



THE RISE AND FALL OF FRENCH BORROWINGS IN POSTMEDIEVAL DUTCH*

1 INTRODUCTION

The French and Dutch languages have been in close contact for centuries. In the history of Dutch, this has led to contact-induced changes such as borrowings in the lexicon and the morphology, to bilingual social domains implying language choice as well as to a strong anti-French discourse. This discourse is paralleled by a strong pro-Dutch discourse, particularly from the eighteenth century onwards, when the standard language ideology emerges.

The contact situation with French is still badly understood as there is a lack of empirical research from a linguistic angle. In this paper, we analyze lexical and morphological borrowings from French on the basis of the newly developed Language of Leiden Corpus (LOL Corpus) in order to obtain a more fine-grained and empirically sound understanding of the contact. We are here particularly interested in a possible ‘Dutchification’ of the language following a previous stage of ‘Frenchification’. In a previous study, we discussed the distribution of French-origin loan suffixes in the LOL Corpus (Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal 2023a). We found that the token frequency of French-origin suffixes increases over time from the sixteenth century onwards, and peaks in the first half of the eighteenth century. We also found a sharp decrease of these suffixes in the nineteenth century. In the present study, we zoom in on this decrease, while also comparing the distribution of the suffixes to the distribution of loanwords from French across time.

We introduce the sociohistorical situation in section 2. In section 3, we explain our method, after which we first present a diachronic, quantitative overview of the results, and then move on to a discussion of the decrease of French-origin items. Section 4 concludes.

* The research for this paper was supported by a grant from the Dutch Research Council (NWO, Free Competition grant awarded to Gijsbert Rutten, 2018-2024). We thank the editors and reviewers for useful comments on an earlier version.

2 FRENCHIFICATION AND DUTCHIFICATION

Dutch and French share a long history with various contact effects on both sides of the language border (Peersman/Rutten/Vosters 2015). From the late Middle Ages onwards, French was used in the Low Countries in the context of international trade, diplomacy, administration and literary culture, alongside Dutch and other languages such as Latin (Willemys 1994, Sleiderink 2010, Frijhoff 2015). In some cases, such as trade and diplomacy, the use of French was a functional choice, while in other cases, such as literature, multilingualism had always been part of cultural production and reception (Sleiderink 2010). There are important differences between the southern and the northern Low Countries, roughly Belgium and Luxembourg on the one hand, and the Netherlands on the other. Whereas both the north and the south were historically multilingual, the south is characterized by extensive societal multilingualism with large French- and Dutch-dominant communities (Vanhecke/De Groof 2007, Willemys 2015). In the north, the use of French was generally more limited, and French was more often than not a later-learned language. We will limit ourselves to the northern Low Countries here, zooming in on the city of Leiden in particular (see also section 3).

As an important language in several domains, French entered the Dutch school system, which intensified in the Early Modern period following the arrival of tens of thousands of Huguenot refugees, who established French schools across the Low Countries (Frijhoff 2003, Dodde 2020). It is traditionally said that French also entered the private domain in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries with elite families adopting French in private writings such as diaries and letters (Frijhoff 1989, Ruberg 2011, van Strien-Chardonneau/Kok-Escalé 2017). The Early and Late Modern Low Countries thus fully participated in the European tradition of Francophonie (Argent, Rjéoutski/Offord 2014). The intensive and enduring contact with French also affected the Dutch language itself, which comprises many borrowed items, particularly at the level of the lexicon and the morphology (van der Sijs 2002: 215, van der Wal/van Bree 2014: 173–174).

A significant metalinguistic effect of the intensive contact situation with French was the emergence of a discourse of Frenchification, according to which influence from French was severely criticized (Frijhoff 1989, Rutten/Vosters/van der Wal 2015). This discourse has roots in the sixteenth century, continues into the twentieth century, and usually locates the peak of Frenchification in the eighteenth century. In this century, the anti-French discourse was accompanied by another one, focusing on Dutchification instead (Rutten 2019). The rise of the standard language ideology in the context of emergent cultural nationalism subsequently led to various language planning proposals in the second half of the eighteenth century. These resulted in the first official codification of Dutch at the beginning of the nineteenth century. This language policy was quite successful, in that the newly codified standard language was implemented in education in the nineteenth century, and adopted in language use, even in private letters and diaries (Rutten/Krogull/Schoemaker 2020). The language policy was restricted to the northern part of the Low Countries.

The policy concerned the spelling and the grammar of Dutch. There were also official initiatives to create a national dictionary, but this was not realized at the time

(Rutten 2019: 146–147). Over the centuries, there had been many private initiatives to the Dutchification of the lexicon. Purist dictionaries were published from the sixteenth century onwards (Rutten/Vosters/van der Wal 2015: 148). In the 1760s, a long debate about a complete dictionary of Dutch began; work on what would become the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal* ‘Dictionary of the Dutch language’ eventually commenced in the second half of the nineteenth century (Rutten 2019: 133–164). A focal point in these lexicographical debates was the status of borrowings from languages such as French and Latin, which had to be expelled from the Dutch language according to most commentators (Rutten 2019: 163). Haspelmath (2009: 47) recalls that lexical purism is a common phenomenon in European languages, which has led to the ‘large-scale replacement of loanwords by native formations’ in ‘various central and eastern European languages, from the 18th century through the first half of the 20th century’. Whether this is also the case for Dutch is an empirical question, and one that we aim to start answering in the present paper.

3 WORDS AND MORPHEMES FROM FRENCH IN HISTORICAL DUTCH

3.1 Method

The Language of Leiden Corpus was specifically built to study empirically the phenomenon of the so-called Frenchification through corpus-based analyses of contact-induced changes. Previous research has shown that space is an important factor in this context (Rutten/Vosters/van der Wal 2015). Actual as well as perceptual proximity to the Romance language border appears to have been relevant to historical language users so that we have chosen to build a corpus with data from only one locality, viz. the city of Leiden. Leiden was chosen because it is one of the important cities in the dominant region of Holland, with however a less diversified migration history than the historical metropole Amsterdam. Importantly, Leiden has attracted relatively many migrants from French-speaking areas in the southern Netherlands and northern France (Lucassen/de Vries 2001: 29, 40).

The LOL Corpus is based on two independent variables: period and social domain. The corpus comprises textual data, largely manually transcribed from original sources, from seven social domains relevant in the history of Leiden: Academic life, Charity, Economic life, Literary life, Private life, Public opinion, and Religious life (Tjalsma 1978, Van Maanen/Groenveld 2003). The corpus data are furthermore divided into 50-year periods from 1500 to 1899. For each period and domain, we aimed to have 5,000 words. Table 1 gives the structure of the LOL Corpus. Note that from some periods no archival data were found, while for other periods no data were principally available (indicated by N.A.). The latter applies to Public opinion and Academic life: the first Leiden newspaper dates back to the second half of the seventeenth century, and the university was founded in the second half of the sixteenth century. Table 1 also gives broad genre labels for the documents representing the social domains.

Table 1. Overview of the Language of Leiden Corpus (N.A.= not applicable)

Domain	Public opinion	Private	Academic	Religion	Literature	Charity	Economy
Genre	Newspaper articles	Letters	Minutes	Minutes	Plays	Wills	Ordinances Requests
1500–1549	N.A.	-	N.A.	-	-	5,027	5,072
1550–1599	N.A.	4,449	5,046	5,305	5,116	5,229	5,118
1600–1649	N.A.	5,114	5,124	5,259	5,138	5,131	5,276
1650–1699	5,053	5,032	5,177	5,128	5,143	5,111	5,314
1700–1749	5,111	5,421	5,025	5,153	5,183	5,082	5,189
1750–1799	5,095	5,116	5,067	5,128	5,112	5,290	5,212
1800–1849	5,084	5,145	5,160	5,258	5,173	5,114	5,100
1850–1899	5,088	5,038	5,157	5,271	5,194	5,037	5,052
	25,431	35,315	35,756	36,502	36,059	41,021	41,333
Total word count: 251,417							

In a previous study, we discussed the distribution of French-origin loan suffixes in the LOL Corpus (Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal 2023a). Dutch borrowed between 30 and 40 suffixes from French (some may also originate from Latin, or from both languages), including nominal suffixes such as *-aard/-erd* as in *lafaard* ‘coward’, adjectival suffixes such as *-aal* in *amicaal* ‘friendly’, and the verbal suffix *-eren* as in *waarderen* ‘appreciate’; see Table 2 for the full list of suffixes investigated.

Table 2. Dutch suffixes originating from French (based on van der Sijs 2005: 189–195)

Suffix	Example
Nouns	
<i>-aard, -erd</i>	<i>lafaard</i> ‘coward’, <i>goeierd</i> ‘good person’
<i>-es, -esse</i>	<i>prinses</i> ‘princess’, <i>secretaresse</i> ‘female secretary’
<i>-e</i>	<i>studente</i> ‘female student’
<i>-ette</i>	<i>misdienette</i> ‘altar girl’
<i>-(en)ier</i>	<i>aalmoezenier</i> ‘chaplain’
<i>-ist</i>	<i>communist</i> ‘communist’
<i>-ant</i>	<i>predikant</i> ‘preacher’
<i>-ein, -een</i>	<i>Romein</i> ‘Roman’, <i>Hondureen</i> ‘inhabitant of Honduras’
<i>-ees</i>	<i>Balinees</i> ‘inhabitant of Bali’
<i>-ent</i>	<i>producent</i> ‘producer’
<i>-eur/euse</i>	<i>chauffeur</i> ‘driver’, <i>chauffeuse</i> ‘female driver’
<i>-teur/trice</i>	<i>directeur</i> ‘director’, <i>directrice</i> ‘female director’
<i>-iaan</i>	<i>indiaan</i> ‘native American’
<i>-iet</i>	<i>islamiet</i> ‘Muslim’
<i>-ijn</i>	<i>augustijn</i> ‘Augustinian’
<i>-ade</i>	<i>blokkade</i> ‘blockade’

Suffix	Example
-age	<i>lekkage</i> ‘leakage’
-cide	<i>genocide</i> ‘genocide’
-oïde/ide	<i>paranoïde</i> ‘paranoid’, <i>hominide</i> ‘hominid’
-(er)ij/(er)ie	<i>boerderij</i> ‘farm’, <i>pedanterie</i> ‘pedantry’
-ine	<i>vitamine</i> ‘vitamin’
-isme	<i>calvinisme</i> ‘calvinism’
-(i)teit	<i>majesteit</i> ‘majesty’
-lei	<i>allerlei</i> ‘all kinds of’
-tiek	<i>boetiek</i> ‘boutique’
-atie	<i>situatie</i> ‘situation’
-ment	<i>regiment</i> ‘regiment’
-((a)t)uur	<i>signatuur</i> ‘signature’
Adjectives	
-aal	<i>amicaal</i> ‘friendly’
-air	<i>elitair</i> ‘elitist’
-(i)eel	<i>financieel</i> ‘financial’
-esk	<i>soldatesk</i> ‘soldierly’
-(i)eus	<i>complimenteus</i> ‘complimentary’
-iek	<i>politiek</i> ‘political’
Verbs	
-eren	<i>waarderen</i> ‘to appreciate’

We extracted all suffixes from the corpus using the AntConc tool (Anthony 2022), while taking into account spelling variation as well as inflected and conjugated variants (see Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal 2023a for further details). For the loanwords, we were forced to adopt an inductive method, since no deductive search method could be established: it is currently not possible to automatically extract loanwords from a historical corpus of Dutch. We identify loanwords strictly as words ‘that at some point in the history of a language entered its lexicon as a result of borrowing’ (Haspelmath 2009: 36), i.e. on the basis of etymology. This means that we include the entire range from fully integrated words that are not clearly recognizable as loanwords to less integrated and often more recent borrowings. An example of the first type is the noun *kussen* ([kʊsə] or [kʊsən]) ‘cushion’, borrowed in medieval times and based on Oldfrench *cuisin*. An example of the other end of the scale is *municipaliteit* ‘municipality’ from French *municipalité*, which was used during the French reign in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. Borrowings from French also include borrowings from Picardic, from which many words entered the Dutch language, or other regional varieties of French.

The resulting datasets of loan suffixes and loanwords overlap partially, since many words with a French-origin suffix are loanwords from French, but there are also important differences:

1. Not all loanwords from French have one of the aforementioned suffixes, such as the frequently occurring noun *plaats* ‘place’. Research by Stevens (2019) suggests that the number of loanwords exceeds the number of words with loan suffixes.
2. Borrowed suffixes also occur with Germanic stems, for example *waarderen* ‘appreciate’ has the verbal suffix *-eren* attached to the Germanic stem *waard-* ‘value’. Such words are included in the suffix dataset since the suffix *-eren* is considered to be of French origin, but not in the loanword dataset as the verb *waarderen* is not a borrowing from French.
3. Suffixes were judged to be of French origin as a category (see Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal 2023a), while loanwords were analyzed individually. For example, the suffix *-ent* was deemed to be of French origin, in accordance with etymological dictionaries, since most words in *-ent* are borrowings from French. Some words ending in *-ent* are actually of Latin origin, but since we focused on the suffix as a morphological category, we included all words in *-ent*. This approach was also taken in the interest of comparability with Rutten/Vosters/van der Wal (2015; see also Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal 2023a). For the loanword analysis, however, words in *-ent* borrowed from Latin had to be excluded. An example is the noun *student* ‘student’, which frequently occurs in the LOL Corpus (in the Academic domain); the word *student* is not included in the loanword dataset, as it is derived from the Latin form *studentem*.

3.2 Diachronic overview

The LOL Corpus has 6,885 words with a French-origin suffix. The verbal suffix *-eren* is the most frequently occurring loan suffix with 2,682 tokens (e.g. *logeren* ‘spend the night’, *resolveren* ‘resolve’). The total number of loanwords from French is 8,767.¹ This means that in the entire LOL Corpus, which counts 251,417 words (Table 1), the share of established loanwords from French is 3.5%.²

Figure 1 gives the number of loan suffixes and loanwords per 1,000 words for each of the 50-year periods distinguished in the LOL Corpus. Both loanwords and loan suffixes show the same diachronic trend: there is an increase of French-origin items in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, resulting in a peak in the early eighteenth century, after which a decline sets in, which is particularly clear from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century. Across time, the number of loanwords consistently exceeds the number of words with a loan suffix.

-
- 1 There is an additional dataset of 6,419 loanwords with uncertain etymology; these are all possibly borrowed from French, but another origin is also an option (usually Latin). We will not take these possible borrowings from French into consideration here.
 - 2 Van der Sijs (2009: 350) argues that Dutch comprises 19.1% loanwords, and 6.8% loanwords from French. This leads Tadmor (2009: 57) to conclude that the Dutch language is an average borrower (between 10 and 25% loanwords). The analysis is based on present-day Dutch and departs from 1,460 lexical meanings (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009: 5); it is not historical nor is it corpus-based. It should be noted that the relevant lexical items in their sample do not comprise the large number of articles, pronouns and conjunctions found in actual language use (Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009: 22-34).



Figure 1. Loanwords from French (black line) and loan suffixes from French (grey line) in the LOL Corpus: token count per 1,000 words and per 50-year period

In Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal (2023a), we also compare the token frequency of French-origin suffixes to the type frequency. The type frequency is much more constant through time (always between 6 and 11 types per 1,000 words), which does however not mean that it is the same set of types: the set changes diachronically, while the type frequency remains relatively stable. In Assendelft/ Rutten/van der Wal (2023b), we show that a similar pattern is found for the type frequency of loanwords, which ranges from 8 to 13 per 1,000 words. The peaks of 11 types (for the suffixes) and of 13 types (for the loanwords) both occur in the first half of the eighteenth century.

The results in Figure 1 are partially in line with the traditional discourse of Frenchification, which often focuses on the eighteenth century. On the one hand, the token peak of French-origin items is found in the eighteenth century. On the other hand, it is found already in the first half of the century, at a point when the steady increase in the use of French-origin items has been going on for centuries. As previously mentioned, here we are particularly interested in the possibly ideological decrease of French-origin items in the context of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Dutchification.

3.3 Changes in lexical choices

In Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal (2023a), we first identified the decrease in French-origin items from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, when discussing the diachronic distribution of loan suffixes in the LOL Corpus. Taking into account the structure of the corpus, we showed that the use of loan suffixes was particularly prevalent across the centuries in the domains of the Academy and Charity. We examined the decrease of loan suffixes in the nineteenth century and established a range of lexical choices or variables, such as *compareren* v. *verschijnen* ‘appear (before a notary)’, *revoceren* v.

herroepen ‘revoke’, *disponeren* v. *beschikken* ‘dispose’, *resideren* v. *wonen* or *standplaats hebben* ‘reside’, and *ter presentie van* v. *in tegenwoordigheid van* ‘in the presence of’. These represent concepts frequently used in administrative and legal prose, for example in wills, and it seems that the Romance option (first mentioned in the pairs) diachronically gave way to the Dutch alternative. Haspelmath (2009: 49) discusses the effects of loanwords on the lexical stock of the recipient language and distinguishes between *replacement* and *coexistence*. Loanwords may take over the meaning of earlier words, after which these latter fall out of use; this is called replacement. In other cases, loanwords and native words with the same meaning remain in use, and thus coexist. In our Dutch case, we have the opposite, viz. native words replacing loanwords, but the effects are similar: in principle, the loanword can be replaced, or it can be maintained alongside the native word.

In this section, we will zoom in on the issue of replacement and coexistence. As the changes appear to be a matter of lexical choice, we will use the loanword dataset here. Since we are primarily interested in loans from French, we will not discuss words with an uncertain etymology or that were borrowed from Latin (e.g. *comparereren*, *revoceren*, *disponeren*). In addition, we limit ourselves here to the domain of Charity, which has a considerable proportion of loanwords from French (1,722 tokens out of 8,767 in total). The domain of Charity is among the four domains with the highest number of French borrowings; the others are Academy, Economy and Public Opinion (Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal 2023b). Public opinion does not have a history as long as the other three domains. Academy does not display a similar decrease in French loans in the nineteenth century (Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal 2023b); academic life is in fact replete with Romance loans until the present day (*student*, *docent*, *professor*, *assistent*, *promotie*, *oratie*, *dissertatie* and so on). The domain of Economy shows a diachronic pattern similar to Charity. Within the limits of this paper, we chose to focus on Charity.

The domain of Charity covers the whole period from 1500 to 1899 with approximately 5,000 words for each 50-year period. As shown above (Table 1), the texts chosen for this domain are wills. The local system of charity depended to a large extent on donations from individual citizens. These donations were recorded and regulated through wills. Zooming in on these wills related to the Charity domain, Table 3 gives the absolute numbers of loanwords from French across time. The pattern follows the one identified in Figure 1, viz. first, an increase with a peak in the eighteenth century, after which numbers seem to drop again in the nineteenth century.

Scrutinizing the data behind these figures reveals that a number of French loans follow the pattern as in Table 3 and are indeed superseded by Dutch alternatives. An example is *resideren* ‘reside’, used in wills to describe the address or residence of those who appear before the notary (the ‘appealers’) and of the notaries themselves. Another example is *presentie*, used to identify witnesses in the expressions *ter presentie van* and *in presentie van* ‘in the presence of’. Table 4 gives the results for these two frequent words with their Dutch alternatives.³

3 Note that in the expression *standplaats hebben* ‘have a location, reside’, the compound *standplaats* comprises the noun *plaats*, derived from old French *place*, which may not have been recognized as originally French (it’s

Table 3. Loanwords from French in the domain Charity: absolute numbers per 50-year period (based on the LOL Corpus)

Time	Number of French loans
1500–1549	82
1550–1599	187
1600–1649	234
1650–1699	276
1700–1749	292
1750–1799	294
1800–1849	197
1850–1899	160
	1722

Table 4. Two French loans and their alternatives in the domain Charity: absolute numbers

	<i>resideren</i>	<i>wonen</i>	<i>standplaats hebben</i>	<i>presentie</i>	<i>tegenwoordigheid</i>
1500–1549	0	1	0	0	0
1550–1599	0	3	0	5	0
1600–1649	2	3	0	3	0
1650–1699	12	7	0	5	0
1700–1749	14	9	0	4	0
1750–1799	16	10	0	14	0
1800–1849	17	37	0	2	32
1850–1899	8	28	3	0	58
	69	98	3	33	90

Table 4 also shows a diachronic increase in the need to identify witnesses and their residences, suggesting a gradually emerging genre. The French-origin items dominate first and are then accompanied by their Dutch alternatives.

The pattern found for *resideren* and *presentie* can even be established with less frequent items such as *affirmeren* ‘confirm’, which has only 17 tokens in the corpus, 16 of which occur before 1800, of which 13 in the eighteenth century. Its meaning is taken over by *bevestigen*, which has only 3 tokens before 1800, but 6 in the period 1850–1899. In all these cases, the French-origin item does not disappear entirely from the language. The words *resideren*, *presentie* and *affirmeren* still occur in Dutch. At the level of the Dutch language, coexistence thus seems to be the process in place. At the level of the texts representing this domain, however, and in particular when taking into account the frequency shift towards Dutch-origin items, the process may equally be termed replacement. In this respect, it is significant that *resideren* also increases in frequency until the first half of the nineteenth century. The proportion of

still an extremely common word in Dutch), or which in any case sounds significantly less French than *resideren*.

the two variants is the most relevant aspect in our view: despite the increasing use of *resideren*, it proportionally decreases in the first half of the nineteenth century due to the frequency of *wonen*.

Sometimes the introduction of an alternative leads to the temporary coexistence of the French and the Dutch form within one expression. The past participle *gepasseerd* ‘passed (before the notary)’ (72 tokens) is gradually replaced by *verleden* (23 tokens): this participle *gepasseerd* of the verb *passeren* (from French *passer*) occurs sporadically first, then increases to 12 tokens in 1700–1749, 19 tokens in 1750–1799, and 16 tokens in 1800–1849, after which it drops to 6 in the final period. The alternative *verleden* occurs sporadically throughout the centuries; it has even no occurrences at all in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, but then increases to 11 tokens in the final period. In 9 instances, however, the two forms co-occur as in the phrase *verleden en gepasseert*. These cases of coexistence within one phrase are only found in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

Other frequent French-origin forms occur throughout the centuries and into the nineteenth century without a remarkable decrease but are accompanied by a Dutch alternative in the most recent period. The nouns *testateur* and *testatrice* (147 tokens together), indicating men and women who make a will, are used interchangeably with the masculine form *comparant* and the feminine form *comparante* ‘someone who appears before a notary, appearer’ (230 tokens together). In the first half of the nineteenth century, the Dutch alternative *erflater* ‘testator’ is introduced (1 occurrence), which has 33 tokens in the second half of the nineteenth century, when it is however still outnumbered by *testateur/testatrice* (23 tokens) and *comparant(e)* (45 tokens).

A final example of the gradual rise of Dutch alternatives to French loans also involves a syntactic difference. The adjective *publiek* ‘public’, often spelt in a French-like fashion such as *publyck* or *publycq*, occurs 56 times in the corpus, of which 53 times in combination with *notaris* ‘notary’. Only a handful tokens are found in the first 150 years, but in 1650–1699 there are 14 tokens of *notaris publiek* ‘public notary’, in 1700–1749 there are 11, in 1750–1799 there are 21, after which the expression entirely disappears. The expression is syntactically remarkable as it has the adjective in postposition, as is common for most French adjectives, though not for Dutch adjectives. The alternative *openbaar notaris* ‘public notary’ occurs only 27 times in the corpus, sporadically throughout the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but in 1800–1849 there are 10 tokens. All 53 instances of *notaris publiek* have the adjective in postposition, whereas the 27 tokens of *openbaar notaris* have the Dutch word order. This shows that word order patterns not existing in the recipient language may be borrowed along with lexical items, albeit in a supposedly fixed expression.

While many French words were gradually accompanied or superseded by Dutch alternatives, we wish to point out that some French loans simply disappear from the corpus without an alternative being introduced. This applies to frequent words such as *accorderen* ‘approve’ with 30 tokens, 17 of which occur in the eighteenth century. Another 3 tokens are found in 1800–1849, and none in the final period. The adverb *expres/expreskelijk* ‘explicitly’ occur 15 times in the corpus. 11 of these 15

tokens have the Dutch adverbial suffix *-elijk*. After some popularity in the seventeenth century, there is a single token in 1700–1749, and another one in 1750–1799, after which *expres/expresselijk* disappears. The adjective *solemneel* ‘solemn’ (7 tokens) occurs 6 times in combination with *testament* ‘will’. There is one final token in the period 1750–1799. Here, as above, the French word order with the adjective in postposition occurs once in the period 1700–1749 (*testament solemneel*). The adjective *testamentair* ‘testamentary’ (20 tokens) occurs only in the expression *testamentaire dispositie* ‘testamentary disposition’. The final two tokens are found in 1800–1849. Here, 5 tokens occur with the French word order, i.e. with the adjective following the noun. In all these cases, there are no clear Dutch alternatives introduced. It may be the case that these words were part of larger expressions or genre conventions that disappeared or changed, but this would require a more detailed analysis of the genre in question.

Finally, we do not want to give the impression that French loans were entirely expelled from Dutch. Words such as *som* ‘sum’ (84 tokens) and *kantoor* ‘office’ (26 tokens), both already borrowed in the thirteenth/fourteenth century, occur throughout the period of the corpus, and are in fact still widely used in present-day Dutch.

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The diachronic trend established for loan suffixes in previous research (Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal 2023a) is paralleled by the pattern for lexical loans: the number of words borrowed from French increases in the LOL Corpus until it peaks in the eighteenth century, after which it drops in the nineteenth century. Some loans simply disappear, while others are maintained. Many lexical borrowings are replaced or accompanied by Dutch alternatives, particularly in the nineteenth century. Focusing on the social domain of Charity, we have shown how lexical choices moved from French-oriented to Dutch-oriented in many cases. These trends confirm an increasing influence of the contact language French on Dutch in the Early and Late Modern period (‘Frenchification’), and at the same time they also show the effect of nationalistically inspired Dutchification in the nineteenth century, following the recently emerged standard language ideology (Rutten 2019).

In the language contact literature, a conceptual distinction is made between replacement and coexistence (Haspelmath 2009). These two concepts refer to the effect of lexical borrowings on the lexicon of the recipient language. Here, we applied these terms to the opposite situation of native lexical items replacing French-origin items. Most examples we presented would count as coexistence: the native lexemes were naturally already around (they were usually not invented in, say, the eighteenth or nineteenth century), and the French lexemes were not always completely removed from the language as a whole. Nonetheless, at the more specific level of domain and genre-related variation, they proportionally disappeared as can be shown by a variationist analysis, after which they were replaced by Dutch alternatives. More generally, we would argue that processes of replacement and coexistence need to be investigated at the level of concrete discourse traditions.

Some of the lexical loans and the concepts that they signify, discussed in section 3, were not very frequent in the sixteenth century, but then increased in frequency in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. This suggests that the genre of the will – our textual source from the domain of Charity – was changing at the time, and stabilized in the seventeenth/eighteenth century, when it included many French-origin items. It probably changed again in the nineteenth century, at least at the level of lexical choice. A topic for future research is therefore the development of the genre of the will through the ages. Another topic for future research is the relationship between phonological integration and avoidance. It is probably not a coincidence that a fully integrated borrowing such as *kantoor* ‘office’ (< *comptoir*) is still a frequently used word in Dutch. Interestingly, our results have also shown that in certain phrases the French syntactic pattern in which the adjective follows the noun was copied into Dutch. A present-day example where this is still the case, also in English, is *secretaris-generaal* ‘secretary general’.

This last observation may suggest that the influence of French on Dutch was pervasive, affecting even syntax, and this is also suggested by the large number of French-origin items in the LOL Corpus (both words and suffixes). At the same time, this wide use of French-origin items across the centuries did certainly not prevent language users later on from identifying many of these words as originating from another language, viz. French, and to avoid them in the nineteenth-century spirit of nationalism.

References

- ANTHONY, Laurence (2022) AntConc (Version 4.2.0) [Computer Software]. Tokyo: Waseda University. <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/>
- ARGENT, Gesine/Vladislav RJÉOUTSKI/Derek OFFORD (eds) (2014) *European Francophonie. The social, political and cultural history of an international prestige language*. Oxford: Lang.
- ASSENDELFT, Brenda/Gijsbert Rutten/Marijke van der Wal (2023a) "Tracing Frenchification: a sociolinguistic analysis of French loan suffixes in a historical corpus of Dutch." In: Rita Franceschini/Matthias Hüning/Peter Maitz (eds), *Historische Mehrsprachigkeit: Europäische Perspektiven*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 37-55.
- ASSENDELFT, Brenda/Gijsbert Rutten/Marijke van der Wal (2023b) "Franse woorden in het Nederlands: een corpusanalyse van de lexicale invloed van het Frans op het Nederlands, 1500-1900." *Tijdschrift voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde* 139(2/3): 160-179.
- DODDE, Nan (2020) *Franse scholen in Nederland. Ontstaan en ontwikkeling vanaf de vijftiende eeuw tot het midden van de negentiende eeuw*. Oud-Turnhout/'s-Hertogenbosch: Gompel & Svacina.
- FRIJHOFF, Willem (1989) »Verfransing? Franse taal en Nederlandse cultuur tot in de revolutietijd.« *Bijdragen en Mededelingen betreffende de Geschiedenis der Nederlanden* 104, 592–609.
- FRIJHOFF, Willem (2003) "Uncertain Brotherhood. The Huguenots in the Dutch Republic." In: Bertrand Van Ruymbeke/Randy Sparks (eds), *Memory and Identity*.

- The Huguenots in France and the Atlantic Diaspora*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 128–171.
- FRIJHOFF, Willem (2015) “Multilingualism and the challenge of frenchification in the early modern Dutch Republic.” In: C. Peersman/G. Rutten/R. Vosters (eds), 115–140.
- HASPELMATH, Martin (2009) “Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues.” In: Martin Haspelmath/Uri Tadmor (eds), *Loanwords in the World’s Languages. A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 35–54.
- HASPELMATH, Martin/Uri TADMOR (2009) “The Loanword Typology project and the World Loanword Database.” In: Martin Haspelmath/Uri Tadmor (eds), *Loanwords in the World’s Languages. A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1–34.
- LUCASSEN, Leo/Boudien de VRIES (2001) “The rise and fall of a West European textile-worker migration system: Leiden, 1586–1700.” In Gérard Gayot/Philippe Minard (eds), *Les ouvriers qualifiés de l’industrie (XVIe-XXe siècle). Formation, emploi, migrations*. Lille: Université Charles de Gaulle/Revue du Nord, 23–42.
- MAANEN, Rudi van/Simon GROENVELD (eds) (2003) *Leiden. De geschiedenis van een Hollandse stad. Deel 2: 1574–1795*. Leiden: Stichting Geschiedschrijving Leiden.
- PEERSMAN, Catharina/Gijsbert RUTTEN/Rik VOSTERS (eds) (2015) *Past, Present and Future of a Language Border: Germanic-Romance Encounters in the Low Countries*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- RUBERG, Willemijn (2011) *Conventional Correspondence. Epistolary culture of the Dutch elite, 1770–1850*. Leiden: Brill.
- RUTTEN, Gijsbert (2019) *Language Planning as Nation Building. Ideology, policy and implementation in the Netherlands, 1750–1850*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- RUTTEN, Gijsbert/Andreas KROGULL/Bob SCHOEMAKER (2020) »Implementation and acceptance of national language policy: the case of Dutch (1750–1850).« *Language Policy* 19, 259–279.
- RUTTEN, Gijsbert/Rik VOSTERS/Marijke van der WAL (2015) “Frenchification in discourse and practice. Loan morphology in Dutch private letters of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.” In: C. Peersman/G. Rutten/R. Vosters (eds), 143–170.
- SIJS, Nicoline van der (2002) *Chronologisch woordenboek. De ouderdom en herkomst van onze woorden en betekenissen*. Amsterdam/Antwerpen: Veen.
- SIJS, Nicoline van der (2005) *Van Dale Groot Leenwoordenboek. De invloed van andere talen op het Nederlands*. Utrecht/Antwerpen: Van Dale Lexicografie.
- SIJS, Nicoline van der (2009) “Loanwords in Dutch.” In: Martin Haspelmath/Uri Tadmor (eds), *Loanwords in the World’s Languages. A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 338–359.
- SLEIDERINK, Remco (2010) “From Francophile to Francophobe: The changing attitude of Medieval Dutch authors towards French literature.” In: Christopher Kleinhenz/Keith Busby (eds), *Medieval Multilingualism: The Francophone World and its Neighbours* Turnhout: Brepols, 127–143.

- STEVENS, Emmy (2019) »‘Adieu, Vaarwel, groet mijne zo Waarde Ouders’: Het gebruik van Franse leensuffixen en leenwoorden in een negentiende-eeuwse familiecorrespondentie.« *Taal en Tongval* 71, 137–156.
- STRIEN-CHARDONNEAU, Madeleine van/Marie-Christine KOK-ESCALLE (eds) (2017) *French as Language of Intimacy in the Modern Age*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- TADMOR, Uri (2009) “Loanwords in the world’s languages: Findings and results.” In: Martin Haspelmath/Uri Tadmor (eds), *Loanwords in the World’s Languages. A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 55–75.
- TJALSMA, Heiko (1978) “De fysieke structuur van Leiden in 1749.” In: Herman Diekeriks/Karel Davids/Dirk Jaap Noordam/Heiko Tjalsma (eds), *Een stad in achteruitgang. Sociaal-historische studies over Leiden in de achttiende eeuw* Leiden: Sociale geschiedenis R.U.L., 14–54.
- VANHECKE, Eline/Jetje DE GROOF. 2007. “New data on language policy and language choice in 19th-century Flemish city administrations.” In: Stephan Elspaß/Nils Langer/Joachim Scharloth/Wim Vandenbussche (eds), *Germanic Language Histories ‘from Below’ (1700–2000)*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 449–470.
- WAL, Marijke van der/Cor van BREE (2014) *Geschiedenis van het Nederlands*. Houten: Spectrum.
- WILLEMYNS, Roland (1994) »Taalpolitiek in de Bourgondische tijd.« *Verslagen en Mededelingen van de Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal - en Letterkunde*, 162–177.
- WILLEMYNS, Roland (2015) “Trilingual tug-o’-war: Language border fluctuations in the Low Countries.” In: C. Peersman/G. Rutten/R. Vosters (eds), 39–60.

Abstract

THE RISE AND FALL OF FRENCH BORROWINGS IN POSTMEDIEVAL DUTCH

In this paper, we discuss the remarkable decrease in the use of French-origin loanwords and loan suffixes in Late Modern Dutch. We consider both changes to be lexical changes since the decrease in loan suffixes such as the verbal suffix *-eren* appears to result from a shift in certain lexical choices as well (Rutten/Vosters/van der Wal 2015). Our data come from the newly compiled Language of Leiden Corpus (LOL Corpus), developed at Leiden University in the context of a project on the historical Dutch-French contact situation. The main aim of the project is to assess empirically the supposed ‘Frenchification’ of Dutch in the Early Modern period (Frijhoff 2015). The LOL Corpus comprises data from seven social domains (Academy, Charity, Economy, Literature, Private life, Public opinion, Religion) significant in the history of the city Leiden from 1500 to 1899. Leiden was chosen as it was one of the important urban centers in Holland, attracting many migrants, including French-speaking labor migrants and Huguenots. The results for both words and suffixes borrowed from French

show a gradual increase from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, and a remarkable decrease from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century. The results partially confirm the ongoing and intensifying influence of French on Dutch in the Early Modern period, depending strongly however on the social domain involved (Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal 2023a). At the same time, the results also show an unanticipated ‘Dutchification’ in more recent times. We relate these ‘Dutchifying’ lexical changes to the national language planning efforts emerging in the eighteenth century, following the rise of the standard language ideology from the middle of the eighteenth century onwards. These language planning efforts led to the official codification of Dutch in 1804/1805, which targeted spelling and grammar. Previous research has shown the significant influence of the officialization of Dutch, both on the field of education and on language use (Rutten 2019). In this paper, we argue that the successful language policy had the surprising side effect of inspiring language users to exchange sometimes long-established loans for originally Dutch words.

Keywords: Dutch, French, historical sociolinguistics, lexical borrowing, loan morphology, language contact

Povzetek

VZPON IN PADEC FRANCOSKIH IZPOSOJENK V POSREDNJEVEŠKI NIZOZEMŠČINI

V prispevku se ukvarjano z močnim upadom v rabi prevzetih besed in pripon francoskega izvora v pozni moderni nizzemščini. Obe spremembi imamo za leksikalni, saj se zdi, da je upad v rabi prevzetih pripon, kot je glagolska pripona *–eren*, tudi posledica sprememb v nekaterih leksikalnih izbirah (Rutten/Vosters/van der Wal 2015). Podatke zajemamo iz novega korpusa, znanega kot Language of Leiden Corpus (LOL), ki je nastal na Univerzi v Leidnu v okviru projekta o zgodovini nizozemsko-francoskih stikov. Glavni cilj projekta je empirična oceana domnevnega “pofrancozenja” nizozemščine v zgodnjem novem veku (Frijhoff 2015). Korpus LOL vključuje podatke s sedmih področij družbenega delovanja (akademsko področje, dohodnost, gospodarstvo, književnost, zasebno življenje, javno mnenje, vera), pomembnih za zgodovino mesta Leiden med 1500 in 1899. Leiden smo izbrali, ker je bil pomembno nizozemsko urbano središče, privlačno za mnoge priseljence, vključno s francosko-govorečimi priseljenci, ki so se sem preselili zaradi dela, in hugenoti. Rezultati tako za besede kot za pripone, izposojene iz francoščine, kažejo postopen porast od 16. do 18. stoletja in nato močan upad od 18. do 19. stoletja. Izsledki deloma potrjujejo, da je bil zgodnji novi vek obdobje intenzivnega vplivanja francoščine na nizozemščino, čeprav v izraziti odvisnosti od posameznega področja družbenega življenja (Assendelft/Rutten/van der Wal 2023a). Obenem je razvidno, da je pozneje prišlo do nepričakovanega “ponizozemljenja”. Tovrstne leksikalne težnje povezujemo s poskusi jezikovnega načrtovanja na državni ravni, ki so se začeli sredi 18. stoletja, po vzponu ideologije standardnega jezika.

Ti poskusi jezikovnega načrtovanja so privedli do uradne kodifikacije nizozemščine v času 1804/1805, ki je zadevala pravopis in slovnico. Predhodne raziskave so pokazale, da je imel proces uradne kodifikacije nizozemščine močan vpliv tako v izraževanju kot v jezikovni rabi (Rutten 2019). V prispevku trdimo, da je bil stranski učinek uspešne jezikovne politike v spodbujanju jezikovnih uporabnikov, da že dolgo uveljavljene izposojenke včasih zamenjajo z izvorno nizozemskimi besedami.

Ključne besede: nizozemščina, francoščina, zgodovinska sociolingvistika, leksikalno izposojanje, oblikoslovje prevzetih besed, jezikovni stik