to the academic community, and a move away from the more practical and accessible work of Ketelaar. Mill also edits a list of ‘verbs of the first conjugation’ (*Verba primae conjugationis*, Mill 1743: 503-509) collated in Latin, Hindustani and Persian (the latter again, in Persian script only). It is an almost exact copy of Ketelaar’s *Verba der eerste conjugatie* (with one item, *beswaare*, omitted). Interestingly, Mill does not seem to notice that this is the only conjugation group presented by Ketelaar, who, purposely or not, presented merely ‘verbs conjugated in the first person’. The next part (pages 510-598) is entitled *Etymologicum Orientale Harmonicum* and encompasses 88 pages of a quadrilingual dictionary of Latin, Hindustani, Persian and Arabic, arranged alphabetically according to Latin. The last column is written in Arabic script only, and is basically a Bible concordance with references both to the Old and New Testament. The last part of the lexical Hindustani and Persian section (*idem*: 599-601) is devoted to ‘words with some difference’ in Hindustani (*Differentiae quorumdam Vocabulorum, Linguae Hindustanicae*), or what we know as the list of similar words (*naast gelijkende woorden*) from the *Instructie*.

Interestingly, before getting into the declensions patterns, Mill makes his own short summary of the accidents of the noun, in which he mentions that *Numerus duplex est, singularis & pluralis* (‘There are two numbers: singular and plural’, 1743: 490). A couple of pages further, however, in what should be the same information, he writes a somehow cryptic sentence: *Formae non nisi duae sunt, una, & plures una, in omnibus temporibus eadem sunt* (‘There are only two forms, one, and more than one, the same in all tenses’, p. 494). The first part is a rather obvious translation of the sentence from

### 7.3 Reinventing the grammatical terminology: Mill’s translation

Before the recent edition of Bhatia and Machida from 2008, Ketelaar’s *Instructie* was published only once, in 1743, when it was translated into Latin by David Mill as a part of his *Miscellanea Orientalia*. However, in the same book, directly after the Hindustani grammar, we find a sketch grammar of “modern Persian used in Hindustan”, entitled *Rudimenta Linguae Persicae Hodiernae, prout in usu est in Hindustania, aulisque Regum Mohammedorum in India* (Mill 1743: 489-503). Bodewitz (1994-1995: 129) attributes it to Ketelaar, but limits himself to analysing how the number of pages reflect relevant sections from the *Instructie*. Mill himself mentions Ketelaar’s name only as the author of the Hindustani grammar, and never declares the source of the Persian one. As far as I know, this text has never been adequately studied; therefore I will present its brief description here.

Mill starts his grammar with two very short chapters on consonants and vowels, drawing many comparisons with Arabic. He introduces five classes of ‘letters’, according to manner and place of articulation: *labiales* (labials), *laterales* (laterals), *sibilales* (sibilants), *gutturales* (gutturals), *palatinae* (palatals) and *linguales* (linguals). This is clearly the model used earlier by the Arabs and imitated by the Jews, and later copied in Western grammars of Arabic and Hebrew (cf. Zwartjes 2011: 252-254, 256-260). Not surprisingly, the following two chapters on declensions and conjugations are almost a word for word translation of Ketelaar. Remarkably, Mill replaces the phonemic transliteration with words in Persian script only. This may be a deliberate nod to the academic community, and a move away from the more practical and accessible work of Ketelaar. Mill also edits a list of ‘verbs of the first conjugation’ (*Verba primae conjugationis*, Mill 1743: 503-509) collated in Latin, Hindustani and Persian (the latter again, in Persian script only). It is an almost exact copy of Ketelaar's *Verba der eerste conjugatie* (with one item, *beswaare*, omitted). Interestingly, Mill does not seem to notice that this is the only conjugation group presented by Ketelaar, who, purposely or not, presented merely ‘verbs conjugated in the first person’. The next part (pages 510-598) is entitled *Etymologicum Orientale Harmonicum* and encompasses 88 pages of a quadrilingual dictionary of Latin, Hindustani, Persian and Arabic, arranged alphabetically according to Latin. The last column is written in Arabic script only, and is basically a Bible concordance with references both to the Old and New Testament. The last part of the lexical Hindustani and Persian section (*idem*: 599-601) is devoted to ‘words with some difference’ in Hindustani (*Differentiae quorumdam Vocabulorum, Linguae Hindustanicae*), or what we know as the list of similar words (*naast gelijkende woorden*) from the *Instructie*.

Interestingly, before getting into the declensions patterns, Mill makes his own short summary of the accidents of the noun, in which he mentions that *Numerus duplex est, singularis & pluralis* (‘There are two numbers: singular and plural’, 1743: 490). A couple of pages further, however, in what should be the same information, he writes a somehow cryptic sentence: *Formae non nisi duae sunt, una, & plures una, in omnibus temporibus eadem sunt* (‘There are only two forms, one, and more than one, the same in all tenses’, p. 494). The first part is a rather obvious translation of the sentence from
Ketelaar: *de gestalten zijn maar tweederleij, eenigh en meer als een*. However, in the second part of the sentence, the confusing part *de gestaelte gevende off wegh wijser des persoonen* (UMS: 83) is omitted. In Greaves, the whole fragment reads: *Personae tres sunt, & duo Numeri, Singularis, & Pluralis. Dualem Persae non usurpant. Literae formativae, sive indices personarum, in omnibus Temporibus eadem sunt* (1649: 44). Predictably, Mill copies Ketelaar’s mistake with prescribing verbal endings -*ed* and -*es* which in Greaves (and in the standard Persian) are -*d* and -*t* (ibid.)

It is quite fascinating how faithfully Mill renders Ketelaar’s less fortunate expressions. Without much hesitation or further explanation he translates the dubious *De pronomina, off voornaamen, beekeent deselve, een g’ejindige Zaek* simply as *Pronomina significant rem finita* (1743: 492). Ketelaar also confuses the famous scholar with his *in sijnselve bestande woord*, which Mill translates once as *nomen substantivum* and later as *verbum substantivum*. Apparently, Mill never realised that Ketelaar’s work was not original, and he went to the trouble of deciphering and translating the simplified grammar back into more scholarly Latin. This has led to a ‘circularity’ of meanings, exemplified in the following table, which strongly proves the relation between Mill and Ketelaar:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greaves 1649 (with English translation)</th>
<th>Ketelaar 1689</th>
<th>Mill 1743</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Cases where Mill recognizes the original Latin]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syllabica terminatio (<em>syllabic termination</em>)</td>
<td>sijlabische terminatie</td>
<td>sillabica terminatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>casus (<em>case</em>)</td>
<td>casus</td>
<td>casus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrativus (*‘demonstrative’)</td>
<td>bewyselijk</td>
<td>demonstrativus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[pronomen] relativus (*‘relative [pronoun]’)</td>
<td>weder_omhalige</td>
<td>relativus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De gestalten zijn maar tweederleij, [eenigh en meer als een]</td>
<td>[personae sunt tres,] et forma duplex, [singularis et pluralis’]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modi (<em>moods</em>)</td>
<td>manieren</td>
<td>modi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutatio (*‘modification’)</td>
<td>veranderingh</td>
<td>mutatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>radix seu theme (*‘root or theme’)</td>
<td>wordel en oorspronck</td>
<td>radice et themate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terminatio (*‘ending, termination’)</td>
<td>uitgangh, of terminatie</td>
<td>terminatio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particula (*‘particle’)</td>
<td>het deelken</td>
<td>participula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compositum (*‘compound’)</td>
<td>het t’samen gevougd de ontkennende gebiedende maniere</td>
<td>compositum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imperativus negativus (*‘negative imperative’)</td>
<td>leugenachtige woorden</td>
<td>imperativus negativus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verba negativa (*‘negative verbs’)</td>
<td></td>
<td>verba negativa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbum perfectum (*‘perfect verb’)</td>
<td>perfecte woord</td>
<td>verbum perfectum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mill should be admired for his almost intuitive understanding of Ketelaar’s clumsy grammatical formulations (leugenachtige woorden; wortel en oorspronck). In fact, sometimes it almost looks like he had consulted the Greaves’ original – which as we know, was in his collection when he died (listed as item 547 in Paddenburg’s auction catalogue of books of David Mill, 1757: 62).

---

12 In Dutch: voltooid tegenwoordig toekomende tijd. For the discussion on the definition of future perfect and future subjunctive see Michael (1970: 117-118).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latvian term</th>
<th>Dutch translation</th>
<th>Ketelaar term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>verbum substantivum</em> (‘verbum substantivum’)</td>
<td>in zijnselve bestaande woord/ in zigh zelfs bestaande woord [boedem] (DHMS); in sig selve bestaande woord [boeden] (PMS) substantive woord</td>
<td><em>verbum substantivum nomen substantivum</em> [būdan] [sic!] (496)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>prima radicalis</em> (‘the first radical [letter]’)</td>
<td>eerste worteling (PMS)</td>
<td><em>prima radicalis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>euphoniae gratia</em> (‘for euphony’)</td>
<td>uijt oorsaake van beter klanck</td>
<td>euphoniae gratia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Futurum, seu Praeterito futurum subjunctivi.</em> (‘futurum exactum, or future perfect’)</td>
<td>door het voorledene toekomende van het vooren gevougt</td>
<td>futurum, vel praeterito futurum subjunctivi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>negationis nota</em> (‘note of negation’)</td>
<td>negeerende notulo</td>
<td>particulae negantes H / negante notula (P, 497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>litera negationis</em> (‘letter of negation’)</td>
<td>letter der logen</td>
<td>vocula negationis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>[verba] anomalae</em> (‘irregular [verbs]’)</td>
<td>niet naar de sleur geconjugeerd</td>
<td>Verba, quae non regulariter conjugantur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>singularis/ pluralis</em> (‘singular/plural’)</td>
<td>eening en meer als een</td>
<td>[Numerus duplex est,] singularis et pluralis/ Formae nonnisi duae sunt. una, &amp; plures una</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lexicographis Persicis linguae Turcicae studiosis</em></td>
<td>de geleerste Persijen den begeerlijken tot de turckse taale</td>
<td>Doctissimos Persas Turcicae linguae amatoribus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Homo quantò melior ove</em></td>
<td>een mensch is beeter als een schap</td>
<td>homo melior est quam ovis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>literae formativae</em> (‘formative letters’)</td>
<td>de gestalten gevende</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>indices personarum</em> (‘indicators of person’)</td>
<td>wegh wijsers der persoenen</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Greaves’ terms and expressions retranslated into Latin via Dutch
Ketelaar’s *Instructie* is an example of a very specific kind of grammatical text. It is a work of an amateur and not a scholar, a manual not primarily meant for publication but for practical use. Even though the Persian part is an adapted translation of an earlier book, this different origin and destination of Ketelaar’s work is reflected in the choice of his metalinguistic terminology. The first observation is the lack of consistency in applying grammatical terms, to the point of a sense of “free-styling” in the grammatical nomenclature. The second characteristic is that besides common and established Dutch terms (*tijden; het tegenwoordige; het toekomende; buiging, uitgangh*, etc.), Ketelaar almost always keeps the Latin or Latinised form of each term (*perfective; perfectum; secundum futurum* alongside *tweede toekomende; pronomina next to voornamen*). Some Latin terms left in their original forms (such as *consonanten; vocalen*) must be the ones he could not easily find Dutch equivalents for; sometimes they get periphrastic descriptions (e.g. *euphoniae gratia* expressed as *uijt oorsaake van beter klanck*).

Yet most interesting are the terms we do not fully understand. When next to perfectly standard words we find an unusual one, like next to perfectly recognizable cases *namentlijk, roepelijk, afnemelijk* we see *geboortelijk, or beschuldighlijk*, questions impose themselves. Are these simple calques from Latin? And what is the story behind *in sijnselve bestande woord*? Are *gestalte and getalle* a mistake or a trace of some actual terminological phenomenon? Are *deelaghtige, letter den loochen* and *leugenachtige woorden* Ketelaar’s own creation, or were they commonly used at a certain point in time? Is *het onperfecte* a misspelling, or an actual 17th century word? And which terms are inspired by other languages, for example German? In spite of having access to an impressive amount of digitised historical sources, the corpus is still too small and still not diverse enough to give definitive answers to all these questions. However, even at this early stage, the analysis of the corpus offers some preliminary impressions. One thing is certain, that Ketelaar used every possible strategy to label the grammatical meaning he wanted to convey. In the process, he made some mistakes but also coined a few original terms, and created his own unique heterogeneous metalanguage. Further systematic study of the grammatical terminology used by him and his contemporaneous Dutch authors working in Asia still has to be undertaken; it may bring up fresh material with its original grammatical labels and terms unknown in the Republic and thus, open a new exotic chapter in the history of Dutch descriptive linguistics.
8. Worlds beyond words: transcultural manifestations in lexicographic descriptions

For understandable reasons, Ketelaar’s grammar of Hindustani has always been a central interest for Indology scholars. However, the lexical part, which contains over twice as many pages as the two grammars together (112 vs. 51 pages), deserves a proper study in its own right. Up to now, it has been rather neglected as research material, and it has not received a detailed study beyond a rudimentary description by Vogel (1941: 671-673). Moreover, wordlists and dictionaries are rarely a totally original productions, and as Reed famously remarked, “borrowing—even plagiarism—is no sin to lexicographers” (Reed 1962: 95). But what lexical models did Ketelaar use, if any? Although Bhatia (1987: 33) speculates that the thematic vocabulary was modelled on Comenius, no such relation has been sufficiently proven. This chapter aims to present the general structure and various lexicographical styles used by Ketelaar, and to suggest his possible models and direct influences. Furthermore, I intend to go beyond lexical entries in his trilingual wordlists: I will try to decipher his aims by considering the implicit cultural and historical information that may be hidden in the text. Although elements such as conversion tables of weights and measures used in India point explicitly to a mercantile readership, what internal evidence can the text furnish us with to better understand the selection and presentation of topics? What other factors were at play when Ketelaar was compiling his book? To paraphrase Hüllen (1999: 179), this chapter attempts to “unravel ideas of which the compiler himself may not have been conscious”, in order to understand Ketelaar’s work “as a product of its time, coloured by the Zeitgeist as every historical artefact is.” (ibid.). Let us start with the less obvious ones.

8.1 The rupee inscription

In between the paragraphs of Ketelaar’s Persian grammar, we find a curious couplet in Persian:

Sicke sedder Jahaon Tsjoen Badder Manier
Sjaa Orangseeb Alemgier.
Sikke Sedder Jahaon tsjoen Koers pannier
Nourangsieb bradder Kosch, oe babbagier.
It attracted Vogel’s attention, and he recognised the intended persiflage on the unpopular Shah Aurangzeb “whispered to Ketelaar’s ear by one of his ‘Moorish’ or ‘Pagan’ friends” (1941:19-20 (622)). However, partly because of spelling differences (Kicke instead of Sicke in DHMS), his interpretation and translation were incorrect.¹ In fact, the first two lines should sound Sikka Zad Dar Jahan Cho Badr-e-munir Shah Aurangzeb Alamgir (‘Stamped/ struck coin, in the world, like the bright full Moon, Emperor Aurangzeb Alamgir’). It transpires that it is not a random rhymed verse: the couplet, composed by Mir Abdul Baqi Shahbai, figured on most silver rupee coins, especially in the later part of Aurangzeb’s reign.²

As it turns out, the lines lampooning the Emperor have also been recounted in Storia do Mogor by the Venetian doctor and traveller Niccolao (Niccolò) Manucci (1639–1717). According to Manucci, in AD 1663 Aurangzeb had sent his trusted aid Tarbiyat Khan as the envoy to the Safavid court of Shah Abbas, hoping to re-establish “peace and friendship” with the King of Persia. However, the Mughal ambassador was very badly received at the Persian court. He was prohibited to leave for a year, during which time he had to endure several humiliating experiences. During one last audience, before sending him back, Shah Abbas asked the envoy whether he had any coin of Hindustan and a portrait of his king. When Tarbiyat Khan produced some coins of gold and silver, and a portrait of Aurangzeb

¹ Vogel’s interpretation of the verses: “Kik sadr-i jahan dun badr-i munir Sah Aurangzeb, ‘alam-sir / Sik sadr-i jahan cun kurs-i panir Kurang-zeb, biradar-kus hubab-gir” (…) “De oogappel van de ² A numismatist from New Delhi, Mitresh Singh, informed me that “the Silver Rupee all bear the “badr-e-munir” couplet while the Gold Mohurs bear the “mehr-e-munir” (“The Resplendent Sun”) couplet. There are, however, few silver rupees from certain mints that, instead of the “badr-e-munir” couplet bear the “mehr-e-munir” couplet” (personal communication).
painted on paper, Shah Abbas asked him to read aloud the words stamped on the coin. On the pretence of illuminating the scene, the torch-holder ‘accidentally’ set Tarbiyat’s beard on fire. Then, Shah Abbas uttered a stream of abuses against Aurangzeb, threw his portrait on the ground and spat on it. On hearing the “badr-e-munir” couplet, Shah Abbas laughed that the inscription on the coins should rather sound: “Secazad bacurs penir, Orangzeb beradercox paderguir (Sikkah zad ba qurs-i-panir, Aurangzeb baradar-kush-i-pidar gir), which could be translated as “Struck coin upon a round of cheese, Aurangzeb – Brother-Slayer, Father-Seizer”.

Although Manucci visited Surat in 1683 on his way to Goa – the same year when Ketelaar arrived in India – it would be too far-fetched to imply the two might have met; the story of Tarbiyat Khan’s embassy mishaps must have been well known among the locals. Intriguingly, even though Ketelaar never mentions the origin of the couplet, the name of Terbieet Ghan – heer van de Zeeden (‘master of morals’) features among the Moorish names in the Instructie.

8.2 The calendar puzzle

Units of measurement of time are one of the most common elements in any dictionary, for obvious practical and administrative reasons. However, calendars are notoriously idiosyncratic. As I write these words, it is the year AD 2017 in Europe, 2074 in Nepal, 1439 AH (Anno Hegirae, ‘in the year of the Hijra’) in the Islamic calendar and year 5778 in the Jewish one. Even within Europe today, Orthodox and Catholic Christians disagree as to what day Easter falls on, and different nations would argue about the seasons: while in Ireland Imbolc, or St. Brigid’s day on February 1st is celebrated as the beginning of Spring, Poland is usually still covered in heavy snow, and the Spring festival of Marzanna does not happen until the astronomical equinox in late March. In Tudor times, New Year Day was observed on January 1st, yet the calendar year did not change until March 25th, the Feast of the Annunciation, which marked the start of the liturgical cycle in the Roman Catholic church. Although in 1582 Pope Gregory XIII introduced a new calendar in which both secular and liturgical New Year were observed on January 1st, England did not adopt it until 1752, and kept changing the year on ‘Lady Day’ (i.e. the Annunciation) in March. As a result, English “old style” dates from January to March are a year behind (e.g., February 1562 is in fact February 1563 everywhere else in Europe). It is therefore easy to imagine how puzzling it gets if we move to a different continent, culture, and astronomical system. Also Ketelaar’s list of months contains some surprises:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch (Ketelaar)</th>
<th>Hindustani (Ketelaar)</th>
<th>Modern Hindi / Gujarati</th>
<th>“Persian” (Ketelaar)</th>
<th>Islamic names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>louw maand</td>
<td>duwalike kartek [duvali kartek DHMS; kattek PMS]</td>
<td>Kārtika Kaartak</td>
<td>sabwaal</td>
<td>Shahwāl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spronckel maand</td>
<td>magser</td>
<td>Mārgashīrsha Maagsar</td>
<td>sulkaad [sulkeeds]</td>
<td>Dhu'l-Qa'dah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lente maand</td>
<td>hoos [Poes PM]</td>
<td>Paush Posh</td>
<td>sulheeds [sulheds DHMS] [sulhids PMS]</td>
<td>Dhu'l-Hijjah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gras maand</td>
<td>maa</td>
<td>Māgh Maha</td>
<td>mharum [moharun PMS]</td>
<td>Muharram (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bloeij maand</td>
<td>phaggen</td>
<td>Phālguna Faagan</td>
<td>safaar</td>
<td>Safar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>somer maand</td>
<td>tsijiter</td>
<td>Chaitra (1) Chaitra</td>
<td>samadel_ auwel</td>
<td>Rabi'al-Awwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hooij maand</td>
<td>wijssack</td>
<td>Vaishākha Vaishaakh</td>
<td>samadel acher</td>
<td>Rabi'al-Thanny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oogst maand</td>
<td>dseedt [dseed]</td>
<td>Jyaishtha Jeth</td>
<td>rewiel auwel</td>
<td>Jumadi-al-Awwal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herfst maand</td>
<td>akkaar [assar - PM]</td>
<td>Āshadh Ashaadh</td>
<td>rewiel acher</td>
<td>Jumadi-al-Thanny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wijn maand</td>
<td>tsjouwan [tjouwan - PM]</td>
<td>Shravāna Shravaan</td>
<td>raatsab [radsab DHMS]</td>
<td>Rajab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slagt maand</td>
<td>bhadowo</td>
<td>Bhādrapada Bhadarvo</td>
<td>saban [sjaban PMS]</td>
<td>Sha'ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winter maand</td>
<td>assouw</td>
<td>Āshwina Aaso</td>
<td>ramsaan</td>
<td>Ramadan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Ketelaar's list of months compared with Hindi, Gujarati and Islamic names.

Ketelaar's strategy when presenting the Hindustani and Persian equivalents is quite curious. He starts his Hindustani year with Duwalike-Kartek. To be very clear: Diwali, or Deepavali, the festival of lights, can never fall in January; it is calculated according to the Hindu lunisolar calendar. These calculations are complicated enough to justify a simplification by saying that in the North of India, the main celebration happens on Amavasya, the day of the new moon, on the 15th day of the dark fortnight of the month Kartik (usually between mid-October to mid-November of the Georgian calendar). Yet for some reason, Ketelaar decided to put it as his January. This gives us an unexpected...

---

3 In Paris MS, kattek is the equivalent of ramsaan from which the Persian year starts, according to Boudaan. Consequently, the explanation of the name Ramsani from the name list is adjusted as een die in de eerste maand des jaers geboren is (‘the one who is born in the first month of the year’) (PMS: 151).
geographical hint. Although there have been a plethora of regional calendars in India, most of them agree on the new year being celebrated on the first day of Chaitra (usually 13-14 of April). The notable exceptions are the two North-Western states, Gujarat and Rajasthan, where Diwali marks the ending of the year, and the New Year starts the day after. Indeed, Vogel (1936: 817) mentions that Surat was the first port of call for Ketelaar in India, which would explain the otherwise unusual equivalence of January and the autumnal festival of Diwali. This is also confirmed by the fact that the names of months are more Gujarati than Hindi sounding (compare forms in columns 2 and 3).

But this is not the end of the calendar puzzle. In the “Persian” column, we don’t find Persian month names at all, but rather Arabic ones of the Islamic calendar. Ketelaar seems unaware of the existence of the Persian solar calendar. Again, this can easily be explained; despite Persian being the language of the court and administration at the time, the religion of the ruling class was Islam. The intriguing thing is, however, that Ketelaar starts his “Persian” year with Shawwal. Shawwal is not January. Shawwal is not even the first month of the year. Muslims start their year with Muharram (number four on Ketelaar’s list). Why would anyone provide Ketelaar with such incorrect information? The answer lies in the month directly preceding Shawwal – Ramsaan (Ramadan), the Islamic holy month of fasting. Ketelaar’s belief that Ramadan is the last month of the year is confirmed in the list of Moorish names, where he explains that the name Ramsani means die in de laaste maand des jaars is gebooren (“the one born in the last month of the year”). In his list of “various words used by the Moors” and the “meaning of Moorish names” Ketelaar gives another reference to Ramadan that only confirms the same: Rooska jed is het feest van naer de moorse vasten lijd, off nieuwe Jaar. (“Rooska jed” is the festival after the Moorish fasting time, or the New Year”). To the best of my knowledge, the name quoted by Ketelaar is hard to find in any dictionary or other source from the time.4 Roza ka id must have been a colloquial term (probably from Urdu Roza ka Id – “the festival of fasting”) for the holy day marking the end of Ramadan, better known by the Arabic Id ul-Fitr (or Eid Al-Fitr)5 and celebrated in the Mughal Empire with large processions. Nevertheless, no Arab Muslims would ever consider it the New Year – which in any case is not a festive celebration but rather a time marked with self-reflection, prayers and fasting.

---

4 According to Wikipedia, similar sounding names are used in Assamese (Rūzar Id), Sylheti (Rūzar Id), Uyghur (Roza Hēyt) and Kazakh (Ораза aït/ Oraza aït) (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eid_al-Fitr).

5 Steingass (1892: 594) defines roza as “A day, a day’s (journey, &c.); daily allowance; fasting; a fast-day”; Platts as well has roza: “(rel. n. fr. roz, q.v.), s.m. Fasting; a fast; Lent (see ramaţān); a fast-day” (1884: 605). De Tours translates jejuniun (le jeune, ‘fast’) as “róza, paréz” (1703: 420).
But as it turns out, there was a time when the Mughals, however reluctantly, did consider it the start of the New Year. It dates back to Emperor Aurangzeb’s (1618-1707) reign (r. 1658-1707). Under his predecessors, the two calendars, Islamic and Persian were used alongside each other for practical administrative reasons: since the lunar Islamic months are moving through the seasons, farmers and tax collectors need a seasonal calendar to know when the soil is ready to be sown and when the harvest is ready to be taxed. Therefore older calendars like the Julian calendar (which was in use in the Ottoman Empire, and up to this day in rural Morocco), or the Persian calendar (modified Zoroastrian calendar that has been the civil calendar in Iran and Afghanistan since 1079), stayed in use alongside the Islamic one. But to Aurangzeb, the most orthodox of all Mughal rulers, the Persian New Year festival **Nau Ruz**, intrinsically connected with the vernal equinox on 20th or 21st March, must have appeared revoltingly “pagan”. Aurangzeb, who was slowly eliminating Zoroastrian and Hindu elements from public life, finally abolished the Persian calendar in 1659, which must have come as a drastic change for Mughal nobles. Until then, the lavishly celebrated **Nav Ruz** was the state holiday of the empire, where nobles presented tributes, received increases in salary and rank, and were transferred to new posts. As it corresponds with the onset of the summer heat in Northern India, it was a good time to end war, and to employ and transfer. Moreover, since Emperor Akbar (1542-1605) introduced the new era in 1584, **Nau Ruz** commemorated both the new year and the emperor’s accession, one of the consequences for Aurangzeb was that he had to choose a new date on which to celebrate his accession. A pious Muslim, he chose Ramadan 1, which meant that the state festival and all celebrations had to be postponed until the last day of the month, the end of the canonical fast (Blake 2013: 130). As the day was no longer tied to a season, it also meant that nobles could now be transferred in the middle of war or tax collection. The Mughal historian Khafi Khan (ca. 1663-1731) bitterly summarized it:

---

6  “Its months have Zoroastrian names: **Farvardin, Ordibehesht, Khordâd, Tir, Mordâd, Shahrivar, Mehr, Abin, Azar, Dey, Bahman, Esfand** (modern pronunciation). In Afghanistan, the corresponding Zodiac signs are used as names: Hamal, Sour, Jouzâ... = Aries, Taurus, Gemini... In Bengal, this calendar was adapted by giving the months Indian names and defining Aries as the sign in the sky, so 1/1/1423 BS (Bongla Samvat) was on 14th April this year, as the stars of the zodiac keep moving slowly backwards.” (Dr. Stephan Popp, personal communication).

7 I would like to thank Dr Stephen Popp for suggesting this point to me.
“Mathematicians, astronomers and men who have studied history know that... the recurrence of the four seasons, summer, winter, the rainy season of the Hindus, the autumn and spring harvests, the ripening of the corn and fruit of each season, the tankwah [income] of the jagirs [a district with revenues assigned], and the money of the mansabdars [holders of the rank] are all dependent upon the solar reckoning, and cannot be regulated by the lunar; still, his religious Majesty was unwilling that the nauroz and the year and months of Magi [Zoroastrian priests] should give their names to the anniversary of his accession” (Mehta 1986: 486). Nevertheless, it was now Id ul-Fitr, or Rooska jed, that marked the new year, and Ketelaar recorded that fact in his list of months. In spite of the devout motivation of Aurangzeb, his successors did not give up the festivities associated with the New Year. When British Baronet and East India Company civil servant Sir Thomas Theophilus Metcalfe (1795-1853) recorded the feast during the reign of the last Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah Zafar (r.1837-57), it took him a twelve folds long panorama to depict the exuberant Id ul-Fitr procession (fig. 8.2).

Interestingly, Ketelaar is not the first author of a Dutch vocabulary to present the months in such an unusual way. In a highly popular (and frequently reprinted) 17th century Spraeck ende woord-boek, Maleysche ende Madagarsche woorden by Frederick de Houtman from 1603, we find a list of months in Duyts, Maleys and Madagaskers (Dutch, Malay and Malagasy) with a following introduction:


‘Here follow the names of twelve months, which do not always correspond to ours: because they always begin with the New Moon, and end when the New Moon is visible again. In the year 1602, the year started with the New Moon on May 22nd, and [the month] is called Machgaran [Muharram], which is their first month of the year. When the Moon is ten days old, a big feast is held in India [Ashura]. The 9th month of the year called Rammelanon [Ramzan] is the beginning or the entering of their fast. With the start of the new month, the 10th month, called Sauwalon [Shawwal] at the New Moon their fasting ends, and another great celebration [Id al-fitr] is held. In the year 1600 it was March 15th; in 1601, March 5th; and in 1602, February 22nd, etc.’

What follows is a list of months in three languages in three columns. Each of them has numbers on the left side of the month. However, only the Dutch column has numbers in order

---

8 For a full list of re-editions and translations, see the article by W. Linehan, The earliest word-lists and dictionaries of the Malay language, in JMBRAS 22, 1949, fasc. 1, pp. 183-187 (as quoted in Lombard 1970: 4).
9 Translation by Gijsbert Kruijtzer.
1-12 (Januarij - December). The Malay list starts with Rammalaen, marked as 9th month, and the Malagasy list starts with a month Hatsia marked as number 3 in the year.

As De Houtman correctly observed, the Islamic calendar is based solely on the cycles of the Moon. Since there are always twelve lunar months in a year, and they are slightly shorter than Georgian months, the Islamic months drift constantly in relation to Gregorian ones by 11 or 12 days, and as a result, are not synchronised with seasons. Today, finding the correspondence between Islamic and Georgian months is easy thanks to calendar converters. According to an online one (http://www.oriold.uzh.ch/static/hegira.html), the two dates given by De Houtman for the end of fast are correct (although they mark the last day of Ramadan rather than the first day of Shawwal), however, the beginning of the new year in the month of Muharram seems to be miscalculated by one month and actually fell on June 21, 1602. Interestingly, De Houtman never explains why his list of months starts with Rammaläen (Ramadan), even though he marks it as the 9th month of the year. It can be presumed that he presents the coincidence of months in the particular year. The closest date to the publishing of the book in 1603, when Ramadan coincided with January was 1605, when Ramadan started on January 21st.

In the list of weekdays, de Houtman applies the same numbering strategy, by which the Dutch Sunday equals the third day of the Malay week (Friday being the first one), and the seventh day of the Malagasy week:

---

10 It is beyond the scope of the present chapter to further investigate the coincidence of Malagasy months with the other two; we may presume the presentation of months, giving months that are not necessarily the first month of the year as equivalents of January, is dictated by their coincidence in a particular year.

11 Taking into account the one-day discrepancy between dates given by de Houtman and the online calendar converter I have used, which may be a result of a different hour of the New Moon rising in different geographical locations, or more likely of the fact that the Muslims start their month not from the astronomical new moon but from the first visibility of the moon, which can be up to four days later than the astronomical event.
Additionally, he makes a remark explaining that *de daghen vander weeke* [...] *niet met de onse over een en comen: want die in Indyen den Vrydach houden voor haren Sabbeth / nae de Weth van Machomet.* (‘The days of the week do not correspond to ours, since in India Friday is considered their Sabbath [day of rest, Saturday], according to the law of Mohammed.’). Its similarity to Ketelaar’s note on the same (‘*onse vrijdagh is der mooren, gelijk ook aller mahomethanen son, off beede dagh* – ‘Our Friday is for the Moors, just like for all Muslims, Sunday, or the prayer day’) is quite striking.12

Whether Ketelaar was familiar with the book of De Houtman is not certain. But what if Ketelaar did see and used de Houtman’s book as an exemplar for his calendar chapter? Let us test one last hypothesis. Assuming that Ketelaar followed the example of De Houtman, he presented what Muslim month corresponded to the Diwali festival in the year of writing. By checking when the two calendars coincided in Diwali (and *Kartik*) falling in *Shawwal*, we may be able to get the exact year of the compilation of the list. It’s not immediately obvious even for Hindus when the Diwali starts each year. The rule of thumb is that it falls on the new moon between mid-October and mid-November. I used the Fred Espenak’s “Six Millenium Catalog of Phases of the Moon”13 to pick the possible Autumnal new moon dates at the end of 17th century, from 1680 to 1700. Then, using the online calendar converter, I checked them, year by year, to see if these Diwali dates ever coincided with *Shawwal*.14 The only year where “my” Diwali fell in *Shawwal* was 1683, with 1682 and 1681 within the couple of days’ range. It is well documented that Ketelaar first came to India in 1683. Could this be a mere coincidence? Moreover, the same Gregorian and Islamic month overlap with each other every 32 to 34 years. Boudaan’s copy, in which Ketelaar’s list is amended to put *Ramadan* as the

---

12 The question remains whether De Houtman meant *Sabbath* literally, as Saturday, or more generally, as a Christian day of rest, i.e. Sunday (the latter being more likely, de Houtman being a member of the Dutch Reformed Church).

13 The catalogue is available online at astropixels.com/ephemeris/phasescat/phasescat.html.

14 The converter I used is available at http://www.oriold.uzh.ch/static/hegira.html. Another excellent converter is http://www.fourmilab.ch/documents/calendar/.
first month, bears the date of January 1714. If we do the same check for Diwali and Ramadan at the beginning of the 18th century, we’ll find out that the two coincided in October 1713. Could that be an accident, too?

This date opens a new question. Discussing the earliest probable date of a manuscript that would be earlier than the 1698 copy, Bodewitz states that since Ketelaar first visited Surat, being 23 years old at the time, “his learning of the language should have taken some years” so “much earlier dating than 1689 is unacceptable” (Bodewitz 1994-95: 126). Yet in the same article he admits that the command of Hindustani “could be acquired only by practice” (idem, p.123) and that “Ketelaar was able to speak Hindustani, but had only a limited knowledge of Persian” (idem, p.127). If Ketelaar could attempt writing a Persian grammar and a vocabulary with only a limited knowledge of that language, why should we presume his knowledge of Hindustani was already perfect at the moment of compiling the Instructie? It would not be hard to imagine that Ketelaar did not sit down to “write a grammar” once he decided his knowledge was enough for the task, but rather that he was taking notes while he was learning. He could have already started on the ship, writing down the Dutch lists of months, days of the week, names of household items, etc. and only later, his notes became the basis for a book intended to help others learn. Or, even more likely, he copied some other wordlist and filled in the Hindustani and Persian words.

Such a hypothesis might also be confirmed by what would otherwise be false modesty, when in the introduction Ketelaar writes: so sal dit werckje, als door een leerlingh ondernomen, van fauten niet zuijvert gevonden worden (“so this little work, since undertaken by a student, shall not be free of errors”).

In the end, we may never know for sure what motivated Ketelaar’s and Boudaan’s choice of months, but at least we have a couple of plausible theories to choose from.

8.3 Historical comparativism

At the end of the Persian grammar in both Elementa and Instructie there is a list of Persian cognates. Greaves presents a list of 14 Persian words that he finds to “agree in sense and

---

15 Also Angelus in Gazophylacium devotes a whole chapter to “De linguae Persiceae cum Europeanis analogia” (‘analogy between Persian and European languages’ – Angelus 1684: 5-7). His comparative
number of letters” with English (*exactè cum Anglicis, eodem sensu, et numero ferè literarum, congruentia – 1649: 90), and sixteen other Persian words which, as he speculates, probably derive from Latin (*à Latinis vocibus videntur suam deducere – idem: 91). Similarly, Ketelaar compiles a list of twelve Persian and Latin cognates, and ten Persian words that correspond with Dutch (*die met het Duijts accordeeren – UMS: 88[92]). Such lists were quite à la mode in the 17th century and although various versions circulated among scholars, naturally many of the words were identical. In the case of Ketelaar, his close connection with Greaves’ book, demonstrated in the Persian grammar, may be an excuse not to look any further. However, even the relatively small differences between the lists may also be indication of other sources used; therefore it may be instructive to do a brief overview of the history of such lists.

The Professor of Hebrew at Leiden University Franciscus Raphelengius (1539-1597) is often credited with being a pioneer in comparative Persian-Germanic studies. He was later quoted by Bonaventura Vulcarius (De Smet; 1538-1614) in *De Literis et Lingua Getarum sive Gothorum* (1597: 87-88). Vulcarius says that in his two-page *Specimen Linguae Persicae*,” *Aliquam enim eius esse cum Teutonica affinitatem vel ex eo constat, quod multa vocabula utrique lingue inter se sunt communia*” (*the fact that there is a kind of relationship between this and the Teutonic language can be inferred from the fact that both languages share many words*) and gives 22 examples. As stated by Vulcarius himself, this list was compiled on the basis of the words from the Persian version of the *Pentateuch* published in Hebrew script in Constantinople in 1546,¹⁶ Latinised by Raphelengius:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persian</th>
<th>Latin (English translation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Band</td>
<td>Vinculum (‘bond’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berader</td>
<td>Frater (‘brother’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begryst,</td>
<td>Fleuit (‘he wept’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casti</td>
<td>Cista (‘chest, box’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choda,</td>
<td>Deus (‘God’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dandán,</td>
<td>Dens (‘tooth’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dochtar,</td>
<td>Filia (‘daughter’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drog,</td>
<td>Mendacium (‘lie’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gryft,</td>
<td>Tenuit (‘he held’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab,</td>
<td>Labium (‘lip’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madar,</td>
<td>Mater (‘mother’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mus,</td>
<td>Mus (‘mouse’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Must,</td>
<td>Mustum (‘must, wine’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁶ For more detailed bibliographical information see Orsatti (1995: 526, n.10).
Yet, as Van Hal (2010: 15) demonstrates, already five years before Raphelengius’ letter from 1584, Josephus Justus Scaliger (1540-1609) mentioned the similarities between Persian and Germanic words father, muder, brader, tuchter, band. Scaliger, however, remained ‘cautiously skeptical’ of the hypothesis of a common ancestry for these languages, and is mostly remembered as a disbeliever.17

Greaves’ list is similar, yet this time the focus is on similarities with English (an extra column with the Persian transliteration is added to make the similarities more visible). The last two columns to the right are Ketelaar’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latín</th>
<th>Inglés</th>
<th>Persa (con transliteración MP agregada)</th>
<th>Persa</th>
<th>Holandés</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tonitru</td>
<td>Thunder.</td>
<td>tundar, tundar</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malus</td>
<td>Bad.</td>
<td>bad</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melior</td>
<td>Better.</td>
<td>bihtar</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemures</td>
<td>Fairies.</td>
<td>part</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frater</td>
<td>Brother.</td>
<td>birādar</td>
<td>bradder</td>
<td>broeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filia</td>
<td>Daughter.</td>
<td>doḵhtara</td>
<td>dochter</td>
<td>dogter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foemina</td>
<td>Maid.</td>
<td>maida</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonsor</td>
<td>Barber.</td>
<td>barbar</td>
<td>berber</td>
<td>barbier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostium</td>
<td>Doore.</td>
<td>dar</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labium</td>
<td>Lip.</td>
<td>lab</td>
<td>leb</td>
<td>lip</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 Some other early traces of historical comparativism originating in India are to be found in the works of the English Jesuit missionary Thomas Stephens (c.1549–1619), author of the Arte da Lingoa Canarim, posthumously printed in Rachol in Goa in 1640. He had already “mentioned the affinity between Sanskrit, Latin and Greek in a letter dated 1583”. This letter “was not published in the West until 1957”, indicating “a total lack of regard for missionary sources for many centuries” (Zwartjes 2011: 4-5).
In spite of small discrepancies, we can risk the conclusion that one was modelled on the other, with small adaptations (comparing Persian with Dutch and not English; adding numbers). It raises the question whether it is a reflection of Ketelaar’s linguistic interests, or another selling point for his book.

**8.4. Lexicographic make-up: types of word lists**

**8.4.1 Beduiding eeniger Moorse namen (‘meaning of some Moorish names’)****

Besides the thematic vocabulary, there is a second lexical part placed after the grammars. The curious thing about it is the apparent randomness of various types of lexicographical styles. The first one is a list of meaning of Moorish names (Chapter 49). Since this element was even introduced in the title, it must have been considered a philological curiosity of possible interest to the Dutch reader. Ketelaar introduces names such as Allabax, *gods geschenck*.
(‘God’s gift’), Ghan, heer (‘lord, master’), Doost Mameth, Mahomet’s vrund (‘friend of Muhammad’), Ruhiem, genadigh (‘merciful’), Abdullaa, Gods onderdaan (‘subject of God’). He also includes more general words like fackier, bedelaar (‘beggar’), Ghan ghanna, heer der heeren (‘lord of lords’=emperor), and biblical names: Davoet, David (‘David’), Soliman, Salomoen (‘Solomon’), Noei, Noach (‘Noah’), Ibrahim, Abraham (‘Abraham’), Moessa Moijses (‘Moses’), etc. Vogel (1941: 672) notices the unusual translation of the name Enaat as Iugnatius (‘Ignatius’). Finally, the list closes with names of Mughal rulers and their family members, proving Ketelaar’s attention to Mughal history and politics: 18

· Noer Mahal (Nur Mahal, later Nur Jahan, 1577–1645, Emperor Jahangir’s wife) – dagraad des vrouwelijk hofs ‘dawn of the court of the women’
· Selim (Salam, the birth name of Emperor Jahangir 1569-1627) – goed-aardigh ‘good-natured’
· Moeraatbax (Murad-Bakhsh, Shah Jahan’s fourth son) – volmaakte begeerte ‘fulfilled wish’
· Rousnarie Begum (Roshanara Begum 1617-1671, second daughter of Shah Jahan) – princes des lochts ‘princess of lights’?
· Dara (Dara Shukoh,1615-1659, the eldest son of Shah Jahan) Darius
· Sujas (Shah Shuja, 1616-1661, second son of Shah Jahan) – kloekmoedig ‘brave’
· Aurangzeeb (Aurangzeb 1618-1707, third son of Shah Jahan) – ciraat des troons ‘jewel of the throne’
· Rouschinarie begum (Roshanara Begum??) – luister der princessen ‘splendour of princesses’

Several Muslim names from the list have no equivalent in Dutch, and one (Evam, ‘Eve’) has an empty space on the Hindustani side, suggesting that this collection of names and meanings was done bi-directionally, and remained a work in progress. Indeed, Boudaan in 1714 has it filled in as asaadam and hava (PMS: 150).

8.4.2 Naast gelijickende Hindoustanse woorden (‘closely resembling Hindustani words’)

The next list of words starts with an explanation:

Daar sijn verscheijde woorden inde hindústanse taale, die in, het uijtspreeken den anderen seer gelijken, dog de meinjinge ter Contrarie seer verschillende, dierhalven in het spreken wel moet geobsereert werden, dat het eene niet in plaats van een ander woord werd gepleegt, sijnde dierhalven eene dier woorden vervolgens ter nedergesteld.

‘There are several words in Hindustani which closely resemble one another in pronunciation, but whose meanings are on the contrary rather different. Therefore one should pay attention not to mistake one for the other. In this aim, there below some of these words are presented’

The list contains 199 words arranged in pairs or triplets, most of which – yet not all – correctly reflect Hindustani phonological distinctions: 19

---

18 A similar list with names of all the Mughal emperors since Timur (Nomes dos Reys que tem havido neste Indostan) can be found in the anonymous Grammatica Indostana (1778: 136).
19 Ketelaar’s original spellings are followed by forms in square brackets from Platts’ 1884 dictionary.
Such pragmatically oriented lists called confusibilia occur in Latin schoolbooks in Europe (e.g. Shirley’s Grammaticae latinæ institutiones from 1654) to sensitize children to subtle differences in pronunciation of pairs such as aestas and aestus.\textsuperscript{20} They can be seen as a precursor of minimal pair pronunciation training in modern language learning. In case of the Instructie, the benefits to the learner are clear, and the hope of avoiding embarrassment when practicing a new language in a professional situation sounds like a strong incentive to acquire the book.

\textbf{8.4.3 Words requiring explanation}

The next list in Ketelaar’s lexical part, Explicatie van verscheijde soo Persjaanse als Hindoustanse woorden, bij de Mooren gebrujkelijk (‘explanation of both Persian and Hindustani words used among the Moors’, chapter 51) (UMS: 122\textsuperscript{[128]-129\textsuperscript{[137]}}) reverses the perspective and rather than looking for equivalents of Dutch words and concepts, seeks to explain the Hindustani ones. The headwords and their Dutch definitions are arranged in two columns per page, and although they do not follow any particular alphabetical or semantic order, we can distinguish certain thematic chains as in the example below (Platts’ spelling in square brackets):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ketelaar [MSU Platts’ form]</th>
<th>Ketelaar’s definition (UMS)</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hocka [buqqa]</td>
<td>een tabacks rook gereetschap bijde moors gebruijkelijk</td>
<td>‘tobacco box and smoking implements used by the Moors’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsjillem [čilam]</td>
<td>is de ketel van de hocka alwaar de taback werd jgedaan.</td>
<td>‘is the bowl of the hookah in which the tobacco was put’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nal [nal]</td>
<td>is het riet van de hocka waardoor de rook werd getrocken.</td>
<td>‘is the hose of the hookah through which the smoke is drawn’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaali [thält]</td>
<td>is de schootel van de hocka.</td>
<td>‘is the plate of the hookah’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiwi [ índž[t]]</td>
<td>is de krans onder de hocka, gehoorende.</td>
<td>‘is the girdle to be put under hookah’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cirpoos [sar-posh]</td>
<td>is de dexel van de tabacks keetel.</td>
<td>‘is the lid of the tobacco bowl (kettle)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>destpanna [dast-panāh]</td>
<td>is het vuurantjje.</td>
<td>‘is fire tongs’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table 15: An example of a semantic chain of lexical items from Explicatie}

\textsuperscript{20} I am indebted to Prof. John Considine for this information and the reference.
Such a detailed list must have clearly been composed in a real-life situation. Other ‘semantic chains’ refer to clothes and fabrics, one of the Dutch East India main trading goods in India (g'ird gheer – is de onderste wijte, off ronts van een rock; derreds ciewen – is de maate van een kleed etc.: Tsijen – de ploijen van een kleet etc.: [ćin – the folds/plaits of a cloth]; Tsjaak – is de openinge onder de rock [ćāk] – ‘is the opening of a skirt’), and ‘exotic’ household objects (Lootha – een kleenpotje, daer men waater me schept [loṭā] ‘a small clay pot to pour water’). Ketelaar not only explains various clothing elements, ornaments and unusual objects which the learner may come across in his or her daily situation (oeplies ijn gedroogte koeken van een kooije, off buffels mest, die in plaats van turf gebruikten ‘upli’, cow dung cakes used as fuel), but he also provides many common sayings which may make small talk easier for a beginner or intermediate learner (cf. sjivenedsjen sjaaal – ‘t leven is moeijelyk ‘life is difficult’, Nadsjudenie – gij sult tot geen effect komen ‘you won’t succeed’, wawa – is een verwonderingh over een aangenaame zaak ‘is a surprise at a pleasant matter’). Dealing with specific cultural references, Ketelaar uses the familiar to explain the unfamiliar. And so, Muslim Islamic beads tesbih are translated as Tesbie – is een paternoster, off koralle snoer – a rosary or a coral string. This extensive list of 224 entries describing exotic objects, habits and useful expressions must have been a very solid selling point both for the learner in India and the curious reader in Europe.

8.5 Searching for models

8.5.1 Instructie – what is in the title?
Looking closely at the complete title of Ketelaar’s manuscript: Instructie off Onderwijsinge der Hindoustanse en Persiaanse talen, nevens hare declinatie en Conjugatie, als mede vergelejkinge, der hindoustanse med de hollandse maat en gewigten mitsgaders beduijdiningh enieger moorse namen etc., we realise that for the author, unlike for the later scholars who studied his work, the grammatical description was not necessarily the main
focus. Compared with the content, the title suggests that the actual main body of teaching is contained in the thematically arranged vocabulary. The title also mentions other sections such as practical tables of conversion of weights and measures, as applicable in the city of Surat, and elements of purely philological interest (‘meaning of Moorish names’). ‘Conjugations’ and ‘declensions’ are only an addition to it. This is in line with the fashion of the time where a short grammatical sketch was often appended to a learner’s dictionary (cf. Hexham’s *A Copious English and Netherduytsch Dictionary* from 1675, or even the aforementioned *Spraeck ende woord-boek* by Houtman from 1603).

The expression “instructie off onderwijsinge” is not very common in Dutch. In its Dutch form, the combination of these words appears in dictionaries as translation of the word ‘Instruction’ (e.g. Hexham’s dictionary from 1675, no page numbers), but we also find it in a title of treatise on pigeon-keeping for amateurs (*Beschryvinge der duyven ofte onderwijsinge ende instructie voor de beminnners van haef, ofte liefhebbers van de duyven*, Utrecht, 1686) or, possibly more relevant to Ketelaar, in a marine navigation tutorial with charts and profiles of coastlines published by Anthonie Jacobsz. in Amsterdam in 1649, and reprinted by Pieter Goos in 1659: *De lichtende Columne ofte Zee-Spiegel, inhoudende: de zee-kusten van de Noordsche, Oostersche, en Westersche schip-vaert; vertoonende ... alle de havens, rivieren, baeuwen, reeden, diepten, en ... met noch een instructie ofte onder-wijs in de konst des zee-vaert* (emphasis added). Yet, the clues as to what other book might have been a model for the lexical part of the *Instructie* are hidden in the Dutch forms of the macrostructure of Ketelaar’s vocabulary.

8.5.2 Ketelaar’s topical dictionary.

Ketelaar’s vocabulary extends to 49 pages and is divided into 41 thematic sections. Even though such onomasiological arrangement of lexemes (spiritual, followed by the human > inhuman > animate > inanimate) has been used in Europe for centuries (Hüllen 1999: 305-430), it is not exclusively a Western European system. It was also well known in the Arabic lexicographic tradition (cf. Baalbaki 2014: 62); even the unpublished Persian-Hindustani-Dutch dictionary mentioned in Chapter 2 has a very similar organisation of topics. Also in India such dictionaries were not unfamiliar; in his exploration of the origins of the modern Urdu lexicography, Hakala describes ‘a very popular *niṣāb* [a genre of multilingual vocabulary in verse] composed by an enigmatic Indian lexicographer ‘Abdul Wāsē’ ca. 1700 entitled *Risālah-i Jān Pahcān* (‘The Treatise of the Familiar Friend’). Interestingly, the words in the first four verses contain “The Pure Lord” [God], His “messenger” [‘prophet’], “angel” [‘spirit’], “book”, “heaven”, “land” and “sun” (Hakala 2010: 393-394). This cosmography is almost identical with the European one as expressed in Ketelaar’s initial headwords: *God* ‘God’, *Iesus* ‘Jesus’, *engel* ‘angel’, *geest* ‘spirit’, *de wereld* ‘the world’, *hemel* ‘heaven’, *zon* ‘sun’. To facilitate searching, at the beginning of the book there is a table of contents with page numbers, and at the end Ketelaar used a relatively modern invention: an alphabetical index.

---

21 However, it is resonant with titles of missionary works from New Spain (for example, *Doctrina y enseñanza en la lengua maçañva* – ‘Doctrine and teaching [... in the Mazahuah language’ by Diego de Nágera (1570-1635) from 1637, or *Instrucción Christiana* by Augustin de Quintana (ca. 1660-1734) from 1729, et alia. (For more details on these titles, see the database of Amerindian grammars at http://ctlf.ens-lyon.fr/n_resul.asp?req=Zwartjes,%20Otto  )
After a rather long and tedious search, browsing through a large number of various multilingual topical dictionaries, I eventually came across an unexpected match: a popular 17th century Latin schoolbook for use in Dutch gymnasiums. Out of several editions I was able to consult, the one most resembling *Instructie* is *Linguae Latinae rudimenta, in quibus usitatoria aliquot vocabula: deinde declinationum, comparationum, ac conjugationum paradigmata...: in usum Scholae Amstelodamensis* (part 1) published in 1633 by Henricus Laurentius (Hendrick Laurensz, 1588-1649) in Amsterdam. In the table below is a comparison of sections of the dictionary, as well as other elements that have their parallels in Ketelaar’s text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructie</th>
<th>Rudimenta (1633)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[title page]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Momum (‘To Momus’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Lectorem Benevolum (‘To the Kind Reader’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voor Reeden (‘Preface’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register deer Capitulen (‘Index of chapters’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 van God (‘Of God’)</td>
<td>(1)22 De numine &amp; rebus celestibus. Van ‘t_Goddelijcke wesen ende hemelsche dinghen. (‘Of divine beings and heavenly matters’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 van de wereld (‘of the world’)</td>
<td>(2) De mundi regionibus, Vande ghwesten des werelds. (Of regions of the world’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 van de luchts vertoogen (‘of atmospheric occurrences’ - [weather, etc.])</td>
<td>(5) De meteoris &amp; tempestatibus, Van des luchts vertooghen ende ghetyden (‘Of atmospheric occurrences and seasons’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 van_de winden (‘of winds’)</td>
<td>(3) De ventis. Van de winden. (Of winds’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 van_de gewesten des werelts, en ellementen ‘van_de elementen’ (‘of regions of the world, and the elements’)</td>
<td>(4) De Elementis, eóque spectantibus. Van de Elementen, ende t’geen daer aen vast is. (‘Of elements and what belongs to them’)[includes words from K’s Landschappen]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 van de mensch, en zijn deelen (‘of the man and his body parts’)</td>
<td>(7) De homine &amp; partibus ejus. Van de mensch ende sijne delen. (‘Of men and his body parts’) (7a) De membris infra collum. Van leden onder of beneden de hals. (‘Of body parts below the neck’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 Part two (pp. 201-248) entitled *Altera pars Rudimentorum provectionibus proponenda* contains rules and definitions of etymology and syntax and does not seem relevant to any section of Ketelaar’s work, with the possible exception of a list with Dutch translation of ‘easy regular examples’ (*Exempla facillimarum regularum*) used in this part which vaguely resemble the idea behind Ketelaar’s ‘explanation of Persian and Hindustani words used by the Moors’.

23 There are no section numbers in *Rudimenta*. I am introducing them here to show the original arrangement of topics, while the table is designed to find parallels between the two works.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Note(s)</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>van de familie (‘of the family’)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td>De visceribus, vande deelen binnen ’t lijf. (‘Of internal organs’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8a)</td>
<td>Cognatus, consanguineus, propinquus, bloed-vriend, maech. (‘Blood relation, kinship’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8c)</td>
<td>De affinitate, van aenghehijlicte vriendschap. (‘Of affinity by marriage’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>De sexe &amp; ætate hominum, Van’t man-en-wijfs-verscheel, en der menschen bejaertheyt. (‘Of the difference man-woman, and of human age’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>van de hoogte ampten (‘of high offices’)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>Dignitatium &amp; muniorum ac opisciorum vocabula, namen van hooghe ampten, bedieningen, ende ambaché-. (‘Names of high offices, services, and crafts’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>van de kunst ambaghten, en kleene ampten (‘of crafts and smaller occupations’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>van de militaaren ampten (‘of military ranks’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>van de verscheidene natien (‘of various nations’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>van d’veragte, en oneerlijke ampten (‘of the despised and dishonest professions’)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>van d’ viervoetige land gediertens (‘of quadruped land animals’)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>De animalibus varijs, van velerhande ghdieten. (‘Of all sorts of animals’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>van het gevegt seegge gevogelte (‘of birds’)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>De animalibus volantibus, Vande vliegende ghdieten. (‘Of volant animals’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>van de bloeylose beeskens (‘of bloodless small animals’)</td>
<td>(20)</td>
<td>De insectis, van kleyne bloedeloos beestkens. (‘Of small bloodless animals’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>van finyng gediertens (‘of venomous animals’)</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>De serpenitibus, Van slangen. (‘Of snakes’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>van d’ vischen (‘of fish’)</td>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>De piscibus, Van de visschen. (‘Of fish’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>van d’ eetwaaren (‘of food items’)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>De cibi generibus. Van vellerhande eet-waren. (‘Of all sorts of food items’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>van d’ drancken (‘of drinks’)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>De potu, Van dranc. (‘Of drink’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>van d’ kleederen (‘of clothes’)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>De vestibus, van kleederen. (‘of clothes’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>van het huijs, en zijn deelen (‘of house and its parts’)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>De edificis, eorumque partibus, van ghebouwen en der selfder gedeelten. (‘of buildings and their parts’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>van het huijsraad, en gereetschap (‘of household and implements’)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>De varia supellectile &amp; instrumentis, van vellerhande huysraat, ende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gereedschap. (‘of various sorts of household implements’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>van d’ oologs behoeften (‘of war necessities’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>van d’boom, en zijn vruchten (‘of a tree and its fruit’)</td>
<td>(23) De arboribus, Van boomen (‘of trees’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>van d’ thuyn, en veld vruchten (‘of a garden and the fruits of the field [earth]’)</td>
<td>(24) De Herbis &amp; Frugibus, van kruyden, ende aardvruchten, (‘of herbs and the fruits of the earth’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>van d’ specerijen (‘of spices’)</td>
<td>(25) De aromatibus, van speceryen. (‘of spices’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>van d’ juweelen (‘of jewels’)</td>
<td>(26) De lapidibus, van steenen. (‘of stones’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>van d’ bergh giften (‘of mining goods [minerals]’)</td>
<td>(27) De metallis, van bergh-giften (‘of mining goods [minerals]’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>van het geld (‘of money’)</td>
<td>(28) De pecunia, van geld. (‘of money’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>van de landschappen (‘of landscapes’)</td>
<td>(included in (4))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>van t schip, en toebehooren (‘of ship and its parts’)</td>
<td>(11) De re navali, Van schepen, en daer aen behoo rende. (‘Of ships and their parts’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>van d’ verruwen (‘of [paints] colours’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>van de tijden (‘of times’)</td>
<td>(6) De temporibus, Van de tyden (‘Of times’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>van de maanden (‘of months’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>van de dagen (‘of days’)</td>
<td>[days of the week included in (6)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>van het getal (‘of numbers’)</td>
<td>(32) Numerus Cardinælis, Hooft-ghetal. (‘Cardinal numbers’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>van t onder getal [DHMS: ordre getal] (‘of ordinal numbers’)</td>
<td>(33) Numeros ordinælis, Order-ghetal. (‘Ordinal numbers’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>van t gebrooken getal (‘of fractions’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>van d’ vuijv-sinnen (‘of the five senses’)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>van de verscheyde sieckten (‘of various diseases’)</td>
<td>(17) De morbis, Van siecten. (‘Of diseases’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>van de substantiva, en adjectiva (‘of nouns and adjectives’)</td>
<td>(31) Sequuntur Adjectiva et Quidem primo, secunda declinationis. Volgen de Adjectiva, Ende Voor eerst vande tweede declinatie. (Hereby follow adjectives, starting with the second declension)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(31a) Adjectiva tertie declinationis. [Adjectiva] Vande derde declinatie. (‘[Adjectives] of the third declension’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>van d’ adverbia (‘of adverbs’)</td>
<td>(39) Nomenclatura Vocabulorum familiarium è partitus invariabilibus. Adverb. (‘Adverb.’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>van d verba ('of verbs')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>verba der eerste conjungationes ('verbs of the first conjugation')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37) Familiaira quardam verba conjugationis prime. Sommige gemeensame woorden van de eerste Conjugatie. ('Some common verbs of the first conjugation')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37a) Verba Conjugationis secunda. Woorden vande tweede Conjugatie. ('Verbs of the second conjugation')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37b) Verba Conjugationis tertiae. Woorden vande derde Conjugatie. ('Verbs of the third conjugation')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verba Conjugationis quatræ. Woorden vande vierde Conjugatie. ('Verbs of the fourth conjugation')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>declinatie der persiaanse taale ('declensions of the Persian language')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30) De nominum substantivorum declinatione</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>conjugatie, der persiaanse taale ('conjugation of the Persian language')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(38) De Conjugatione Verborum, Vande Conjugatien der woorden. ('Of conjugations of verbs')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>declinatie, der moorse taale ('declension of the Moorish language')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>conjugatie, der moorse taale ('conjugation of the Moorish language')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>beduijdingh eeniger moorse namen ('explanation of some Moorish names')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>naest gelijkende woorden ('similar words')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>explicatie, eeniger hindoustanse woorden ('explanation of some Hindustani words')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>reducksie, van_ceer, en ponden, etc. ('conversion of ceers and pounds')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Verscheijde Oliteijten ('various oils')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De Thien Gebooden onses Heeren ('The ten commandments of Our Lord')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decalogus. De X. Geboden. ('The Ten Commandments')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40) De twalf articulen des Christelijken geloovs ('The 12 articles of Christian faith')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39) Symboolum Apostolorum. De XII. Artiickelen des Christelijken Ghearloofs. ('The 12 Articles of Christian faith')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onse Vader ('Our Father')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precatio Dominica. Het Ghebed onses Heeren. ('The prayer of Our Lord')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alphabet Persiaans en Hindoustans [Persian and Hindustani alphabet]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12) De curru &amp; iis, qua ad equum.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although not all sections of the two vocabularies have their respective equivalents (Ketelaar has additionally van d’oologs behoeften; van de militaarens ampten; van de verscheijden natien; Verscheijde Oliteijten, etc., and Rudimenta has a section on horses, books, and games), and the division and order of topics is slightly different, the very formulation of some unusual section titles (Van des luchts vertooghen; van kleyne bloedeloose beestkens; van bergh-giften) is too similar to be a mere coincidence. It seems quite probable that Ketelaar used some other edition of Rudimenta, which over time had many slightly different versions and translations.24 Additionally, an important point comes from comparing the general content

24 For example, the edition from 1742 has Elementa translated as Hoofdstoffen; De Meteoris & Tempestatibus as Van de dingen, die in de lugt haar oorspronk hebben; and De Animalibus volantibus as Van vliegende dieren. The third edition of the version from The Hague uses Van de Hoofdstoffen, en Luchthevelingen; en ’t Weër, en de dingen daar toe betrekkelyk. On the other hand, it also includes a section De Hominibus maleficis & probrosis – Van quaad-doenders, en menschen die een schandelyk leven leiden (p.21), section De re militari, & vario armorum genere – Van de zaaken des krygs, en en verscheidene soort van wapenen (p.24), similar to what we find in Ketelaar but not present in Amsterdam 1633 edition. It also mentions De Animalibus, praecipue quadrupedibus – Van de dieren, voornamentlyk viervoetige (a word used also by Ketelaar); however, metals are translated as bergstoffen. Other sections differ from both Rudimenta 1633 and Instructie: De Artibus et Scientiis – Van de Konsten en Wetenschappen; De Mediamentis – Van de Geneesmiddelen; De Sacris & Superstitionibus – Van de

Table 16: Comparison of the structure and content of the Instructie and Rudimenta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section in Instructie</th>
<th>Section in Rudimenta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De re libraria, van boecken, ende ’tgheen daer vast is. (‘of books and what belongs to them’)</td>
<td>De re libraria, van boecken, ende ’tgheen daer vast is. (‘of books and what belongs to them’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De ludicris, van speelgeredschap. (‘Of toys’)</td>
<td>De ludicris, van speelgeredschap. (‘Of toys’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigmata Nominum adjectivorum Voor-beelden van de Nomina Adjectiva (‘Examples of Nomina Adjectiva’)</td>
<td>Paradigmata Nominum adjectivorum Voor-beelden van de Nomina Adjectiva (‘Examples of Nomina Adjectiva’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigmata Comparationum. Voor-beelden vande comparatien ofte vergelijkingheen. (‘Examples of comparisons’)</td>
<td>Paradigmata Comparationum. Voor-beelden vande comparatien ofte vergelijkingheen. (‘Examples of comparisons’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigma Irregularis Comparations. Voor-beelden vande comparatien ofte vergelijkingheen, buyten de gemeenen regel. (‘Examples of comparisons beyond the standard rule’)</td>
<td>Paradigma Irregularis Comparations. Voor-beelden vande comparatien ofte vergelijkingheen, buyten de gemeenen regel. (‘Examples of comparisons beyond the standard rule’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De pronominum declinatione. Vander Pronominen declinatie. (Of the declension of pronouns)</td>
<td>De pronominum declinatione. Vander Pronominen declinatie. (Of the declension of pronouns)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the two works: *Rudimenta* contains a lot of grammatical information presented in two main sections on declensions and conjugations, as well as lists of adverbs, verbs of the four conjugations etc. which, for one thing, would help explain Ketelaar’s slightly random list of *verba der eerste conjugationes*. Last but not least, the first part of the Latin schoolbook ends with a mini catechism: translations of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, Our Father, and some other evening- and morning prayers, the first three of which we also find in Ketelaar’s manuscript.

There were many more editions of this basic Latin-Dutch vocabulary for the use of schoolboys in the Netherlands (in fact, different cities seem to have had their own versions), and the one actually used by Ketelaar was probably closer in time to his stay in Amsterdam (ca. 1680). A more in-depth comparison of the section content with an eye on inclusion or exclusion of specific words (such as ‘beer foam’ in the section on drinks which in this case suggests a connection between Ketelaar’s work and this early edition of *Rudimenta*) may reveal an edition that is an even better match for Ketelaar’s list, so further bibliographic research is needed to establish the direct model. Moreover, such comparative study of the content of thematic sections may offer new insights into Ketelaar’s “customisation” of the topics. For example, *Rudimenta* lists various stones, including bricks, magnet, whetstone, millstone, marble, etc. while Ketelaar focuses solely on gem stones; in the section “Of fish”, exotic species such as Javanese *Jacob-Everts-visch* appear; the “Dutch” name of palm wine in the section on drinks in *surie*, originally from the Sanskrit word “sura, vinous liquor” (Yule 1903: 874), yet it is doubtful whether the word would have been recognised in Europe without additional comment. The full extent of such acculturation would be another important result of studying Ketelaar’s and others overseas Dutch lexicons.

8.6 Among Pagans and True Believers: national and religious identities in the colonial encounters

It is not unreasonable to suppose that the nationalities appearing in Ketelaar’s word list reflect the composition of the local population where the dictionary was composed. And we have good reason to believe it was composed in Surat and Agra. Father Manuel Godinho, a Portuguese Jesuit who visited Surat in 1663, writes:

> A cidade he mais comprida que larga: na grãdeza leua muita ventagem á nossa Euora, como tambem no numero de seus vizinhos, que eu faço passarem de cem mil, Mogoles brancos, Mouro Indunates, Gentios de toda a relê, Christãos de varias naçoẽs; gente emfim de mundo todo, que ou viue em Çurrate de assento, ou vem àquelle porto por negoceação. Em Çurrate se achaõ Hespanhôes, Franceses, Alemaês, Ingleses, Olandeses, Flamengos, Dunquerqueses, Italianos, Vgaros, Polacos, Suecos, Turcos, Arabios, Persas, Tartaros, Gorgis, Scitas, Chinas, Malauares, Bengales, Chingalás, Armenios, com outra infinitade de gentes barbaras, & desconhecidas. (Godinho 1665: 22)

Godsdienst en bygelovigheden, et alia. Conversely, a section on Verscheijde Oliteijten squeezed in after the conversion tables in UMS and PMS seems to be Ketelaar’s own addition. However, in DHMS is just the last section of the thematic vocabulary.

In 18th and 19th century printed books, *surie* is often presented as *de surie of palmwijn* (cf. google.books.nl).
The city is longer than wide; in its size it has an advantage over our Evora, as it also has in the number of its inhabitants, which I estimate to be more than a hundred thousand, White Muggals, Indian Muslims, all types of Pagans, Christians of various nationalities and, in fact, people from all over the world who have either settled in Surat or have come to the port on business. In Surat we find Spaniards, Frenchmen, Germans, English, Dutch, Flemish, Dunkirkians, Italians, Hungarians, Poles, Swedes, Turks, Arabs, Persians, Tartars, Georgians, Scythians, Chinese, Malabariz, Bengalis, Sinhalese, Armenians, and an endless variety of other strange barbarian people.

Ketelaar defines Mogol as “een blank mensch van vel” — a person with white skin. A Persian is a pharsi mogol, or alternately: pharsie, mogol, as in the 1714 copy. A Christian is jssahi — with no mention of the alternate Arabic origin-word nasarâni, or nasrâni, ‘a Nazarene’, as in Marsden, Gilchrist, Fallon and Platts. The word for Jew has two pronunciations, the English-sounding dsjauwd in 1700, and more common iahood in 1714. Ketelaar enumerates a few European nations, giving only Hindustani equivalents and leaving the Persian column blank. He starts with een neederlander (‘a Dutchman’) — in a rather cute phonetic spelling bvellendees close to the Dutch Hollandees, and resonating with the Malayan ōrang wolanda. Other Hindustani names for Europeans include francees ‘a Frenchman’, englees ‘an Englishman’, and of course fringie ‘a Portuguese’. The copy from 1714 adds hoogduijtscher – allmaan ‘a German’, and Deenmarki ‘a Dane’. There is no mention of Spanish, Italians, Poles, Hungarians (let alone Dunkirkians – more likely Dunkirkers, the notorious Spanish-sponsored commerce raiders), presumably because those countries had no significant trading posts in India at the time. Compare this with a later observation of Europeans in Surat, between 1759-1800 (Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency, p. 149): “The chief European traders were, as before, the English, Dutch, French, and Portuguese. But, in addition to these, mention is made of Danes, Swedes, and Germans.” We see that Ketelaar was only missing the Swedes – understandably so, as the Swedish East India Company was not established until 1731, long after Ketelaar’s death. Describing the merchant nations in Surat, Thomas Salmon (1747: 53) writes: “The English, French, and Dutch have their factories here and trade very largely; but the Moors, Armenians, Banians, Arabs, and Jews, are much greater merchants.” Also Ovington in 1689 marvels at Armenians:

Armenians, above any of the rest, travel the farthest, spread themselves in all parts of Asia, as well as Europe, and are as universal Merchants as any in the World. The Armenians are Civil and Industrious, their Language is one of the most general in all Asia. [...] For they have always had a celebrated name for Merchandise. (Ovington 1696: 222)

From Asia and Africa, Ketelaar lists arabie ‘an Arab’; roemij ‘a Turk’ (“a native of Rum” from Arabic word for the “land of the Romans”, i.e. the Byzantine Empire); siedie ‘an Angolan’ and hapsje – in Dutch habasinder, an Abyssinian or Ethiopian (two great African nations, and victims of the slave trade); telinga ‘a Malabar’; tsjienka ‘a Chinese’; Uzbekie for a Russian; mallinghi ‘a Malay’; armeni ‘an Armenian’; klimagh ‘a Tartar’, or rather a Calmuc Tartar. From Sri Lanka, we have two not quite expected “nations”: lancka ‘a Sri Lankan’ and rakkes ‘a giant’ (reus). According to Clough, in his Sinhalese English Dictionary, Rakus is “a demon, fiend, ogre, Titan”, and Rakusa is “a harsh or morose man, demon, vampire”. Marsden also quotes the word rakshasa — “giant; demon, evil genius of the Hindu mythology” (1812: 147). Together with Yakkas and Nagas, Rakshasas were the mythological
original tribes inhabiting the island of Sri Lanka, famous for their large bodies. Needless to say, none of these ‘nationalities’ can be found in the little Latin-Dutch dictionary for the use of schoolboys in Amsterdam, which might have been at the source of Ketelaar’s lexicographic work.

But how did the Hindustani perceive the Europeans? Although Ketelaar’s list contains two separate entries and two slightly different forms: fringie as a Hindustani translation of ‘a Portuguese’ and faringie (or frangi in a later copy) for a European, let us presume he means the same word. In his chapter of “Explanations of various Persian and Hindustani words, used among the Moors”, he combines the two in one definition: Fringe is een Europia[n], ook wel een portugees — ‘a European, and also a Portuguese’. There is little doubt about the word farangi (in its plethora of spellings: farangi, Firingi; firungee; friñggi; farangî; franghi; ferenghie), ubiquitous in Asia since at least the 14th century, as meaning “a Frank, a native of Europe”. In some cases it also means Christian, as in Marsden’s Dictionary of the Malayan Language (frînggi – 1812: 207). Although Hobson-Jobson quotes a few examples of feringee meaning Indian-born “black” Portuguese, the examples come from after 1750; so Ketelaar’s version may have quite different origins.

When, in 1701, another Dutch grammar writer and minister, Johannes Ruëll, died in Ceylon, the Governor and Council composed a lengthy tribute praising Ruëll’s linguistic proficiency, and despairing of the difficulty in finding a successor who could carry on correspondence with the King of Kandy (cf. van Goor 1978):

want wij weten niet een Europiaan, die selvs maar Portugees kan lesen en schrijven, off den eijgentlijke grond dien tale verstaat.

‘[...] for we do not know of a single European who can even read or write in Portuguese, or at least understands the foundations of that language’.

Not a single European who can speak Portuguese (emphasis mine). To these men the Portuguese were without question the enemy, carriers of the “papist superstition”. The Portuguese, by their pioneering and overwhelming presence in Asia since early 16th century, had certainly gained a privileged position in the hearts and the vocabularies of the locals. But they also seem to have occupied a unique spot in the minds of their fellow Europeans. The idea that Portuguese are Europeans did not quite catch on at the time — at least not among the Dutch. Later, under the British Raj, the English put their own egocentric spin on the same word. Fallon (1879: 870) defines farangî as a Frank; European; an Englishman, and Platts (1884: 780) confirms the meaning as European as well as English. What are the sources of this “also” mentality, where the Dutch see the Portuguese as non-European, and the British see themselves as non-European? Perhaps this pars pro toto and totum pro parte confusion is fuelled by ideas of a nation’s position in the great colonial chess game of the era — and of course, by the concept of a nation itself, very different today’s before the 19th century.26 In

---

26 The concept of ‘nation’ has been argued to be a relatively modern phenomenon. Eric J. Hobsbawm has stated that “[n]ations, as we know... are not, as Bagehot thought, “as old as history” and that “the modern sense of the word is no older than the eighteenth century, give or take the odd predecessor.” Hobsbawm cites the New English Dictionary to support his argument which “pointed out
any event, by the end of the 18th century, the term *farangi* seems to have acquired a disparaging connotation that is totally absent in Ketelaar.

The European names for inhabitants of India are a separate issue. Noting the Dutch distinction between Muslims and Heathens (which reflects an established Indo-Persian usage of dividing the inhabitants of India into Muslims and non-Muslims), Kruijzer (2009: 15) recognizes this contrast as largely the same as the distinction between Islamicate and Indic in the modern scholarship. This couldn’t be more true in regard to Ketelaar’s usage. Many other authors had traditionally based their description of the inhabitants of Northern India on the distinction between *Mouro Persiano* versus *Bracmene Gentio* (Manuel Godinho, 1665: 22-23), or basically, between Indian Moors (Muslims) and Hindus. *Hobson-Jobson* (Yule 1903: 581-582) explains the etymology of the word Moor:

MOOR, MOORMAN, s. (and adj. MOORISH)

[...] To the Spaniards and Portuguese, whose contact was with the Musulmans of Mauritania who had passed over and conquered the Peninsula, all Mahomedans were Moors. So the Mahomedans whom the Portuguese met with on their voyages to India, on what coast soever, were alike styled Mouro; and from the Portuguese the use of this term, as synonymous with Mahommedan, passed to Hollanders and Englishmen.

What strikes us immediately when we look at Ketelaar’s list of nations is that it contains religious affiliations. Religion has always been a strong social and national identity marker, so it should not surprise us to find it in the Indian context. Even today, it will raise more eyebrows in India to introduce oneself as an atheist than as a follower of the most obscure religious cult. An interesting point is that, even though the adjective *moorse* (Moorish) and the noun (*Mooren* - Moors), appear in his title and throughout Ketelaar’s book, he manages to avoid the term in his main list of nationalities. Instead, he uses the word *Regtgelovige* — ‘true believer’. We find the same word used in *Europische Mercurius*, published in Amsterdam in 1719 (Volume 30, p. 95): “een Leger van 100 000 Musulmanen of Regtgelovige” is opposed to the *Ongelovige*, or Infidels. The same source mentions *Musulmannen of regtsinnige Gelovingen* — ‘Muslims, or right-thinking (i.e. orthodox) believers’.

Daniel Havart (1693: 117) also uses the term “een regt-gelovige” as the definition of the word *Momien* (another Arabic term for Muslim). The adjective *regtgelovige* is commonly used for Christians and Jews, but the noun usually refers to Muslims. In his Dutch-French dictionary from 1710, Halma does not mention the word in the noun form, only the adjective, as in “rechtgelovig Christen”. European adoption of the concept “true believers” may well be the result of contact with Muslims, who originally used the term. In 1812, William Marsden translates the Malay word *moslem* or *muslam* in a similar way, as “belonging to the true faith; a true believer, musulman” (1812: 323). In Ketelaar’s time, the term *Mahometaen* is also in use (for example in 1672 in *Asia, of naukerige beschryving van Het Rijk des Grooten Mogols* by Olfert Dapper). In the 1714 copy of Ketelaar’s work we witness a split:
regtgelovige is still translated as musselman, but a separate entry mahometaen appears, having mahomeddi as its Hindustani equivalent.

It is worth noting that Moor replaced Turk as a most common term for Muslim in Europe relatively late. In the middle ages, the Muslims were known in Europe as Saracens (Yule 1903: 581). Moor as Indian Muslim quickly gained popularity in British English, yet in the Dutch language in Europe, contrary to the overseas and VOC-context usage, the word Moor seem to have never been extended beyond the inhabitants of North Africa and the Arabs of the Iberian Peninsula. In Halma’s French-Flemish dictionary (1719), More describes only “Habitant de la Mauritianie” (“an inhabitant of Mauretainia” with synonyms Moor, neger, zwaart, mooriaan. Consequently, More is “le language des Moores” (“the language of the Moors”, i.e. Arabic), or de Negers spraak (idem: 510). However, Musulmans are translated as ‘Turcs’ (Turks, 1719: 517), with the adjective Musulman translated as ‘turkish’ (Turc; Dutch synonyms: Turksch, Ottomannisch) – a reminder of the times when Europe felt the threat of the Ottomans. A curious expression joins the two nations: traiter de Turc à Maure (Op zijn Turksh handelen, of onthaalen) — to treat with the utmost rigor. In the fifth edition from 1761, the words Mahométan, Mahométans were added as synonyms of Musulman (1761: 540). The title of Adriaan Reland’s seminal treatise from 1705 De religione Mohammedica libri duo was translated in Dutch in 1718 as Verhandeling van de godsdienst der Mahometaenen, yet the German translation from 1716 kept the term “Turkish” as well: Zwey Bücher von der Türkischen oder Mohammedischen Religion. Interestingly, Lorenzen (1999: 648) mentions a 16th century “humorous poetic dialog between a Hindu Brahmin and a Muslim” called in the original Hindu-turka-samvada, in which the term “Turk” (turka) is clearly used in the sense “Muslim”, which witnesses to a broader reach of the term than just Europe.

A very common, and therefore easy to overlook, term for Hindus used by Ketelaar is Heijden — pagan, gentile, or idolater. It is a translation of the Portuguese Gentios, heathens, which as a label for the original inhabitants of India has a long tradition in European languages. In English, it resulted in a “corrupted” form, Gentoo. Interestingly, in the Judeo-Christian Bible, Gentiles originally denoted non-Jews. In early medieval Irish texts (8th/9th century), non-Christian Irish are called gentilech, gentiles, a term that was also used as a synonym for Vikings. How and when did it begin to specify pagans, heathens, being both non-Christian and non-Muslim? Early references to Hindus as “Gentiles” appear in 16th century Portuguese missionary writings. Hobson-Jobson quotes the 1548 Cartas, by Simão Botelho de Andrade. François Xavier complains about Gentios in his letters to Ignace de Loyola from 1544 (as quoted in Didier 2005: 34). It was applied in contradistinction to Moors. It is common among contemporary scholars to assume that “Pagans” (and therefore “Hindu”) used to encompass all Indians who were not Muslims, Parsis, Christians or Jews — so Jains, Sikhs, Buddhists, etc.

Shakespeare may have helped to popularise its use with his play Othello (c. 1603), subtitled The Moor of Venice.

Interestingly, Lorenzen (1999: 648) mentions a 16th century “humorous poetic dialog between a Hindu Brahmin and a Muslim” called in the original Hindu-turka-samvada, in which the term “Turk” (turka) is clearly used in the sense “Muslim”.

I am grateful to Fearghal Duffy for providing this information.
Numerous are studies of linguistic, social and religious aspects of the term ‘Hindu’ itself. To mention just one: Koenraad Elst’s book *Who is a Hindu?* gives some unique insight into the history of the term. According to Elst, the word Hindu “was brought into India with the Islamic invaders, and meant: Indian Pagan” (2002: 32). An interesting remark, if we consider that the reason behind the Portuguese use of *Gentios* also seems to be based on religion; Hindu polytheism would intrinsically characterise them as Pagans. In classical Latin, the word *paganus* simply meant rustic, rural. Likewise, the Dutch *Etymologisch Woordenboek van het Nederlands* points to the Proto-Germanic root of the word *heidn*, meaning field, open land. But with time, the term acquired pejorative meanings as ‘bumpkin’, ‘yokel’, and by the second half of the fourth century was being used to describe non-Christians in general — as Christianity had begun as an urban movement. Elst (1993: 206) believes this association is not a mere historical accident, but a logical consequence of Paganism’s being rooted in “the experience of life cycles, the power of nature, the celestial phenomena”, and Christianity and other monotheistic religions being a “revealed” religion that had to be preached to propagate. There are even theories that the concept of Hinduism as a unified, systematic religion is a construct of Western Orientalism (cf. Pennington 2005). Indeed, the first use of the word “Hinduism” can be traced to the 18th century British colonial context. However, it has to be noted that any such discussions of religious and ethnic nomenclature should be language-specific. For Ketelaar, the Hindustani word for *heijden* was *hindou*. If we analyse the use of words *Heydenen* and *Heydendom* in A. Rogerius (1651), we clearly see that he narrows his descriptions to the religion of Brahmans using *Samscortam* (Sanscrit) in their book of law *Vedam* (Vedas). Moreover, when he describes a caste, or rather “a family” (*gheslachte*) of *Theers* (possibly *Dhedh*, the untouchable group from outside the Hindu ranking system) in Gujarat, he remarks that they seem to be *noch Heydens, noch Moors* [...] *maer op haer selven te leven sonder eenigh Gheloof, ofte Godsdienst* (‘neither Pagans nor Muslims, but living by themselves, without faith or religion’ - Rogerius 1651: 11). The nuances and limits of the concept of *Heydendom* are therefore more clear to him than it may be expected from reading contemporary historical analyses.

In fact, the Europeans, rather than talking of Hindus in general, often named specifically the castes with which they frequently interacted, says Kruijzert (2009: 15). And so, in his preface, Ketelaar mentions *banjaanen*; similarly, Henry Lord in 1630 wrote a book based on his experiences in Surat, titled “A discovery of the sect of the Banians”. Gupta (2000) describes *Baniyas* as members of merchant castes who were “demonstratively pietistic in their social behaviour and relations” (2000: 125) to the extent that the orthodox ones were thought by Marco Polo to be Brahmans (*ibid.*). They traditionally avoided any contact with the Muslims, as it might have endangered their purity (*ibid.*). Ketelaar mentions them as well as other “Pagans” as possessing their own script, which is nevertheless never used by the Muslims (see also 3.3). These may have included other trading groups, like Chettis and Komatis (Kruijzert, *ibid.*). In the light of the above, one last question imposes itself: who were Ketelaar’s informants? There is no doubt that his whole work is based on the language spoken among the [Mughal] Muslims: he lists *Moorse namen* (Moorish names) with their meaning, and frequently talks about words and grammatical constructions used by the Moors (*De pronomina, die de mooren [...] gebruiken*, 'The pronouns that the Moors use; [...] *bij de mooren weijnigh gebruikijfijk*, 'seldom used by the Moors', *Wanneer de moorsen hindoustanners willen seggen [...]*, 'When the Moor Hindustanis want to say [...]'); explicatie van verscheijfde soo persiaanse als Hindoustaanse woorden bij de mooren gebruikijfelijk
‘explanation of various Persian and Hindustani words used by Moors’, etc.). Consequently, he
uses the glottonym moors and moorse taale interchangeably with Hindustani, Hindustanse
taal – as we have seen in chapter 3.2. Last but not least, the choice of word forms (such as
dsumberaad [jum’a-rāt] for Thursday, where François-Marie de Tours (1704) has
brespoutvar [from bhīhaspatti-wār, or Friday as dsamma vs. de Tours’ soukrvar from šakr-
vār] strongly suggest Islamicitic context (cf. Table 17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch (UMS)</th>
<th>Hindustani (UMS)</th>
<th>Hindustani (Platts)</th>
<th>Persian (UMS)</th>
<th>Persian (Steingass)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d’sondagh (‘Sunday’)</td>
<td>Jtuar</td>
<td>ḥawār</td>
<td>jeksjombe</td>
<td>yak-shambih,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maandagh (‘Monday’)</td>
<td>pieṛ</td>
<td>ṣer</td>
<td>dosjombe</td>
<td>dā-shambih, da-shambah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dings dagh (‘Tuesday’)</td>
<td>Mangel</td>
<td>Ṣingāl</td>
<td>cesjombe</td>
<td>si-shambih,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woonsdagh (‘Wednesday’)</td>
<td>Bhoeit</td>
<td>ṣapi</td>
<td>tsjahaarsjombe</td>
<td>chahār-shambih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>donderdag (‘Thursday’)</td>
<td>dsummeraad</td>
<td>ḥumār</td>
<td>pas sjombe</td>
<td>parshambih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrijdag (‘Friday’)</td>
<td>Dsumma</td>
<td>ḥume</td>
<td>d’summa</td>
<td>jum’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zaturdag (‘Saturday’)</td>
<td>Siniser</td>
<td>ḥanejār</td>
<td>sjombe</td>
<td>shambih</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nota: onse vrijdag is der mooren, gelijk ook aller mahomethanen son, off beede dagh.

Table 17: Ketelaar’s days of the week with modern equivalents
(Chapter 35 Van de dagen)

From other historical sources we know that the relationship between Muslims and the Dutch
in India was generally good, and “on occasion took the form of conviviality and
commensality” (Kruijzet 2009: 39). Although the records suggest that the frequent dinner
invitations by Muslims in India were never reciprocated by the Dutchmen for reasons of
purity and keeping the rules of halal, Geleynssen noted that the Muslims had no objections to
European wine (idem: 40). Generally, the harmonious relations may have been encouraged by
a similar financial status, or the shared aversion towards “idolatrous” religious representation.
Kruijtzer, quoting several documented cases of friendship and collaboration (including a
Dutchman in Hyderabad in 1682 who explicitly wrote that “with the Moors it is rather easier
to interact that with the Brahmins”) draws a conclusion that “the views of these Dutchmen of
events in India were more informed by Muslim ‘informants’ than by others like the Brahmin
‘informants’ who were so important in shaping the British view of India in the late 18th and
early 19th century” (idem: 42). It would be interesting to conduct a more in-depth
comparative study comparing and contrasting the descriptions of Hindustani prepared by
different European nations and confessions to see whether any significant trends and
differences can be identified.
8.7 Conclusions

Starting with the title, the lexical part of Ketelaar’s *Instructie* is modeled on other contemporaneous works. It combines an extensive trilingual onomasiological dictionary with lists of words arranged according to their grammatical category, and accompanied with an alphabetic index. Yet little does it resemble the modest bilingual schoolbook for boys to be used in Amsterdam gymnasiums it was likely modelled upon.

Customs and “ways of life” from North India are recorded in the form of various wordlists, covering topics ranging from household utensils, to tailoring terms, to administrative jargon, to religious traditions and concepts. Already this explicit lexical level provides copious cultural information. It is interesting to see how *karma, asana, tikka, roti, samosa, kebab, halal*, nowaday common words, were introduced to European readers in the late 17th century. Perhaps even more interesting is the way Ketelaar, true to the Western “sameness-and-difference” classification principle, introduced this new exotic world with the help of more familiar European concepts. As a result, we have Sundays falling on Fridays, January in October, Islamic prayer beads becoming “paternoster”, not to mention curious equivalents of local food items. We get a glimpse of the world as existed in 1698, including reflections of contemporary scientific debates, like for example the taxonomy of bats, or the ancient relationship between languages. In the words of Hakala, (2016: 12) “lexicographic works reflect dominant cosmographies”, which Dudney (2017: 325) interprets that “a dictionary reflects its author’s intentions and contemporary social and political circumstances as much as the language it purports to describe”. These words could not be more true in regards to Ketelaar’s vocabulary. Beside information obvious in the context of trade (such as tables with conversions of weights and measures valid in a particular Indian port), indirect information about author’s political interests can also be found (e.g. the names of the rulers from the Mughal dynasty included in the list of Muslim names). A distich that can be linked to a contemporaneous rupee coin discloses gossip about a disliked emperor; a detail in an otherwise rather ordinary list of months records the moment of a radical societal change. Furthermore, implicit attitudes towards religious and national identifications are revealed, where some nations are “less European” than others, and followers of certain non-Christian religions are nevertheless considered “the true believers”, whereas others remain “heathens” by geographical and ethnic default. As a result, a more complete picture emerges of a socio-cultural landscape in which the Dutch merchant Ketelaar wrote a strikingly modern in its approach introduction to Hindustani and Persian language, which, had it been publish in time, had a potential to become an international best-seller.

---

30 Even the philosopher John Locke (1632-1604) took part in the controversial discussion whether bats are birds (1689: 3: 317). Ketelaar still has them listed among birds.
9. Conclusions and desiderata

To any Indologist, *Instructie off Onderwijsinge der Hindoustanse en Persiaanse talen* is instantly recognizable as the iconic ‘first grammar of Hindustani’ – just as the name of its author Joan Josua Ketelaar is well-familiar to scholars of Dutch colonial history. Although fragmentary studies of it have been made (Chatterji 1935, Vogel 1941, Bodewitz 1994-95, Bhatia 1987, 2008, McGregor 2001), and a Latin translation (Mill 1743) and one English edition published (Bhatia and Machida 2008), having read them all, I was left with the impression that the complete story and value of this work has never been fully appreciated. With this study, I wanted to do justice to a rather special Dutch East India Company merchant, and to a quite significant piece of work he created. My ambition for this study was to put more history into linguistics, and more linguistics into history.

Contrary to the general belief, valid until a couple of years ago, that there was only one extant manuscript, there are in fact three extant copies of his work, which I was able to consult and study. The first one, previously known, was copied by Isaacq van den Hoeven in 1698 (Den Haag MS). The second one, undated, was possibly made by Ketelaar himself (Utrecht MS). The third one was made by Gideon Boudaen in 1714 (Paris MS). On the basis of a paleographical analysis and other textual clues, especially shared mistakes, I came to the conclusion that the published Latin translation of Ketelaar’s grammar of Hindustani and Persian by David Mill from 1743 was based on the Paris copy – a conclusion that is corroborated by historical data.

In the course of my research, I traced the origin of Ketelaar’s ideas to two books that directly influenced his work. The first was John Greaves’ *Elementa Linguæ Persicae* from 1649 which he likely used for the Persian grammar, and *Linguae Latinae Rudimenta*, a basic contemporaneous Latin-Dutch vocabulary for the use of schoolboys in Amsterdam that gave shape to his thematic dictionary and the overall structure. So, was Ketelaar in any way an innovative scholar? The answer depends on how much credit one wants to give him for the approach he adopted. Undoubtedly, his Persian grammar is generally a direct translation of the Greaves’ one. For a non-scholar, to make a translation of a Latin linguistic work and to adapt it to a beginner learners’ practical needs by editing out too specific details and rules, it is already an achievement. Also the fact that although the Latin text is kept very closely to the original, the actual Persian forms show divergence from the book, possibly reflecting the colloquial speech of India, demonstrates that Ketelaar was not just a mindless copyist but a thoughtful writer. In fact, Ketelaar can be regarded as a link between the academic Latin-speaking community in Europe and less literate merchants working overseas who sought practical knowledge of foreign languages to be used in daily trade dealings.
Furthermore, a systematic analysis of the text of the *Instructie* also showed that Ketelaar modelled his Hindustani grammar on a Persian one. Similarly, for a non-scholar to approach writing a grammar of a new foreign language by modelling it on an existing grammar of another language cannot be seen as anything but a clever and prudent strategy. Surely, one can reprove Ketelaar for the fact some significant grammatical phenomena such as ergativity, resulting from typological differences between Persian and Hindustani have eluded his attention, yet one has to remember what his starting point was as well as his purpose: a quick practical language help for his peers stationed in Northern India. Had he included more dialogues or examples, or more text in general, it might have been possible for him, or at least for a scholar working on a later edition to spot these atypical cases – after all, he recognised the characteristic word order of Hindustani to be different from Persian when he had enough sentence samples. But ironically, this shortcoming may be due to Ketelaar’s decision to stick with the model of a renown grammar he knew.

This different origin and purpose of Ketelaar’s work is reflected in the choice of his metalinguistic terminology. In both grammars, Ketelaar uses regular Latin grammatical labels (although sometimes morphologically ‘dutchified’) alongside a curious mix of standard and invented Dutch terms. Ketelaar was certainly familiar with many Dutch terms used by scholars in the Republic, yet sometimes he perplexes the reader with the (mis)use of a certain Dutch word, such as the *getalle–gestalte* case (see 5.3.2), and it is hard to establish where the confusion originated. In other cases, he creates his own labels, often direct calques from Latin, or possibly German-inspired. From the mixed style and inconsistencies exhibited in his approach, it does not seem likely that he consulted any contemporaneous grammatical study in Dutch; rather, he created his own eclectic metalanguage based on diverse sources. He seems to be either motivated by the drive for simplicity, or somehow limited by his insufficient familiarity with specialised Dutch vocabulary.

In order to better understand Ketelaar’s work with its intricacies and abstruse historical references I looked at the broadly understood linguistic production of people in a similar position, working for the VOC overseas. From many unpublished linguistic texts scattered in libraries across Europe and beyond, I realised that many untold stories are often locked in the material aspects of the manuscripts that carry them. The type of binding, paper, ink, bookseller plates, etc. are vital clues to people who can recognize them. And indeed, one of the manuscripts, preserved in Biblioteca Marciana in Venice, helped me solve a provenance puzzle, explaining how the date 1715 entered the received history of linguistics as the year of the creation of Ketelaar’s text. An anonymous vocabulary from Leiden proved its use for understanding Ketelaar’s phonemic transcription. An early sailors’ book by De Hautman suggested that the Dutch merchants may have been using his – or a similar – model for comparing different calendars and Muslim holidays. This exercise further convinced me that this Dutch linguistic
production has to be seen as predominantly mercantile, in contrast to missionary motivated works of other seafaring nations.

An almost total absence of religious references or vocabulary, in contrast to multiple practical elements such as calendars, conversion of weights and measures, dialogues devised to conduct business, fragments of political information, and a lot of specialised trade vocabulary all point to a professional and secular target audience. Such a pragmatic approach is especially emphasized in Ketelaar’s work, which with its lists of *confusabilia* (similarly sounding words) and conjugation tables for quick retrieval of a verbal form is almost a perfect beginner’s language manual.

The lexical part of Ketelaar’s *Instructie* combines an extensive trilingual onomasiological dictionary with lists of words arranged according to their grammatical category, and accompanied with an alphabetic index, yet little does it resemble the modest bilingual schoolbook for boys to be used in Amsterdam gymnasiums which it was likely modelled upon. Beside information obvious in the context of trade (such as tables with conversions of weights and measures valid in a particular Indian port), indirect information about the author’s political interests can also be found: a list of rulers’ names; a distich on a disliked emperor, etc. Also, implicit attitudes towards religious and national identifications are hidden in a seemingly unremarkable list of nationalities. When even a list of months records the moment of a radical societal change, a more complete picture emerges of a socio-cultural landscape in which Ketelaar wrote his introduction to Hindustani and Persian languages.

Being able to zoom out on the overall picture on Dutch linguistic production of the VOC era with its common characteristics can also be helpful to understand individual works on particular languages, as an in-depth understanding of the metalanguage is the real key to reading a multilingual historical text. The nuances of standardisation, historical and regional spelling variations, and the historical phonology of the description language are all necessary to properly establish the linguistic details from a historical account of a foreign language.

Unavoidably, the present study is limited in some aspects. This is partially due to my original decision to provide a broad overarching approach in order to show how multifaceted a ‘simple’ historical linguistic text can be. I did not present a historical grammatical analysis of neither Persian nor Hindustani, which is not my area of expertise, but instead I specifically focused on the relation between the models Ketelaar used and their impact on the quality, comprehensiveness, and the overall shape of his work. Further philologically-oriented comparative studies of the earliest grammars and dictionaries of Hindustani (including De Tours’ *Thesaurus* and *Grammatica Linguae Indianna*, the anonymous *Grammatica Indostana* from 1778, Schulze’s *Grammatica Hindostanica* from 1745, the anonymous Persian-Hindustani-Dutch dictionary from Leiden, and the anonymous Portuguese-Hindustani from SOAS, London) will hopefully offer answers as to
the development of modern Hindi-Urdu. Such projects may possibly be undertaken as an extension of the project on early Hindustani in European sources at the University of Uppsala. Also, inasmuch as I would have liked to be able to make a more in-depth analysis of Ketelaar’s phonemic transcriptions, especially compared and contrasted with other contemporaneous authors, in an attempt to make a phonological reconstruction of the 17th century Hindustani, such analysis is beyond the scope of the present study.

Most definitely, the present overview of Dutch VOC linguistic works is just a first step, and more work is needed in order to produce a comprehensive inventory of it, possibly incorporating translations (religious and other) which I deliberately excluded here. It has to be noted, however, that many of the contemporaneous Dutch works are devoted to writing and pronunciation, entirely omitted by Ketelaar, and in many cases they explore the subject in great detail – an apparent trend that would benefit from a study in its own right. A comprehensive critical evaluation of the Dutch linguistic heritage would definitely be worthwhile; it may unravel a story of knowledge circulation and textual transmission between European nations, and possibly reveal connections with the indigenous linguistic traditions of Asia.

Such a study will benefit from a stronger historiographical framing, since the VOC period was an important moment of epistemological transition, also reflected in discussions about languages and translations. On the other hand, the newly discovered manuscripts should be studied using the whole range of available technologies, from paper fibre analysis, to hyperspectral imaging, to petrographic sand analysis (for which the initial funding has been awarded by the Gonda Fund).

Last but not least, a new annotated edition, possibly digital, and English translation of the *Instructie* is necessary, if only to give access to a reliable version of the text for the scholars interested in the development of Hindustani who may not read early modern Dutch. Such an edition should be based on the most complete Utrecht manuscript, and should include variants from the three copies.
This thesis is a multifaceted study of the language manual for Hindustani and Persian entitled *Instructie off Onderwysinge der Hindoustanse en Persiaanse talen*, written ca. 1698 by the Dutch East India Company merchant Joan Josua Ketelaar, and famously containing the first grammar of Hindustani. For the first time, two recently discovered manuscript copies of the text (Utrecht MS and Paris MS) have been examined and compared with the one previously known copy (Den Haag MS). One of the most significant findings in this study is the discovery of models for both the grammatical part and the thematic vocabulary. Ketelaar’s work is put in the context of other linguistic productions by the employees of the Dutch East India Company in Asia.

The dissertation is organised into nine chapters. Chapter one demarcates the scope of the study and situates its disciplinary embedding within the History of Descriptive Linguistics, and its relation to Missionary and Colonial Linguistics. It also summarises the fate of Ketelaar’s work, which after being translated into Latin and published in 1743 fell into oblivion for a couple of hundred years until the Venetian philologist and translator Emilio Teza (1831-1912) revisited it in 1895, pointing it out to the influential Irish Indologist Sir George Abraham Grierson (1851-1941). The first study of the text took place only in the 1940’s and was the work of the famous Bengali linguist Suniti Kumar Chatterji (1890-1977) who, however, based it on the Latin translation from 1743. Around the same time, the Dutch Sanskritist and archaeologist Jean Philippe Vogel (1871–1958) discovered a manuscript copy of the original Dutch text in the State Record Office in The Hague. Vogel also contributed most to the reconstruction of Ketelaar’s biography from the archival sources in his native Elbing, shortly before they were dispersed and destroyed in WWII. The discussion about Ketelaar’s grammar continued between next-generation scholars, Bhatia and Bodewitz in 1990, culminating in the first English edition by Bhatia and Machida in 2008.

Chapter two is devised to offer a broader context to Ketelaar’s work and consists of an exploratory overview of the linguistic documents created under the auspices of the VOC. It starts with a brief historical introduction contrasting the Catholic legitimisation of the overseas expansion with the Dutch pragmatic and seemingly libertarian standing. This is followed by a brief outline of the Company’s attitude to indigenous languages and its role in the circulation of linguistic knowledge between Asia and Europe. The main part consists of a survey of extant Dutch linguistic documents preserved in various institutions across Europe and beyond (Cambridge University Library; Bodleian Library in Oxford; Biblioteca Marciana in Venice; Vatican Library; State Library of New South Wales in Sydney; Fondation Custodia in Paris; Department of National Archives of Sri Lanka in Colombo; National Library of Russia in Saint Petersburg; Protestantse Theologische Universiteit in Kampen;
Tropenmuseum in Amsterdam; university libraries of Utrecht, Leiden and Amsterdam; Het Nationaal Archief in The Hague), some of which are described for the first time and classified here according to their purpose and target audience. As a result, the reader not only gains new insights regarding Ketelaar’s work, but also gets a bigger picture of the scope and content of Dutch linguistics of the VOC times.

Possibly the important contribution of the present thesis is the description and analysis of the previously unknown manuscript copies: one from Utrecht and one from Paris. In Chapter three, I focus on the Instructie as a document, combining cutting edge technology with archival research to reveal new facts about the provenance of these two manuscripts. Consequently, the author of the Utrecht copy has been confirmed as Ian Iosua Ketelaar (who might have even written it himself, since no copyist name is mentioned), and the copyist of the Paris manuscript as one of Ketelaar’s assistants, Gideon Boudaen. By corroborating textual clues using historical data I also prove that the Paris copy most likely served as a basis for the Latin translation by Professor David Mill from 1743. More importantly, I was able to identify the direct models that Ketelaar used: for the Persian grammar, John Greaves’ Elementa Linguæ Persicæ from 1649, and for the thematic dictionary and overall structure Linguae Latinae rudimenta... in usum Scholae Amstelodamensis from 1633, a basic contemporaneous Latin-Dutch vocabulary for the use of schoolboys in Amsterdam. Consequently, I demonstrate that Ketelaar first translated and adapted Greaves’ Persian grammar, and then used it as a model for his Hindustani grammar, which explains the approach, selection of topics and certain omissions. Notably, although the topics and definitions in the Persian grammar are directly translated from Greaves’ Latin, certain grammatical forms which Greaves had extracted from written classical texts are replaced with more colloquial forms, a witness to Ketelaar’s linguistic ear and his pragmatic approach.

Chapter four is a methodological reflection on how to read the Instructie. It starts with an outline of the convoluted history of Hindustani and its script as described by the early European travellers, which is followed by a brief discussion of issues with the Romanisation of Hindustani. Presenting the model of Ketelaar’s notation prepared by Chatterji (1935: 71-78), I make a case for paying more attention to the language of description of the original text: 17th century Dutch. Accordingly, I identify spelling tendencies in the three copies of the Instructie, putting them in the context of Dutch standards at the time. Searching for Ketelaar’s transcription strategies, I analyse his spelling of Persian first, as it possibly had a different source then the Hindustani. I finish the chapter by presenting a case of a Dutch Romanisation of a similar text, which shows the value of comparative studies for understanding how the Dutch orthography and phonology may be influencing the transcription. Without such an approach, I claim, it is not possible to properly evaluate the 17th century phonemic values of Persian and Hindustani words in any future study. Further research in this area is required to create a better methodology for historical phonological analysis.

Chapter five sets out to establish whether and to what extent Ketelaar’s Persian grammar is an original work. Starting with a brief history of Persian studies in Europe, I describe the process that led me to the discovery of a direct model for Ketelaar’s Persian grammar (the 1649 work by Greaves), which happened through the perusing of other relevant 17th century grammatical works. The paragraph-for-paragraph comparison between the source text and Ketelaar’s adaptation is also an opportunity to describe the content of the Persian grammar in the Instructie, which has been up to the present constantly overshadowed by its Hindustani twin.
In Chapter six, I sketch the linguistic situation in Mughal India to emphasize the role and position of the two languages described by Ketelaar. In the 17th century, Hindustani and Persian were two important languages of North India, and their mastering was crucial for the swift functioning of the Dutch East India Company kantoor. Persian was the language of administration of the Mughal court and therefore necessary for all correspondence; Hindustani was a link language of communication used in daily trade dealings, which explains why Ketelaar decided to include both of them in his language manual. In order to help contextualise Ketelaar’s pioneering work, I briefly present other early European descriptions of Hindustani written in French, German, Latin, Portuguese and English. The main goal, however, is to scrutinise the textual evidence to determine whether and to what degree the Hindustani grammar might have been modelled on the Persian text described in the previous chapter. Wherever possible, Ketelaar’s grammatical definitions and observations are put in a comparative perspective, be it from the standpoint of the modern standard Hindi-Urdu (MSH-U), or other aforementioned grammars.

Chapter seven is dedicated to an analysis of the grammatical metalanguage used by Ketelaar in an attempt to identify its origins. I start with Ketelaar’s use of Latin, and then move to his strategies in the Dutch language. I single out terms drawing from the Dutch grammatical tradition, and scrutinise Ketelaar’s own creations in seeking to establish which terminological choices are deliberate and which incidental, or maybe even a mistake. At the end, I trace the textual transmission of terminology that crosses the language divide: from the original Greaves’ Latin, to the Dutch of Ketelaar, back to the Latin of David Mill who retranslated the Instructie in 1743.

In Chapter eight I focus on the lexical part of the Instructie. Besides presenting the general structure and various lexicographical styles used by Ketelaar, I look for possible models and direct influences. I test a hypothesis that his vocabulary was based on a Latin schoolbook to see how much it evolved from the model. Furthermore, I attempt to go beyond lexical entries in Ketelaar’s trilingual wordlists by considering the implicit cultural and historical information that may be hidden in the text. And indeed, facts extracted and stories reconstructed from unusual lexical elements such as a random couplet inserted in the grammar, or an apparently incorrect list of months confirm the importance of proper historical embedding of any linguistic text.

Finally, conclusions and desiderata included in Chapter nine close the current study.
Samenvatting

Ketelaar herontdekt
De eerste Nederlandse grammatica van het Perzisch en Hindoestaans (1698)

Dit proefschrift is een studie van de *Instructie off Onderwijsinghe der Hindoustaanse en Persiaanse talen*, de eerste Nederlandse grammatica van het Perzisch en Hindoestaans. Het werk is rond 1698 geschreven door Joan Josua Ketelaar, die als koopman voor de Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie werkte. Voor het eerst zijn twee recentelijk ontdekte manuscripten van deze tekst (Utrecht MS en Paris MS) onderzocht en vergeleken met de oudst bekende kopie (Den Haag MS). Het werk van Ketelaar wordt in de context geplaatst van andere taalproducties door de medewerkers van de Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie (VOC) in Azië en één van de belangrijkste bevindingen in dit onderzoek is het traceren en identificeren van de modellen die Ketelaar gebruikt heeft bij het schrijven van de grammatica’s en het daarbij behorende lexicografische materiaal (de drietalige thematische woordenlijsten).

Het proefschrift is verdeeld in negen hoofdstukken. In Hoofdstuk 1 wordt de reikwijdte van het onderzoek afgebakend en de disciplinaire inbedding ervan wordt binnen de geschiedenis van de descriptieve linguïstiek en de relatie tot missionaire en koloniale taalkunde geplaatst. Ook wordt de invloed van Ketelaars werk onderzocht, dat na zijn vertaling in het Latijn en publicatie in 1743 een paar honderd jaar in de vergetelheid was geraakt, totdat de Venetiaanse filoloog en vertaler Emilio Teza (1831-1912) het werk in 1895 onder de aandacht bracht van de invloedrijke Ierse Indoloog Sir George Abraham Grierson (1851-1941). De eerste studie van Ketelaars werk vond pas in de jaren 1940 plaats en was het werk van de beroemde Bengaalse linguïst Suniti Kumar Chatterji (1890-1977). Hij baseerde zijn studie echter niet op de originele manuscripten maar op de Latijnse vertaling ervan uit 1743. Rond dezelfde tijd ontdekte de Nederlandse Sanskritist en archeoloog Jean Philippe Vogel (1871-1958) een manuscriptkopie van de originele Nederlandse tekst in het Rijksarchief in Den Haag. Vogel droeg ook het meest bij aan de reconstructie van Ketelaars biografie uit de archieven in zijn geboortplaats Elbing, kort voordat ze verloren zouden gaan tijdens de Tweede Wereldoorlog. De discussies over Ketelaars grammatica werden voortgezet door de volgende generatie geleerden, Bhatia en Bodewitz in 1990, culminerend in de eerste Engelstalige editie van Bhatia en Machida in 2008.

In hoofdstuk 2 wordt een bredere context geschetst van het werk van Ketelaar en bestaat met name uit een overzicht van de taaldocumenten die onder auspiciën van de VOC gecreëerd zijn. Dit hoofdstuk begint met een korte historische inleiding over het contrast tussen de legitimering van de overzeese expansie van de landen die opereerden vanuit de Katholieke kerk en het pragmatische en ogenschijnlijk libertaire karakter van de protestants-Nederlandse overzeese expansie. Vervolgens wordt de houding van de VOC ten opzichte van inheemse talen en zijn rol in de
verspreiding van taalkennis tussen Azië en Europa omschreven en geanalyseerd en een overzicht gegeven van bestaande Nederlandse taalkundige documenten uit verschillende instellingen in Europa en daarbuiten (Cambridge University Library; Bodleian Library in Oxford; Biblioteca Marciana in Venetië; Vaticaanse Bibliotheek; State Library van New South Wales in Sydney; Fondation Custodia in Parijs; Departement van Nationale Archieven van Sri Lanka in Colombo; Nationale Bibliotheek van Rusland in Sint-Petersburg; Protestantse Theologische Universiteit in Kampen; Tropenmuseum in Amsterdam; universiteitsbibliotheeken van Utrecht, Leiden en Amsterdam; het Nationaal Archief in Den Haag). Een aantal bronnen wordt hierbij voor het eerst beschreven en geclassificeerd op basis van hun doel en doelgroep. Hierdoor krijgt de lezer niet alleen nieuwe inzichten over Ketelaars werk, maar krijgt hij ook een groter beeld van de reikwijdte en inhoud van de Nederlandse taalkundige productie in de VOC-periode.

Eén van de belangrijkste bijdragen van dit proefschrift is de beschrijving en analyse van de tot voor kort onbekende manuscriptkopieën uit Utrecht en Parijs. In Hoofdstuk 3 concentreer ik mij op de Instructie als een document, waarbij geavanceerde technologieën worden gecombineerd met archiefonderzoek om nieuwe feiten over de herkomst van deze twee manuscripten te onthullen. Dankzij deze methoden is de identiteit van de auteur van de Utrechtse kopie vast te stellen: Ian Isuua Ketelaar (aangezien er geen naam van de kopiist genoemd wordt, is het mogelijk dat hij dit manuscript zelf heeft geschreven). De kopiist van het manuscript van Parijs was Gideon Boudaen, één van de assistenten van Ketelaar. Door tekstuele aanwijzingen en met behulp van historische gegevens bewijs ik ook dat het exemplaar in Parijs waarschijnlijk als basis diende voor de Latijnse vertaling uit 1743 door professor David Mill. Nog belangrijker was dat ik de directe modellen kon identificeren die Ketelaar gebruikte voor de Perzische grammatica, John Greaves’ Elementa Linguæ Persicæ uit 1649, en voor de thematisch gerangschikte woordenlijsten en de algehele structuur, de Linguæ Latinae rudimenta ... in usum Scholae Amstelodamensis uit 1633, een Latijns-Nederlands vocabulaire dat in die tijd veel gebruikt werd door schooljongens in Amsterdam. Bovendien toon ik aan dat Ketelaar eerst de Perzische grammatica van Greaves vertaalde en aanpaste, en het vervolgens gebruikte als model voor zijn Hindoestaanse grammatica. Omdat hij vaak het model van Greaves volgde, wordt het duidelijk dat Ketelaar niet altijd dit model in voldoende mate aanpaste aan de kenmerken van het Hindoeastas. Op deze manier wordt het verklarbaar waarom hij bepaalde onderwerpen selecteerde of juist wegliet. Ketelaar heeft weliswaar de grammaticale begrippen en definities in de Perzische grammatica rechtstreeks uit de Latijnse tekst vertaald van Greaves, maar het is van belang dat hij de vele voorbeelden die Greaves had verzameld uit prestigieuze en klassieke geschriften heeft vervangen door meer informele vormen en voorbeelden, hetgeen getuigt van de meer pragmatische benadering van Ketelaar.

Hoofdstuk 4 begint met een schets van de ingewikkelde geschiedenis van het Hindoeastani en het schrift zoals beschreven door de vroege Europese reizigers, gevolgd door een korte bespreking van problemen met de romanisering van het
Hindoestani. Het model van Ketelaars romanisering van het Hindoestani is gereconstrueerd door Chatterji (1935: 71-78), maar ik pleit ervoor om meer aandacht te besteden aan de taal van de beschrijving van de originele tekst: het 17de-eeuws Nederlands. Dienovereenkomstig identificeer ik spellingstendensen in de drie verschillende manuscripten van de Instructie, en plaats deze in de context van de toenmalige Nederlandse standaarden. Op zoek naar de transcriptiestrategieën van Ketelaar analyseer ik eerst zijn spelling van het Perzisch, omdat het mogelijk een andere bron had dan zijn transcriptie van het Hindoeestaans. Ik rond het hoofdstuk af met een voorbeeld van een Nederlandse romanisering van een vergelijkbare tekst, waarbij het belang aangetoond wordt van vergelijkende studies, zodat we een beter beeld krijgen hoe de Nederlandse spelling en fonologie de transcriptie kunnen beïnvloeden. Zonder een dergelijke benadering is het niet mogelijk de fonemische waarden uit de 17e eeuw van Perzische en Hindoestaanse woorden in toekomstige studies goed te evalueren. Verder onderzoek op dit gebied is nodig.

Hoofdstuk 5 gaat na of en in hoeverre de Perzische grammatica van Ketelaar een origineel werk is. Beginnend met een kort overzicht van de geschiedenis van studies met betrekking tot het Perzisch in Europa beschrijf ik het proces dat leidde tot de constatering dat het werk van Greaves uit 1649 als direct model heeft gediend voor de Perzische grammatica van Ketelaar. De gedetailleerde vergelijking tussen de brontekst en de aanpassing van Ketelaar is tevens een gelegenheid om de inhoud van de Perzische grammatica in de Instructie te beschrijven, die tot op heden voortdurend overschaduwd leek te zijn door zijn Hindoestaanse tweeling.

In Hoofdstuk 6 schets ik de taalsituatie in Mughal India met aandacht voor de rol en positie van beide talen. In de 17e eeuw waren Hindoeestaans en Perzisch twee belangrijke talen in Noord-India en kennis en beheersing van deze talen waren cruciaal voor het adequaat functioneren van het kantoor van de VOC. Perzisch was de taal van de administratie van het Mughal-hof en daarom onmisbaar voor alle correspondentie; Hindustani was de taal voor de dagelijkse communicatie en handel, hetgeen verklaart waarom Ketelaar besloot beide talen in zijn methode op te nemen. Om Ketelaars pionierswerk in de context van zijn tijd te plaatsen, worden in het kort andere vroege Europese beschrijvingen van het Hindoeestaans in het Frans, Duits, Latijn, Portugees en Engels beschreven. Het hoofddoel is echter om het tekstuele bewijsmateriaal te onderzoeken om te bepalen of en in welke mate de Hindoestaanse grammatica gemodelleerd zou kunnen zijn naar de Perzische grammatica. Waar mogelijk worden de grammaticale definities en waarnemingen van Ketelaar vergeleken met gegevens van het moderne standaard Hindi-Urdu (MSH-U), of andere voornoemde grammatica’s.

Hoofdstuk 7 is gewijd aan een analyse van de grammaticale terminologie en metataal die Ketelaar gebruikte met voornaamste doel de oorsprong ervan te identificeren. Ik begin met het gebruik van de Latijnse terminologie die door Ketelaar gebruikt wordt en analyseer vervolgens zijn vertalingen of aanpassingen in de Nederlandse taal. Ik onderzoek of de door hem gehanteerde taalkundige termen
mogelijk afkomstig zijn uit de Nederlandse grammaticale traditie om vervolgens te kunnen vaststellen of Ketelaars terminologie afwijkt van deze traditie, en indien dit het geval blijkt te zijn, wordt onderzocht of dergelijke creaties en terminologische keuzes opzettelijk zijn of incidenteel, of misschien is er zelfs sprake van een vergissing. Ten slotte traceer ik de tekstuele overdracht van terminologie van het oorspronkelijke Latijn van Greaves naar het Nederlands van Ketelaar, en terug naar het Latijn van David Mill die de Instructie opnieuw vanuit het Nederlands naar het Latijn vertaalde in 1743.

In Hoofdstuk 8 concentreer ik me op het lexicale deel van de Instructie, de woordenlijsten. Naast het presenteren van de algemene structuur ervan en het traceren van de verschillende lexicografische stijlen die door Ketelaar gebruikt zijn, zoek ik naar mogelijke modellen en directe invloeden. Ik test een hypothese dat zijn vocabulaire gebaseerd was op een Latijns schoolboek dat in die tijd vaak in het onderwijs gebruikt werd, waarbij vastgesteld wordt welk materiaal uit dit model afkomstig is. Vervolgens wordt ingegaan op de inhoud van de drietalige woordenlijsten zelf. Deze woordenlijsten bevatten belangrijke informatie over de culturele en historische context. Met name wordt aandacht besteed aan ongebruikelijke lexicale elementen zoals een willekeurig couplet ingevoegd in de grammatica, of een schijnbaar onjuiste lijst van maanden.

Ten slotte wordt in Hoofdstuk 9 deze studie afgesloten door conclusies en desiderata.
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