

**[0738] CONTACT-INDUCED CHANGES IN MODERN WEST FRISIAN\***

Germen J. de Haan

*1. Introduction*

In this paper I would like to discuss some questions concerning dialect levelling in West Frisian, i.e. that West Germanic language variety spoken in the northern part of the Netherlands, the province of Fryslân. At the centre of the discussion will be the relation of West Frisian to (Standard) Dutch, but first I will pay some attention to the variety of West Frisian itself. In this paper we refer to West Frisian as Frisian, if this causes no misunderstanding.

West Frisian is spoken by some 350.000 people, and the language shows variation, albeit almost exclusively at the lexical and phonological level. Traditionally three main dialects are distinguished, *Clay Frisian* ('Klaaifrysk'), *Forest Frisian* ('Wâldfrysk'), and the dialect spoken in the *southwest corner* of the province ('Súdwesthoeks'). Clay Frisian and Forest Frisian are linguistically very similar. More importantly, the variation phenomena that one encounters in the regions where these dialects are spoken, do not cluster in such a way that a distinction between these dialects is linguistically justified. The variation in these regions is significant, but coincides only in four or five cases with the geographical borderline between the dialects that is traditionally postulated.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless I will continue to use the terms Clay Frisian and Forest Frisian if necessary, because the tradition does, but rather with psychological than linguistic significance.

In addition to these three main dialects there is a number of smaller dialects that shows more variation: the dialects in the city of Hylpen, the islands Skiermûntseach and Skylge. There are even smaller ones that I will neglect here altogether. The main dialect spoken in the southwest corner of the province is linguistically more or less midway between Clay Frisian and Forest Frisian on the one hand and the dialect of Hylpen on the other.

---

\* Parts of this paper have been presented at the Workshop on Language Contact at NIAS Wassenaar 1996, at the first Workshop of the ESF Network on Social Dialectology in Berg en Dal 1996, and the 14th Frysk Filologekongres in Leeuwarden 1996. I thank Pieter Breuker and Kim Sauter for their comments on a preliminary version.

1. See Hof (1933: 2-3).

## 2. *Dialect levelling of Frisian dialects*

### 2.1. *Standard Frisian*

In this section I would like to address the question whether there is a process of dialect levelling going on in these West Frisian dialects under the influence of a West Frisian standard language, where I understand the notion of levelling to apply to changes in the grammatical systems involved (hence, interference not shift). This raises of course the preliminary question whether there is a West Frisian standard language in the first place. This is not an easy question to answer.<sup>2</sup>

In order to do this, we have to make a distinction between spoken and written language. It can be observed that written Frisian is codified in the sense that its essential characteristics are laid down in dictionaries, grammatical descriptions and an officially recognized orthography. The grammatical and lexical properties of this standard are based on the main dialects Clay Frisian and Forest Frisian. This standard allows for a lot of variation between these dialects, which is interesting against the background of the traditional claim that standardization should involve dialect selection. This degree of variation makes the standard less useful as a norm for regulating behaviour. But the real problem with written Standard Frisian is that it hardly functions within the Frisian speech community. In the 1984 survey on the language situation in Fryslân, Gorter et al. (1984), it is reported that ca. 10% of the inhabitants of Fryslân are able to write Frisian, but only 4% do so on a regular basis (i.e. at least one or two times a month).<sup>3</sup> Although Frisian is a compulsory subject on primary school, writing this language is hardly taught.<sup>4</sup> There is no general knowledge of the standard and hence no *acceptance* in the sense of Haugen (1972). From this I conclude that knowledge of written Standard Frisian is not generally available, and not very likely to function as a possible model for dialect levelling.

As to a standard for spoken Frisian, there are in principle two possibilities: a standard derived from the spoken language of a certain social and/or cultural elite; or a standard derived from the standard for the written language. Since there is no accepted standard for written Frisian as I have just argued, the latter possibility does not arise. The former possibility is also not realized however: as far as I see, there is no recognizable group of Frisian speakers whose spoken

---

2. See for an in-depth discussion of questions concerning standardization of West Frisian and related questions, Breuker (1993).

3. There has been a replication of this 1984 survey recently, but it is not clear from the first report (Gorter and Jonkman (1995)) whether there have been substantial changes in the use of Frisian as a written language.

4. See for this point, de Jong & Riemersma (1994: 44).

language functions as an implicit or explicit model for oral use. The only model I can think of is the language used in the Frisian television and broadcasting stations. These stations have a rather strong position in the Frisian community, and it is not unrealistic that they could function as a norm for Frisian speakers. It is sometimes reported however that the Frisian varieties that are spoken by employees and public on these stations, are not good enough in order to function as a language norm.<sup>5</sup>

So I can generalize the conclusion I draw with respect to written Frisian: there is no standard for the Frisian language that is internalized by speakers and that can function as a model for dialect levelling. Dialect levelling depending on the influence of a standard language is a form of contact-induced language change. Since personal bilingualism is a *conditio sine qua non* for such a kind of change, the nature of contact-induced change is in part determined by the nature of bilingualism (length, type, degree), as pointed out by Thomason & Kaufman (1988). In Fryslân there is no personal bilingualism to a significant extent consisting of internalization of one of the Frisian dialects and Standard Frisian. Hence the *conditio sine qua non* for this type of dialect levelling is not fulfilled.

Notwithstanding this lack of internalization, Frisian speakers are generally aware of the fact that there is Standard Frisian somewhere out there. They no doubt relate this standard to written Frisian, in particular to the relatively rich Frisian literature. Furthermore, they 'know' that dialects such as the ones from the southwest corner and the islands are non-standard; and although the great majority of them does not 'know' this standard, they 'know' that their language variety deviates from this norm in such a way that they consider themselves not to speak Standard Frisian ('Geef Frysk'), even though it is very unlike other standard languages in that it is very tolerant of dialect variation. All of this seems to me important, since this 'knowledge' leads to a strong feeling of uncertainty about correct usage of Frisian, uncertainty that opens the door for influence of surrounding languages, Dutch being the first candidate.

On the basis of what I have said sofar, the first question we raised: is there a process of dialect levelling going on in these West Frisian dialects under the influence of a West Frisian standard language, has to be answered in the negative.<sup>6</sup> In the next section I want to address the question whether there is dialect levelling between West Frisian dialects under the influence of Dutch, in

---

5. See for this point, Dijkstra (1994: 266). Dijkstra stresses the normative role of the language used for the Frisian television and broadcasting stations.

6. Van der Woude (1970) argues that Standard Frisian leads to a growing awareness of dialect variation, but not to a significant degree of levelling.

particular Standard Dutch.<sup>7</sup> In this respect it is important to first pay attention to the nature of bilingualism in the province of Fryslân, i.e. to the position of Dutch in the Frisian speech community.

## 2.2. *Standard Dutch*

After the Second World War, there have been significant changes in the position of Dutch in the province of Fryslân, leading to full bilingualism of nearly all native speakers of Frisian. The *educational system* in the Netherlands, including Fryslân, has been almost exclusively Dutch-oriented since the beginning of the 19th century. After the Second World War, participation in this system became 100%, hence it covered all Frisian raised speakers; practically every Frisian native speaker became Frisian-Dutch bilingual, where the variety of Dutch that is used is identical, or very closely related, to Standard Dutch. This personal bilingualism was strengthened enormously by the rise of the Dutch spoken and written *mass media*, and also not in the least by a strong dutchification of the *occupational domain*. For example, Fryslân experienced a rise of industrialization, and as a consequence, an import of non-Frisian speakers from outside, strengthening the position of Dutch, and even more importantly, increasingly requiring from Frisian speakers to use the Dutch language at work. This increase in socio-economic mobility also worked the other way around: a movement has been observed of Frisian speaking people leaving their province for Dutch speaking areas, again weakening the position of Frisian. All these changes, which are of course very well known and are by no means exclusive for the province of Fryslân, nor for the Dutch-Frisian language relation, have led to radical changes in the language situation of the province, leading to full mother tongue bilingualism. It may be clear that this type of bilingualism sets a favorable condition for levelling between Frisian and Dutch, and that is exactly what has happened and still happens.

The influence of Dutch on the Frisian language is strong. This is not only true for language *use*,<sup>8</sup> but holds for the language *system* as well. The Frisian lexicon and grammatical system change due to contact with Dutch. In what follows I will use the term *interference* for this type of contact-induced change, and I will refer to the Frisian language variety that results from Dutch interference as *Interference Frisian*. It may be clear that Interference Frisian is a concept that abstracts away

---

7. We will argue later that the relation between Frisian dialects and Standard Dutch is functionally and linguistically similar, albeit not completely identical, to the relation between Dutch dialects and Standard Dutch. This argument is made convincingly in Breuker (1993).

8. I strongly disagree with the claim of Gorter & Jonkman (1995), that the position of the use of the Frisian language is one of stability nowadays, see de Haan (1997).

from idiolectal variation. The crucial point is that Interference Frisian has a lexicon and a grammatical system of its own, although both show considerable overlap with Frisian itself, and that Interference Frisian utterances are completely acceptable to their users. The fact that there are people who have (sometimes rather strong) negative feelings about Interference Frisian may be of interest socio-psychologically, but it is not linguistically significant. To me, the label 'interference' does not have any pejorative connotations. Interference Frisian of today is Modern Frisian of tomorrow.

A central question with respect to interference is what kind of changes can be caused in principle by language contact. According to Thomason & Kaufman (1988), the conditions under which languages are acquired are of crucial importance to this question. In terms of this factor, they distinguish between two types of interference: *interference under maintenance*, influence of a second language on a first language, and *interference through shift*, influence of a first language on a second language.<sup>9</sup> Since Frisian-Dutch bilingualism today is a matter of full mother tongue bilingualism, this does not fit into this two-way distinction, and therefore I like to add a third type of contact-induced change, namely *interference under full bilingualism*, influence of a first language on another first language. In the next part of this paper I would like to discuss this type of interference. Firstly I will give an overview of this kind of interference that is going on between Frisian and Dutch. Secondly on the basis of these examples I discuss the question which linguistic factors determine this type of language change. Finally I will comment on the non-linguistic factors relevant for interference, and especially those that play a role in the Frisian-Dutch contact situation.

### 3. Examples of Frisian-Dutch interference

The process of Frisian-Dutch interference is a rather one-sided one, i.e. from the literature it is very clear that the Frisian language changes by adopting features of Dutch, but it is also very clear that it does not happen the other way around. This is not to deny that the Dutch language of a Frisian-Dutch bilingual may undergo influence of his Frisian mother tongue, but I am not aware of any such changes of the Dutch language that go beyond the individual level.

Dutch interference in Frisian has been discussed extensively in a number of publications.<sup>10</sup> Here I will try to present on the basis of examples what seem to

---

9. A similar distinction is made in van Coetsem (1988).

10. In what follows I have made use of examples and discussion of levelling of Frisian in Breuker (1979), Breuker (1993), Breuker et al. (1982), Dijkstra and Hiemstra (1977), Feitsma (1971), de Haan (1990), de Haan (1992), de Haan (1995), Sjölin (1974), Sjölin (1976) and Sjölin (1993).

me to be the essentials of this phenomenon. As noted above full mother tongue bilingualism makes it possible in principle for levelling of Frisian dialects under the influence of Dutch to occur. I will now give an impression of the kind of levelling that is going on between Frisian and Dutch.

### 3.1. *Lexical interference*

A dominant aspect of Dutch interference in Frisian is heavy borrowing of lexical items. What seems to me to be significant with respect to this lexical borrowing is that it consists not only of lexical *innovation*: introduction of new words borrowed from Dutch into the Frisian lexicon, but also of lexical *replacement*: Frisian words belonging to the domain of daily use, and supposedly used frequently, are replaced with Dutch equivalents. Replacement of both content words and grammatical words can be observed:

#### (1) *lexical replacement: content words*

F(risian)	IF (Interference Frisian)	D(UTCH)	
broeksboksen	broekspipen	broekspijpen	'trouser-legs'
earmtakke	ellebooch	elleboog	'elbow'
kaai	sleutel	sleutel	'key'
muoike	tante	tante	'aunt'
widze	wych	wieg	'cradle'
earder	froeger	vroeger	'before'

#### (2) *lexical replacement: grammatical words*

F	IF	D	
er	ie	ie	'he'
har(ren)	hun	hun	'their'
him	sich	zich	'himself'
hokker	welke	welke	'which'
jo	u	u	'you'
neffens	volgens	volgens	'according'
oant	tot	tot	'until'
om...hinne	omstreeks	omstreeks	'about'
sûnt	sinds	sinds	'since'
ta	tot	tot	'till'
ûnder	beneden	beneden	'below'

One of the consequences of these subcases of lexical borrowing is that the Frisian lexicon becomes much more similar to the Dutch one. There are also more subtle ways in which this is brought about. There is a strong tendency for Frisian words which differ slightly from Dutch ones to become adapted to their Dutch counterparts. Below I present examples of phonological, morphological, and syntactic interference.

### 3.2. Phonological interference

Phonological differences between Frisian and Dutch words are removed according to different strategies. Sometimes, Frisian words that already look phonologically like their Dutch counterparts are simply made identical:

#### (3) adaptation of phonological form

	F	IF	D	
bestjoer:	bəstjuər	bəstyər	bəstyər	'government'
boppe:	bopə	bovən	bovən	'above'
dochs:	doχs	toχ	toχ	'yet'
doe:	du	tun	tun	'then'
fijân:	fijɔ:n	fɛjant	fɛjant	'enemy'
fjochtsje:	fjoχtsjə	fɛχtə	fɛχtə	'fight'
freon:	frʌən	frint	frint	'friend'
haad:	hat	ho:ft	ho:ft	'head'
mûtse:	mutə	mYts	mYts	'cap'
noas:	noəs	nøs	nøs	'noas'
snobje:	snobjə	snupə	snupə(n)	'to eat sweets'
sop:	sɔp	sup	sup	'soup'
spiegel:	spe:γəl	spiγəl	spiγəl	'mirror'
wa:	va	vi	vi	'we'

In addition to phonemic assimilations that result in (almost) phonologically identical words, such as in (3), there are also partial phonemic replacements of a more systematic type. So it is quite generally the case that bilabial [w] after [d, t, s, k] becomes labiodental [v] under Dutch influence:

(4) [w] --->[v]: [dʌn] *dwaan*, [tʌ] *twa*, [sviət] *swiet*, [kvɑ] *koart*

Dutch does not have [w] as a phoneme. The change of [w] into [v] after other consonants than [d, t, s, k] is less common, possibly due to phonetic complexity of the resulting cluster. In words such as [gvɑsə] *Goasse*, and [gvot] *guod* the

labiodental [v] is not too difficult apparently, but it is in *boartsje* 'play', *foarke* 'fork', *moanne* 'month', *noaske* 'little nose', *poarte* 'gate', *ruotsje* 'to soot', which are all pronounced with [w].

A tendency related to the phonetic complexity of these consonant clusters is *cluster simplification*, i.e. simplification by dropping the [w] altogether: [fɔ̃] *foar* 'before', [vɔ̃kəm] *Woarkum* 'Workum', [smɔ̃χ] *smoarch* 'dirty'; or simplification by lexical replacement:

(5)	F		IF	
	buorlju	--->	buren	'neighbours'
	foars	--->	fors	'robust'
	loarkje	--->	lurke	'to suck audibly'
	muoite	--->	moeite	'trouble'
	noartsk	--->	nors	'grumpy'
	poarte	--->	poart [poət]	'gate'
	ruotsje	--->	roetsje	'to soot'
	wuolje	--->	wikkelje	'to wrap up'
	huorren	--->	hoeren	'whores'

Cluster simplification is a phenomenon that can be observed in connection with other consonant clusters as well. Again we find examples of simplification by deletion: *l(j)ocht* 'air', *r(j)ucht* 'right', *str(j)itte* 'street', *(t)siis* 'cheese', *(t)sjettel* 'kettle', and simplification by replacement:

(6)	F		IF		D	
	stjer	--->	ster		ster	'star'
	fjild	--->	felt		veld	'field'
	pjukke	--->	prikke		prikken	'prick'
	bjirk	--->	berk		berk	'birch'
	triuwe	--->	duwe		duwen	'push'
	ferklearring	--->	ferklaring		verklaring	'explanation'

Dutch influence is supported in these cases by the factor of phonetic complexity.

Another case of phonological interference within the Frisian consonant system involves the process of *r-deletion*. Frisian phonology has a rule that deletes an [r] before dentals, obligatorily within the phonological word, and optionally elsewhere: [jɛrə]-[hɛi jɛt] *hearre-hij heart* 'to hear-he hears', [kerə]-[hɛi keət] *keare-hij keart* 'to turn around-he turns around'. Words are increasingly becoming exceptions to this rule, no doubt under the influence of Dutch:



(7) *r-deletion*

no *r*-deletion in loanwords: *start*, (*ik*) *tart*, *sport*, *turn*, *urn*, *mars*, *snars*, *skors* optional in loanwords: *beurt*, *beurs*, *koers*, *jaloers*  
 optional in native words: *earst*, *barst*, *moard*, *aard*, *kaart*, *maart*, *Noarden*, *Holwert*, *Boorsma*, *bakkers*, *juffers*, (*hy*) *leart*, (*hy hat*) *leard*  
 obligatory in native words: (*hy*) *heart*, (*hy*) *keart*

There is not only instability in the Frisian consonant system, but also in the vowel system. For instance, the [ɪ] before nasals is instable, and likely to be replaced with its Dutch counterpart [ɛ]:

(8)	F	IF	D	
	winke	wenke	wenken	'to motion'
	minge	menge	mengen'	'to mix'
	binde	bende	bende	'gang'
	kring	kreng	kreng	'bitch'
	stim	stem	stem	'voice'
	string	streng	streng	'strand'
	ing	eng	eng	'narrow'
	him	hem	hem	'him'

Another case concerns the pronunciation [ɔ] which shows a tendency to become [ɑ] before dentals: [gɑ] *gas* 'gas', [bɑ] *bad* 'bath'. Pronounced with [ɑ], these words are identical to their Dutch counterparts.

Other phonological interferences put pressure on the phonemic inventory of Frisian. I will discuss a couple of cases. Diphthongs [uə], [oə], [iə] and [Iə] are phonemic in Frisian, but in Dutch they are positional variants of [u], [o], [i] and [I] (before [r]). In quite a number of Frisian words these diphthongs are replaced with the corresponding short/long vowel, especially in names:

(9)	F	IF	
	[uə] --->	[u]:	Boelens, Koen, Teroele, boete, sjele, koel
	[oə] --->	[o]:	Boatsma, Koas, Koatstertille, boas, roas, poal, iroanyks, perioade
	[iə] --->	[i]:	Miedema, Stiens, De Wielen, Hiemstra, liet, spinwiele, bies
	[Iə] --->	[e]:	Peanstra, Ealse, Bakkefean, meast, sjeas, heas

In some cases a compound or derived form shows the monophthong, whereas the groundword has the diphthong: *doel* [uə]- *doeltrap* [u]; *bloed* [uə] - *bloeddruk* [u];

*frieze* [iə]/-*friesvak* [i]. Quite generally the diphthong is replaced, not with the Dutch positional phonological variant, but with another monophthong that is found in Dutch equivalents. This happens extremely frequently with [iə]:

(10)	F	IF	D	
	died	daad	daad	'act'
	yndie	inderdaad	inderdaad	'indeed'
	ier	ader	ader	'vein'
	striel	straal	straal	'ray'
	jierbeurs	jaarbeurs	jaarbeurs	'industries fair'
	jierferslach	jaarferslach	jaarverslag	'annual report'
	hierfyn	haarfijn	haarfijn	'fine-spun'

Another phonematic interference involves long high vowels. These vowels are sometimes diphthongized, pronounced with [ə] as a second segment: [tiət] *tiid* 'time', [gryəs] *grús* 'grass', [huəs] *hûs* 'house'. These diphthongs have phonemic value in Frisian. If diphthongization of long high vowels continues, then the Frisian vowel system will be simplified by elimination of these vowels. This elimination assimilates the Frisian system to that of Dutch, since Dutch does not have long high vowels. Here also Dutch influence interacts with internal Frisian factors, since the diphthongization process is facilitated by following dentals as opposed to labiodentals, compare the examples just mentioned with *skúf* ?\*[skyəf].

### 3.3. Morphological interference

I now turn to a discussion of changes in morphological properties of Frisian, induced by Dutch. I present cases of interference in the verbal and nominal morphology subsequently.

The Frisian verbal system is divided on the basis of past tense formation in two classes, a class of *weak* verbs and a class of *strong* verbs. The class of weak verbs is subdivided into two subclasses: a subclass that is characterized by an infinitival suffix *-e* [ə]; and a subclass with an infinitival suffix *-je* [jə]. I refer to these classes as *-e* verbs, and *-je* verbs, respectively. The conjugations of both subclasses differ systematically. The classification of Frisian weak verbs does not correspond entirely to the Dutch system, since Dutch has weak *-e(n)* verbs, but does not have a subclass corresponding to *-je* verbs. It has been observed that quite a number of Frisian *-je* verbs undergo transition to the class of *-e* verbs, and are conjugated accordingly. Examples are in (11):

(11) *je-verbs becoming -e-verbs*

achtsje, bergje, belje, earje, ferlangje, fervje, flagje, foegje, flechtsje, fluitsje, folgje, genietsje, haatsje, hakje, hechtsje, heelje, hoedzje, hoopje, jachtsje, klopje, kostje, leegje, moetsje, piipje, ploegje, pronkje, reizgje, suchtsje, ringje, skiftsje, slachtsje, soargje, stichtsje, stopje, tikje, trilje, waarmje, wachtsje, wedzje.

On the basis of the observation that quite a number of the Frisian *-je* verbs that undergo this transition have identical Dutch *-e(n)* counterparts, it has been suggested that this change in lexical specification for verb class membership is due to Dutch influence: the Frisian-Dutch bilingual has a tendency to assign verbs to the 'wrong' verb class, a verb class that is in its infinitival form closer to Dutch than the alternative class.

This point is supported by the two additional observations. First, verbs on *-igje*, *-elje*, *-emje*, *-enje*, *-erje* frequently change verb class, no doubt stimulated by one of the surface forms of the 3rd person singular which is identical to the Dutch form (for example, *hammer+t-hamer+t*).<sup>11</sup> Second, there is also a group of Frisian *-je* verbs that is replaced by *-e* forms that are not native Frisian, but borrowed from Dutch:

(12) *je-verbs becoming e-verbs via borrowing*

eamelje	-	kletse	'to chatter'
easkje	-	eise	'to demand'
fjouwerje	-	galoppeare	'to gallop'
flaaike	-	fleie	'to flatter'
fûstkje	-	de hân jaan	'to shake hands'
hymje	-	hijge	'to pant'
jarje	-	giere	'to dung'
knibbelje	-	kniele	'to kneele'
krôkje	-	boere	'to belch'
libje	-	leve	'to live'
narje	-	peste	'to tease'
noaskje	-	befalle	'to please'
siedzje	-	saaie	'to sow'
stribje	-	streve	'to strive'
sutelje	-	fente	'to sell'
tarje	-	teare	'to tar'

11. The 3rd person singular of these verbs has an alternative form that differs from Dutch, namely *hammeret*.

terskje	-	dorse	'to thresh'
tsjûgje	-	getuge	'to testify'
weitsje	-	wake	'to wake'
wrakselje	-	worstele	'to wrestle'
wurkje	-	werke	'to work'

A second example of interference in the Frisian verbal morphology involves several kinds of adaptations to the Dutch verbal conjugational system:

(13a) *Strong verb conjugation into the direction of Dutch (inf-past tense-participle)*

F	IF	D
blike-bliek-blykt	blike-bleek-bleken	blijken-bleek-gebleken 'appear'
ferwite-ferwiet-ferwiten	ferwite-ferweet-ferweten	verwijten-verweet-verweten 'reproach'
dûke-doe/dûkte-dûkt	dûke-dook-doken	duiken-dook-gedoken 'dive'
sûpen-soep/sûpte-sûpt	sûpe-soop-sopen	zuipen-zoop-gezopen 'booze'

(13b) *Strong verbs replaced by verbs with weak conjugation*

dekke-diek/duts-dutsen	dekke-dekte-dekt	dekken-dekte-gedekt 'cover'
strekke-striek/struts-strutsen	strekke-strekte-strekt	strekken-strekte-gestrekt 'stretch'
winke-wonk-wonken	winke-winkte-winkt wenke-wenkte-wenkt	wenken-wenkte-gewenkt 'motion'

idem verbs such as *krinke*, *swinke*, *minge*

In the domain of nominal morphology I would like to present three cases of interference: noun pluralization, determiner selection and diminutive formation.

As to *pluralization*, I distinguish three examples of Dutch influence: 1. exceptional plurals become regular ones by borrowing: *skiep-skieppen*; 2. in Frisian, there is nowadays a dialect difference between *-en* and *-s* plurals where Dutch has *-en*; the Frisian *-s* plural goes into the direction of Dutch: *hjerrings-hjerringen*, *ferklearrings-ferklearringen*; 3. nouns on [ə] have quite generally an *-en* plural in Frisian, but in Dutch both possibilities *-en*, and *-s* exist; we see a rise in Frisian of the *-s* plural in nonnative nouns, and nouns which are (almost) identical to Dutch: *gemeentes*, *masines*, *fitamines*, *prinsipes*.

Levelling also occurs in connection with *determiner selection*. In Frisian and Dutch simplex nouns have to be lexically specified for determiner selection, *de/de*

or *it/het*. In a small subset of cases, the corresponding nouns select different determiners. There is a tendency in Frisian to make the system of determiner selection identical to Dutch:

(14)

	F	IF	D	
wang:	it	de	de wang	'cheek'
skaad:	it	de	de schaduw	'shadow'
burd:	it	de	de baard	'beard'
kin:	it	de	de kin	'chin'
boarst:	it	de	de borst	'breast'
ankel:	it	de	de enkel	'ankle'
fabryk:	it	de	de fabriek	'factory'
sop:	it	de	de soep	'soup'
muzyk:	it	de	de muzyk	'music'
bil:	it	de	de bil	'buttock', 'thigh'
finsterbank:	it	de	de vensterbank	'window-sill'
sin:	it	de	de zin	'desire'
kût:	it	de	de kuit	'calf'
skouder:	it	de	de schouder	'shoulder'
bosk:	de	it	het bos	'woods'
ein:	de	it	het eind	'end'
fôle:	de	it	het veulen	'foal'
mar:	de	it	het meer	'lake'
lêste oere:	de	it	het laatste uur	'last hour'

Another change involves the Frisian *diminutive system*. In Frisian diminutives are formed by adding a diminutive suffix to a noun stem. This diminutive suffix has several surface forms: *-ke* [kə], *-tsje* [tsjə], *-kje* [kjə] or *-je* [jə]. I assume that *-ke* and *-tje* are underlying suffixes. The surface forms *-tsje*, *-kje* and *-je* are derived from underlying *-tje*. It has been observed that this system changes in such a way that a subset of the *-ke* diminutives becomes a variant on *-tsje*. This change appears to be an example of interference from Dutch: the suffix *-ke* is replaced gradually with *-tsje* in those contexts where Dutch has a corresponding diminutive suffix *-tje*:

(15) F	IF	D	
auto-ke	auto-tsje	auto-tje	'car'
tou-ke	tou-tsje	touw-tje	'rope'
sigaar-ke	sigaar-tsje	sigaar-tje	'cigar'

beker-ke	beker-tsje			beker-tje	'cup'
kar-ke	kar-ke	*kar-tsje	(>*kar-etsje) <sup>12</sup>	kar-etje	'cart'
mûs-ke	mûs-ke	*mûs-tsje	(>*mûs-je)	muis-je	'mouse'
beam-ke	beam-ke	*beam-tsje	(>*beam-pje)	boom-pje	'tree'

Note that *-ke/-tsje* replacement in Frisian is at work where Dutch has a *-tje* suffix *on the surface* and not underlyingly.

### 3.4. Syntactic interference

There are also contact-induced changes in Frisian in the lexical specification of syntactic properties. One case involves verb-particle constructions. Both Frisian and Dutch have a set of verb-particle constructions with some minor differences in separability between verb and particle. The particle *oer* in Frisian *oer'komme* (where ''' indicates stress on the following syllable) allows for both possibilities, whereas the Dutch counterpart *over'komen* only occurs as a syntactic unit. Frisian *'trochsykje* 'to search' is separable, as opposed to Dutch *door'zoeken*. In Interference Frisian, both items take over the Dutch syntactic possibilities, in the case of *trochsykje* including shift of stress.

A second example concerns the syntax of aspectuals. In Frisian *gean* 'go' and *bliuwe* 'stay' are aspectual auxiliaries, but they can be combined only with a very limited number of infinitival verbs without *te*.<sup>13</sup> Their Dutch counterparts do not show this restricted distribution. Frisian has the tendency to replace this system with a straightforward translation of the Dutch expressions for aspect, so with free combinations of the verbs *gean* and *bliuwe* with infinitival verb forms without *te*:

(16)

F	IF	D
ik gean lizzen/ *fytsen	ik gean lizzen/ fytsen	ik ga liggen/fietsen 'I go (to) lay down/(to) bike'
hy bliuwt sitten/ *praten	hy bliuwt sitten/ praten	hij blijft zitten/praten 'he continues (to) sit/(to) talk'

Another case of syntactic levelling occurs in connection with the expression of the inchoative aspect by *komme+te* 'to come to' in Frisian. This construction is substituted for the equivalent of Dutch *komen* without *te*:

12. See below for the rise of such forms.

13. Both verbs combine with *lizze* 'to lay', *sitte* 'to sit', *steane* 'to stand' and *hingje* 'to hang'. The verb *bliuwe* has a few extra possibilities, see van der Woude (1954: 55).

(17)

F	IF	D
hy komt hjir te wenjen	hy komt hjir wenjen	hij komt hier wonen 'he comes here (to) live'
kom mar ris te praten	kom mar ris praten	kom maar eens praten 'come but once (to) talk'

There are also some additional changes in the use of Frisian *gean*. In Dutch the equivalent of *gean* is *gaan*: this verb can also indicate future tense. Frisian does not use *gean* as a verb indicating future, but it uses *sille* instead. The Dutch use of *gaan* is observed to intrude into the Frisian system:

(18)

F	IF	D
wa sille moarn winne?	wa gean moarn winnen?	wie gaan morgen winnen? 'who will win tomorrow'
wy sille trouwe	wy gean trouwen	wij gaan trouwen 'we will marry'
wat sille wy ris dwaan?	wat gean wy ris dwaan?	wat gaan wij eens doen? 'what will we do'

A final, and frequently discussed, example of syntactic levelling concerns a change in the word order of Frisian verbs under Dutch influence. In Continental West Germanic languages main verbs in combination with auxiliaries and/or modal verbs occur as one complex in sentence final position. Main clauses differ slightly from embedded clauses in this respect because the finite verb is not sentence-final in main clauses, but sentence-first, or -second. The verbal complex in Continental West Germanic shows minor word order variations across the languages involved. For example, the order of the verbal complex in Frisian is fixed, whereas Dutch allows for some modest form of inversion. To illustrate this, a verbal complex consisting of a main verb infinitive combined with a finite modal can have these verbs in both orders in Dutch, but not in Frisian:

- |      |    |                              |           |
|------|----|------------------------------|-----------|
| (19) | a. | dat hij het <i>doen wil</i>  | (Dutch)   |
|      | b. | dat hij het <i>wil doen</i>  | (Dutch)   |
| (20) | a. | dat er it <i>dwaan wol</i>   | (Frisian) |
|      | b. | *dat er it <i>wol dwaan</i>  | (Frisian) |
|      |    | 'that he it will do/do will' |           |

Inversion is also possible in Dutch, as opposed to Frisian, if the verbal complex contains a past participle of a main verb:

- (21) a. dat hij het *gedaan heeft*  
       b. dat hij het *heeft gedaan*  
 (22) a. dat er it *dien hat*  
       b. \*dat er it *hat dien*  
           'that he it done has/has done'

It is frequently observed that Dutch inversion possibilities of this type are accepted by an increasing number of Frisian speakers as a consequence of syntactic influence from Dutch. Such speakers accept and produce not only (21a) and (22a), but also the variants in (21b) and (22b).<sup>14</sup>

### 3.5. Conclusion

I have presented this extensive overview of interferences from Dutch in Frisian in order to show that this type of levelling really affects all the grammatical subdomains, and furthermore that the amount of levelling is considerable. This of course raises the question why the outcome of the contact between Dutch and Frisian has these characteristics. What are the circumstances that lead to such a heavy interference?

Another interesting question that suggests itself on the basis of these data, relates to the qualitative nature of interference. It seems to me that the examples of Dutch-Frisian interference discussed above all involve incorporation of rather superficial features of Dutch into the grammar and lexicon of Frisian. Frisian appears to borrow exclusively surface characteristics of Dutch, and not parts of the abstract underlying grammatical system. If this is a property of interference in general, I conclude that interference is *data-oriented* and not *grammar-oriented*. This raises the question of linguistic constraints on possible interferences.

Below I will discuss both the quantitative and the qualitative question. I start with the latter.

### 4. The concrete nature of interference

All examples of interference I have discussed above consist of examples of change in Frisian which are codetermined by concrete Dutch linguistic material: content and function words, surface realizations of bound morphemes, phonetic properties, word order etc. There appears to be no evidence for the role of the underlying grammatical system in Dutch-Frisian interference. This is confirmed by the literature on this topic, that is, I am not familiar with proposals showing

---

14. See for a more exact description, and interpretation of the facts, de Haan (1996).



that Frisian also borrows grammatical rules from Dutch.<sup>15</sup> So this case of interference is really a matter of data-orientation.

As far as I am concerned, this surface orientation of contact-induced change is not a coincidence, but a reflection of the surface orientation of language change in general.<sup>16</sup> Taking acquisition (be it by children, or adults) to be the ultimate source of language change, this surface orientation derives in a principled way from the data-oriented nature of acquisition, as perceived, for example, within the Chomskyan research program.<sup>17</sup> I would like to repeat here the essentials of this perspective.

As a starting point I will assume that the following schematic representation of an acquisitional stage is essentially correct:

(23) new data<sub>i</sub> ---> learning devices ---> grammar<sub>i</sub> ---> output<sub>i</sub>  
Universal Grammar

If, for whatever reason, a language learner discovers new data, then he will reconstruct his grammar accordingly. This new grammar will be optimal in the sense that it will cover the old and new data. This reconstruction process is governed by Universal Grammar and a set of learning devices. If we take (23) to be an intermediate acquisitional stage, the question should be raised how this stage relates to the next one:

(24) new data<sub>i+1</sub>--> learning devices ---> grammar<sub>i+1</sub> ---> output<sub>i+1</sub>  
Universal Grammar

The input to this acquisition process consists at least of the output of the old grammar, in as far as the perception of the output has not changed, and new data (which can include 'old' data perceived in a new way). Chomsky (1975, 120-122) raises the important question whether the grammatical form in which the language learner has organized his language, his grammar, is also a factor that determines acquisition. He suggests that it is not. Chomsky's view on the acquisition process is that the result of language acquisition is not dependent on intermediate grammars but, as far as linguistic factors are concerned, on the interaction of Universal Grammar and data, i.e. utterances from the environment,

15. Ytsma (1995: 108) claims with respect to verbal complexes that Interference Frisian borrows an inversion rule from Dutch, but he does not come up with an analysis. His proposal therefore does not really count as an example of rule borrowing.

16. See for an interesting discussion of this point, van Marle (1990).

17. This view is expressed for instance in Chomsky (1975, 121-122), and discussed extensively in White (1982).



the derivation rules, if he would take into account the abstract system underlying Dutch diminutives. It is clear from the interference facts discussed, that this is not what actually happens. There is no evidence whatsoever that interference is system-driven here.

This surface orientation is particularly revealing in the case of the non-borrowing of the Dutch suffix *-je*, since this form could be derived by exclusively Frisian mechanisms: an underlying form on *-tje* and an independently needed rule of *t*-deletion. Apparently the language learner does not take into consideration this abstract characterization of the data, but decides on the basis of a surface analysis of the Dutch data not to include *-je* as a diminutive suffix in the Frisian system.

It is important to note that I do not want to claim that the Dutch suffixes *-etje*, *-je* and *-pje* could never occur in the Frisian system. If interference is concrete, the language learner could still analyze the corresponding Dutch surface forms of diminutives as consisting of a noun in combination with the diminutive suffixes *-etje*, *-je* and *-pje*. He observes that these suffixes do not belong to the already acquired set of Frisian diminutive suffixes, and does not consider them for integration, unless properties of the (surface) data will force him to do so. In Frisian this is apparently not the case nowadays, but this could change. In fact Dutch forms on *-etje* seem to gain some influence on Frisian already as instantiated by cases such as *poppetsje* (Dutch: *poppetje* 'little doll') and *spulletsje* (Dutch: *spelletje* 'little game').<sup>19</sup>

As to the order in the verbal complex, recall that I have discussed above the observation that Dutch inversion possibilities of the verbal complex are accepted by an increasing number of Frisian speakers. If this interference phenomenon is based on the grammatical principles that underly the Dutch verbal complex, we expect this new variety of Frisian to be an exact copy of part of the Dutch system. Consequently, the inversion possibilities should be identical to those of Dutch. But that is not correct, as is illustrated by the following examples:<sup>20</sup>

- (26) a.     dat ik it net dien hawwe kin  
              'that I it not done have can'  
      b.     dat ik it net dien kin hawwe  
              'that I it not done can have'  
      c.     \*dat ik it net kin hawwe dien  
              'that I it not can have done'

---

19. See Breuker (to appear).

20. Some of the inversion facts discussed below are also observed by Wolf (1996).

- (27) a. ik kin it net dien hawwe  
'I can it not done have'  
b. \*ik kin it net hawwe dien  
'I can it not have done'

Examples (26a) and (26b) could be accounted for by a grammar that includes the principles that underly the Frisian and Dutch verbal complex, respectively: (26a) would be generated by the Frisian part of the grammar, and (26b) by the Dutch part. This will not work however, since (26c), whose Dutch translation is acceptable, is not acceptable for speakers of the new variety of Frisian. The same holds *mutatis mutandis* for (27), which are main clause variants of (26): here the non-occurrence of (27b) is the problem: it is not acceptable for speakers of Interference Frisian, although its Dutch translation is acceptable for Dutch speakers.

It is not only the case that not all Dutch inversion possibilities occur in Interference Frisian, I have also observed inversion phenomena in this new language variety that are neither Frisian nor Dutch:

- (28) a. dat er net komme wollen hat  
'that he not come wanted has'  
b. dat er net komme hat wollen  
'that he not come has wanted'
- (29) a. sûnder syn auto meitsje te litten  
'without his car make to let'  
b. sûnder syn auto te meitsje litten  
'without his car to make let'

The (a) variants of (28) and (29) are acceptable for all Frisian speakers, but the (b) examples only for interference speakers. The (b) sentences cannot be produced by Dutch rules, since their Dutch counterparts are not acceptable for Dutch speakers:

- (30) \*dat hij niet komen heeft gewild  
'that he not come has wanted'
- (31) \*zonder zijn auto te maken laten  
'without his car to make let'

What these changes in the word order of the Frisian verbal complex illustrate is

that these changes are due to Dutch influence, but they are not driven by the grammar of Dutch, i.e. the underlying system. They seem to result from an interplay between Dutch and Frisian surface strings. Part of the Frisian grammar underlying the verbal complex is reconstructed with these Dutch and Frisian data as input. This reconstructed grammar is a grammatical system in its own right, and not to be a copy of part of the Dutch system. If this type of interference was system-driven, we would not expect examples such as (28) and (29) to occur, and we would expect (26c) and (27b) to be acceptable to speakers of Interference Frisian. All of this points again to a surface orientation of this type of change.

Within the data-oriented approach to interference defended here, it is not the case that (parts of) grammatical systems play a role in language change. The linguistic factors that do are linguistic data and the linguistic boundary conditions of grammar construction in general, i.e. Universal Grammar. When Thomason & Kaufman (1988) say that the *linguistic distance*<sup>21</sup> between languages is relevant for the linguistic outcome of interference also, they formulate this in terms of similarity between grammatical subsystems. A close fit between subsystems would favor interference, although not automatically lead to it. I agree with Thomason & Kaufman (1988) that the degree of linguistic distance is an important factor for interference, but I would like to rephrase this factor in terms of similarity between the output of grammars, since I think that borrowing of grammatical rules is not an option. What is relevant, is the distance between the utterances of the languages involved.

Quite often it is said that grammatical domains differ in terms of sensitivity for interference. For instance, van Coetsem (1988: 28) states that not all domains or subdomains are equally stable, and he relates the concept of stability to the relative degree of structuredness of a domain. In Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 72-74) similar ideas can be found. In my opinion there is no principled basis for ordering grammatical domains in a kind of stability hierarchy with respect to interference. From my perspective it is not the abstract grammatical system that counts for interference, but the systematic properties that can be read off directly from the speech signal. The underlying system is irrelevant here. Consequently I would like to replace the concept of a stability hierarchy with the factor of the linguistic distance between concrete properties of utterances.

Looking from this perspective to the Dutch-Frisian case again, I would like to emphasize that it is clear to everybody who is familiar with both languages that the linguistic distance between them is very small: there is a close fit between the properties of Dutch and Frisian utterances. As noted by Sjölin (1993: 70-71) for example, strings of Frisian and Dutch morphemes can be identified on the basis

---

21. In fact Thomason & Kaufman (1988) use the concept 'typological distance'.

of quite a number of phonotactic and semantic correspondences. If a terminal string of a Dutch sentence is translated into a terminal string by one-by-one replacement of Dutch terminal elements with Frisian terminal elements, the result is not only an utterance that can be understood (due to full bilingualism) by the speakers involved, but the resulting utterance will be considered acceptable for the majority of the Frisian speakers. Quite generally (there are exceptions of course), understandability amounts to acceptability. The superficial similarity between Dutch and Frisian utterances makes interference easy, although it is not sufficient for interference to take place of course. This requires other causes, to which I will turn now.

### 5. *Why interference?*

Interference is dependent on language contact within one and the same person. Consequently the nature of contact-induced language change is partly determined by the nature of the type of bilingualism on which interference is based.<sup>22</sup> As noted in section 2.2. the Dutch-Frisian language situation can be characterized in this respect as interference under full bilingualism. The first factor that seems to be relevant for the question why Dutch-Frisian interference takes the form it does, has to do with the specific characteristics of full bilingualism in this situation.

The position of Dutch in the Frisian speech community is so dominant that even children that are raised in a homogeneous Frisian speaking family are confronted with the Dutch language from very early on. If we combine this with the observation that both languages are very close as far as typological distance is concerned, it does not seem to be too farfetched to assume that children acquiring Frisian will sometimes have difficulties in distinguishing between the respective input to this acquisition process. After all, the data do not come with a language-specific marking on their sleeves. It becomes possible that we have a *mixing of input*. In fact I have suggested elsewhere (de Haan 1996) that the changes in the word order of the Frisian verbal complex, discussed above, should be attributed to the construction of a grammar based on both Frisian and Dutch input.

Influence of Dutch on the construction of the Frisian lexicon is very likely also, even though there has been no research up until now that can confirm this. In my opinion, there is not only incorporation of Dutch words and idioms into Frisian during early childhood, but also in later stages of acquisition, caused by a shift to Dutch. In secondary socialization (education and work) the position of Frisian is

---

22. See for this point, Thomason & Kaufman (1988) and van Coetsem (1988).

rather weak. Since for Frisian-Dutch bilingual children Dutch can fulfil all the required functions, it becomes quite natural, even for children that are raised monolingually Frisian at home, to use Dutch in all domains. The same holds for bilingual adults of course. As a consequence, Frisian language proficiency does not seem to be adequately supported, in particular in the domain of the lexicon. What I in fact suggest here,<sup>23</sup> is that lexical acquisition of Frisian appears to be interrupted. This *interruption of lexical acquisition* paves the way for lexical interference from Dutch.

A minor factor that stimulates this, is the following. Although it is definitely true that the use of Frisian is restricted for most speakers to informal domains, there have been long lasting attempts to stimulate the use of Frisian in more formal domains as well. In as far as these attempts have been succesful, they have given rise to lexical borrowing from Dutch. More importantly, this process of lexical borrowing has taken place in order to adapt the use of Frisian to the needs of modern society. Since the implementation of a modernization policy for the Frisian language has hardly gained any influence, we see considerable borrowing in the fields of culture, technology, mass media, politics, science etc. All of this comes under the heading of *lexical innovation*.

Finally, one could imagine that this process of lexical interference is slowed down by the functioning of a clear standard for Frisian spoken and/or written language. This is not the case however, since, as we have pointed out above, Standard Frisian does not function in the speech community.

Mixing of input, interrupted lexical acquisition, lack of (acceptance of) a Frisian standard, full bilingualism, small linguistic distance are all factors that contribute to the dutchification of Frisian. The most important factor is related however to the unbalanced position of Dutch and Frisian in the speech community. That position can be characterized (partly) by describing the way these languages function in the speech community. It can be concluded from recent research<sup>24</sup> that Frisian is mainly used as, and considered by the speakers to be, a spoken language for informal domains such as home, neighbourhood, and informal contacts at work. The language has a very modest position in education, formal settings at work, religion and as a written language in official institutions. Compared to Dutch, the use of Frisian is functionally rather limited. Dutch has a strong position in all domains. Even Frisian native speakers who use the Frisian language dominantly, or exclusively, in one or all of the informal domains will be confronted with Dutch in these domains to some extent. Full bilinguals will use the Dutch language now and then in such situations. I conclude that there is no

---

23. This is in my opinion one of the essential points made in Sjölin (1976).

24. See Breuker (1993) and Gorter and Jonkman (1995).

general division of functional labour between Dutch and Frisian. The relation between the two languages is not one of *diglossia*, but should be characterized as one of *competitive bilingualism*.

The choices Dutch-Frisian bilinguals make in this language competition are determined by the specific functions which the languages involved have for them. Koefoed (1987) makes an interesting distinction in this connection between *cultural function* and *status function* of language systems. The cultural function refers to the role a language plays as part of a culture in establishing one's cultural identity. This function is individual-oriented, as opposed to the status function, which refers to the role a language plays in constituting a group. Since language change is a social phenomenon, and there is no change without social acceptance, the linguistic outcome of contact-induced language change, levelling included, is primarily determined by the status-identifying function of the language systems involved.<sup>25</sup>

What seems to be the decisive factor in Dutch-Frisian levelling is that Dutch as a standard language is not functionally limited, whereas for the great majority of Frisian speakers, Frisian is. We already pointed out the domain limitations of Frisian, but far more importantly, Frisian lacks a status-identifying function. As far as I can see, there exists for quite a number of people an individual-oriented Frisian cultural identity, but I see no evidence for the assumption that Frisian speakers use their language to express that they consider themselves members of a cultural group. Even though Frisian hardly plays a subjective role in group constituency, there is also no objective evidence for the existence of a cultural group of Frisian speakers: the property of being a speaker of Frisian does not correlate with other properties, be it education, occupation, income, sex, race, religion, political ideology, or whatever other property I can think of.<sup>26</sup> Since Frisian is not a group norm that should be followed, and since a codified standard is not generally known, the other language, Dutch, becomes dominant in this respect also. One can even say, as is done in Breuker (1993), that Standard Dutch not only functions as a standard for Dutch dialects, but also for Frisian. This language is the source for lexical innovation and substitution as we have seen. Furthermore, Frisian differs from Dutch in that the latter is a neutral language variety in the sense that it can be used by Dutch-Frisian bilinguals in all possible situations. Taking into account the small linguistic distance between these languages, we can state that the influence of Dutch on Frisian is a genuine case of levelling along the standard-dialect dimension, even though the languages do not stand in a standard-dialect relationship in a historically genetic sense.

---

25. See Gal (1979) for discussion.

26. See van der Plank (1987).



## 6. *Language policy*

It is interesting to place the changes in the language situation in Fryslân against the background of a long lasting language policy by the provincial government. We take here into account the essentials of this policy after the Second World War.

The language policy of the province of Fryslân has been directed mainly at the position of Frisian as an official language.<sup>27</sup> Point of departure was (and is) the principle that the rights of Frisian speakers are equal to the rights of speakers of Dutch, and that there is no difference between the values of the languages concerned. The central goal has been to establish a legal basis for this principle. The provincial government aimed at legislation in three areas: education, government and administration of justice. Legislation has been succesful in the first two domains. Since 1955 Frisian can be used as a medium of instruction at primary schools, and since 1980 the language is a compulsory subject. Since September 1994, Frisian has been legally recognized as a language of administration in the province of Fryslân. Shortly legislation will pass with respect to the administration of justice.

From these remarks it may be deduced that the language policy of the provincial government is not directly aimed at maintenance: the idea behind its language policy in this respect is that a firm legal position would automatically promote language use. A recent evaluation of the situation at primary schools however indicates that the education of Frisian is still in its initial stage, and has not been very succesful.<sup>28</sup> Recall my remark that the teaching of writing Frisian is still hardly implemented.

The official Frisian language policy involves mainly status planning, and will probably have contributed to the fact that most Frisian speakers have a positive attitude towards their language; that at least the main dialects are socially neutral; and that it is not uncommon that Frisian is used in the more formal domains. Apparently these effects of language policy on status do not protect Frisian from levelling.

Language policy involving corpus planning has been more modest. The provincial government has played a role in the recodification of the orthography of Frisian recently, and stimulates through the Fryske Akademy ('Frisian Academy') the writing of dictionaries and the development of terminology. This aspect of Frisian language policy mainly concerns written language. As to orthography, it shows archaic and purifying tendencies, and also a tendency of

---

27. See van Rijn & Sieben (1991, chapter 3) for discussion.

28. See de Jong & Riemersma (1994).

distancing from Dutch in frequently selecting the form that is most remote from its Dutch pendants. One of the consequences is that there is a considerable gap between written and spoken varieties of Frisian. Due to official language policy this gap is widened. Since Frisian hardly functions as a written language, as noted above, the effects of this policy on spoken Frisian are minimal. There are no structural changes for which this codification process could be credited, to the best of my knowledge. A consequence of this policy is, however, stigmatization of those new varieties of Frisian which have a lot of lexical borrowing from Dutch, and which show other salient properties of Dutch, such as certain word order properties. This stigmatization strengthens the awareness in native Frisians that their Frisian is non-standard, or even non-Frisian. This does not seem to be a particularly favorable strategy for language maintenance.

#### *7. A short summary*

Above I have presented an overview of interference phenomena from Dutch into Frisian. I have argued that these cases support a view on contact-induced language change that can be characterized as data-driven, as opposed to system-driven. Furthermore I have tried to give an interpretation for the rather strong incorporation of features from Dutch into the grammar of Frisian, the rise of Interference Frisian. I believe that this process should be understood against the background of simultaneous acquisition of Frisian and Dutch during early childhood, interrupted acquisition of Frisian, lexical innovation and small linguistic distance. As noted, this levelling process is primarily due to the socially dominant position of Dutch, which I have described in terms of competitive bilingualism and the lack of status function of Frisian. The current Frisian language policy has positive effects on the status of the language, but cannot stop the process of levelling that is going on.

*Department of Frisian*  
*University of Groningen*  
(e-mail: gdehaan@let.rug.nl)

## REFERENCES

- Breuker, P. (1979): 'De takomst fan it Frysk: standerdisearje of fierder forhol-lânskje', in *Us Wurk* 28, 51-64
- Breuker, P. (1982): 'Ta de oergong -ke > -tsje yn it ferlytsingswurd', in *It Beaken* 44, 85-95
- Breuker, P. (1984): 'Oer it lienjen fan bûne morfemen út it Hollânsk yn it Westerlauwerske Frysk', in N.R. Århammar et al. (eds.) *Miscellanea Frisica; in nije bondel Fryske stúdzjes*, Assen, 219-228
- Breuker, P. (1993): *Noarmaspekten fan it hjoeddeiske Frysk*, PhD dissertation University of Groningen
- Breuker, P. (to appear): 'Recente invloeden van het Nederlands op het Fries'
- Breuker, P. et al. (1982): *Bydragen ta de didaktyk fan it Frysk yn it fuortset ûnderwiis*, Grins/Ljouwert
- Breuker, P. et al. (1984): *Foar de taalspegel; koart oersjoch fan Hollânske yn-slûpsels yn it Frysk*, Leeuwarden
- Chomsky, N. (1975): *Reflections on language*, New York
- van Coetsem, F. (1988): *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact*, Dordrecht
- Dijkstra, A. (1994): 'Nijsfrysk. Oer taal en ynhâld fan 'e radionijsútstjoerings fan Omrop Fryslân', *It Beaken* 56: 253-280
- Dijkstra, Th. and S.T. Hiemstra (1977): *Schooltypen en interferentie-problematiek bij van huis uit Friestalige kinderen*, s.p.
- Eising, G., W. Koopmans & M. Wieberdink (1981): *Een onderzoek naar interferentie in de vervoeging van het zwakke werkwoord en de volgorde in de bijzin in het Fries van Abbega*, Groningen (unpublished master thesis)
- Feitsma, A. (1971): 'Onderzoek naar tweetaligheid in Friesland', in A. Feitsma & M. van Overbeke (eds.) *Tweetaligheidsproblemen. Bijdragen en Mededelingen der Dialectencommissie van de Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen* 41, 5-21
- Gal, S. (1979): *Language shift: social determinants of linguistic change in bilingual Austria*, New York
- Gorter, D. (ed., 1987): *The Sociology of Frisian*. Special issue of the *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 64
- Gorter, D. et al. (1984): *Taal yn Fryslân; ûndersyk nei taalgedrach en taalhâlding yn Fryslân*, Ljouwert
- Gorter, D. and R. Jonkman (1995): *Taal yn Fryslân op 'e nij besjoen*, Ljouwert
- de Haan, G.J. (1990): 'Grammatical borrowing and grammatical change: the Dutchification of Frisian', in D. Gorter et al. (eds.), *Fourth International*

- Congres on Minority Languages, Vol. 1*, Clevedon, published as *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 11: 101-118
- de Haan, G.J. (1992): *Meertaligheid in Friesland*, inaugural address University of Groningen, Dordrecht
- de Haan, G.J. (1995): 'Friese taalveranderingen', in R. Belemans & H.H.A. van de Wijngaard (eds.), *Dialect in beweging. 100 jaar na de enquêtes van Willems en Aardrijkskundig Genootschap*, Stichting Nederlandse Dialecten, Groesbeek: 65-78
- de Haan, G.J. (1996): 'Recent changes in the verbal complex of Frisian', in H.F. Nielsen (ed.) *A Frisian and Germanic Miscellany. Published in Honour of Nils Århammar*, Odense: 171-184
- de Haan, G.J. (1997): 'Over de (in-)stabiliteit van het Fries', to appear in *Nederlandse Taalkunde*.
- Haugen, E. (1972): 'Dialect, language, nation', in E.S. Firchow et al. (eds.), *Studies by Einar Haugen; presented on the occasion of his 65th birthday - april 19, 1971*, The Hague/Paris: 496-509
- Hof, J.J. (1933): *Friesche dialectgeographie*, 's-Gravenhage
- de Jong, S. & A.M.J. Riemersma (1994): *Taalpeiling yn Fryslân. Onderzoek naar de beheersing van het Fries en het Nederlands aan het einde van de basisschool*, PhD dissertation KUB, Ljouwert
- Koefoed, G.A.T. (1987): "'Verzorgd Nederlands", "Verzorgd Surinaams-Nederlands" óf "zorgvuldige taal"?", in: J. de Rooij (ed.), *Variatie en norm in de standaardtaal*, Amsterdam: 115-125
- van Marle, J. (1990): 'Over de ongelijksoortigheid van synchronie en diachronie', inaugural address Free University Amsterdam
- van der Plank, P.H. (1987): 'Frisian language use and ethnic identity', in Gorter (ed., 1987): 9-20
- van Rijn, J.G. & C. Sieben (1991): *Regionalisme en oerheidsbelied. In ûndersyk nei de ynfloed fan regionalistyske easken op it oerheidsbelied yn en oangeande Fryslân, Wales en Bretagne*, Ljouwert
- Sjölin, B. (1974): 'Zur lexikalischen Interferenz im gesprochenen Friesisch', in *Philologia Frisica Anno 1972*, Ljouwert: 24-37
- Sjölin, B. (1976): "'Min Frysk". Een onderzoek naar het ontstaan van transfer en "code-switching" in het gesproken Fries', *Bijdragen en Mededelingen der Dialectencommissie van de Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Amsterdam
- Sjölin, B. (1993): "'Goes it to wash?" Über Routine und Sprachverfall im Friesischen', in *Us Wurk* 42: 69-79
- Thomason, S.G. & T. Kaufman (1988): *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*, Berkeley

- Trommelen, M.T.G. (1983): *The syllable in Dutch*, PhD dissertation University of Utrecht, Dordrecht
- White, L. (1982): *Grammatical theory and language acquisition*, Dordrecht
- Wolf, H. (1996): *Wat en hoe yn it Ynterferinsjefrysk. In syngroan en diagroan ûndersyk nei feroarings yn de Fryske tiidwurdlike einrige*, University of Utrecht (unpublished master thesis)
- van der Woude, G. (1954): 'Oer it "aspekt" by tiidwurden', in *De Pompeblêdden* 25: 35-37; 54-59
- van der Woude, G. (1970): 'Taal en dialekt in Friesland', in W. Peé and G. van der Woude, *Taal en dialekt. Bijdragen en mededelingen der Dialectencommissie van de Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*: 26-44
- Ytsma, J. (1995): *Frisian as first and second language. Sociolinguistic and socio-psychological aspects of the acquisition of Frisian among Frisian and Dutch primary school children*, PhD Dissertation KUB, Ljouwert