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The Low Countries are famous for their radically changing landscape over the last 1,000 years. Occasionally, some remote corner of the modern urbanized landscape allows a glimpse of the landscape of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but the latter were already completely different from the sparsely inhabited peat bogs, dunes and salt marshes that existed just a millennium ago. Like the landscape, the linguistic situation has also undergone major changes. In Holland, an early form of Frisian was spoken until, very roughly, 1100, and in parts of North Holland it disappeared even later. The hunt for traces of Frisian or Ingvaenic in the dialects of the western Low Countries has been on for around 150 years, but a synthesis of the available evidence has never appeared. The main aim of this book is to fill that gap. It follows the lead of many recent studies on the nature and effects of language contact situations in the past. I have approached the topic from two different angles: Dutch dialectology in all its geographic and diachronic variation, and comparative Germanic linguistics. In the end, the minute details and the bigger picture merge into one possible account of the early and high medieval processes that determined the make-up of western Dutch.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ins.</td>
<td>Insular</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
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<tr>
<td>NE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFri.</td>
<td>North Frisian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM.</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Old</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL.</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODu.</td>
<td>Old Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEFri.</td>
<td>Old East Frisian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
<td>OFre.</td>
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<td>OHG</td>
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<td>ON</td>
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</tr>
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<td>OS</td>
<td>Old Saxon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o.s.l.</td>
<td>open syllable lengthening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWFri.</td>
<td>Old West Frisian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFri.</td>
<td>Proto-Frisian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGm.</td>
<td>Proto-Germanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
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<td>PTC.</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>StDu.</td>
<td>Standard Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Southwest-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swe.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>West-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGM.</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPs.</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1

Aim and scope

(...) de stelling van W. Schmidt (...): ‘First the facts and all the facts and then the theory’. Iedereen bij wiens wetenschappelijk werk de fantasie een zekere rol speelt, doet natuurlijk het tegenovergestelde en begint met een idee, dat hij vervolgens confronteert met de feiten. (Heeroma 1943b: 52)

It has long been known that significant structural differences exist between the dialects of the western provinces of Holland, Zealand, and Flanders, and the dialects of the central and eastern Low Countries. In this study I will use coastal Dutch to refer to the dialects of the three western provinces, and inland Dutch for the remaining dialects within the borders of modern Belgium and the Netherlands. The main isogloss separating coastal Dutch from inland Dutch is judged to be the absence versus the presence of secondary i-mutation (Goossens 1981; here § 5 and other sections). The isogloss does not exactly coincide with the eastern borders of Flanders, Zealand, and Holland, but it suffices to define those provinces as the bulk of coastal Dutch.

In order to explain the linguistic difference between coastal and inland Dutch, the early medieval history of the area has often been invoked. Many scholars have argued for the erstwhile presence of a Frisian or Ingvaeonic population which left its trace in substrate features in western Dutch. This theory implies that the coastal dialects from Flanders to Holland are the outcome of a medieval process of franscification, that is, of a shift from an earlier Frisian or Ingvaeonic variety to the inland variety of which the dialects of Brabant, Limburg, Utrecht, and Guelders directly derive. In this study I will use for the alleged substrate the term “Proto-Frisian”, which I borrow from Bremmer 2009: 22ff. Traces of Proto-Frisian in the later Flemish, Zealandish and Hollandish dialects will be referred to as frisianisms.

In spite of this label, I do not claim beforehand that the entire coastal area has been frisophone at some point in the Early Middle Ages. Whereas a Frisian presence from the north down to the mouth of the Rhine has been established beyond

1. “(...) the proposition of W. Schmidt (...): ‘First the facts and all the facts and then the theory’. Everyone in whose scientific work imagination plays a certain part, of course, does the opposite, starting with an idea which is then confronted with the facts.”
doubt (see § 6.5), a genuine Proto-Frisian stage remains hypothetical for the area further south. The aim of this book is to test the hypothesis of a Proto-Frisian linguistic substrate in all the dialects of coastal Dutch. The investigation will focus on those differences which may have originated in the Old Dutch period, before 1200. Using general principles of language contact studies, the results will be interpreted in the light of historical and geographic evidence relating to the demographic history of the Low Countries.

As I explain in more detail in Section 8.2.1, the linguistic investigation will mainly be restricted to phonetics and phonology, since these aspects allow for the most insightful and the most reliable historical comparison between Frisian and Franconian. The main analytical tool will be contrastive analysis of the reconstructed phonological systems of Proto-Frisian and Old Franconian. We will follow the development of both varieties before and during the putative period of contact, roughly between 400 and 1200. The differences in phonetics and phonology between coastal Dutch and inland Dutch which have been claimed to exist, or might be argued to provide evidence for language contact between Proto-Frisian and Old Franconian, will be reviewed on the basis of a renewed examination of the evidence.

The book is structured in the following way. Chapters 2 to 4 provide some preliminary information on definitions, sources and the spelling of Dutch. Chapter 5 surveys the research history of the ‘Frisian question’ in Dutch linguistics. The methodology of the approach is explained in Chapters 6 to 8, which deal with the extralinguistic data to be taken into account, with the study of language contact, and which provide the historical-phonological developments of Frisian and Franconian in the relevant period. Chapters 9 to 21 form the core of the work. Chapters 9 and 10 focus on consonantal issues, Chapters 11 to 15 on the original short vowels, and Chapters 16 to 21 on long vowels and diphthongs. The phenomena studied in these chapters have been selected if one or more of the following criteria apply to them: (1) They have been adduced in the scholarly literature as possible instances of ingvaeonisms or as betraying language contact in the western Low Countries before 1200; (2) They show a geographic distribution which roughly follows the division between coastal and inland Dutch, either for all of the Low Countries or for part of them (e.g. Flanders, or North Holland); (3) They have been insufficiently studied to exclude the possibility that they are due to a geographic west-east split in the Low Countries before 1200. Finally, Chapter 22 summarizes the results and draws a more general conclusion on the reconstructed linguistic scenario.
The main dialects, languages and chronological stages which play a role in the discussion are the following:

*Anglo-Frisian* The common pre-stage of the Anglo-Saxon and the Frisian dialects of West Germanic, from which, on the one hand, the dialects of English and Scots derive, and, on the other hand, those of Frisian. See Sections 8.2.3 and 8.2.4 on the reconstruction of Anglo-Frisian.

*coastal Dutch* The language of the modern-day provinces of West Flanders (including the area now located in France), East Flanders, Zealand, South Holland and North Holland, and adjacent parts of western Antwerp, North Brabant, Guelders and Utrecht, inasmuch as they share (some of) the defining characteristics of their western neighbours.

*Dutch* The language and dialects defined as Old, Middle and Modern Dutch, either as a whole or a subset thereof.

*Flanders* The provinces of West and East Flanders in Belgium plus the French Flanders region in France. The derived adjective is *Flemish*.

*Frankish* For our purposes, this denomination mainly occurs in *West Frankish*. With Frankish (called Francian in other works), I refer to the West Germanic dialect spoken by the Franks at the time of their migration into the Low Countries and Gaul, and up to ca. 800 CE.

*Franconian* The medieval and modern dialects in the northwestern part of the Continental West Germanic dialect continuum, as far as they do not continue an Anglo-Frisian or Proto-Frisian stage. Traditionally, Franconian is contrasted with Saxon, which refers to the northern part of the Continental West Germanic dialect continuum (reflected in northeastern Dutch and Low German).

*Franconization* The process by which speakers of a different dialect (in the framework of this study, this mainly concerns speakers of Proto-Frisian) shifted to speaking a Franconian dialect.

*Frisia* The frisophone area in the Middle Ages, stretching along the North Sea coast from modern Zealand or Holland (cf. 6.5) to modern North Frisia.

*Frisian* Any stage in any region of the Frisian language, defined as one of the two members of the Anglo-Frisian branch of West Germanic.
Fryslân The modern-day Dutch province called, in Dutch, *Friesland*.

Gelderland The Dutch province of that name which was created in 1814 and inherited the name *Gelder-* from its historical predecessor *Guelders*. Note that the town of Geldern remains outside the province.

Geldern The town of Geldern, now situated in the Cleves district in Germany.

Guelders The duchy (1100–1581) and province (until 1795), situated in the southeast of the Dutch linguistic area, which took its name from the town of Geldern, or, in older English, *Guelders*.

Holland The historical region of that name, which emerges from history after 1100. Holland does not refer to the Netherlands as a whole.

Hollandish The dialect(s) spoken in Holland after the shift of Proto-Frisian or Ingvaeonic to Franconian, which is datable roughly to the eleventh century in South Holland, and to the thirteenth century and beyond in North Holland.

Hollandization The spread of the Hollandish variety to regions where it was not originally spoken. Such was the case in North Holland after 1200 (where Hollandish replaced Frisian), and in several towns in Friesland after 1500 (van Bree & Versloot 2008).

Ingvaeonic Traditionally, the term Ingvaeonic is used to refer: (1) To a period in the development of the West Germanic languages, viz. a pre-stage of the varieties which come out as Frisian, Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon; (2) To languages and dialects close to the North Sea shores, in Britain, the Low Countries, Low Germany and Denmark, at various stages in the medieval and modern periods. In this study, Ingvaenic will only be used in citations or paraphrases of claims by other scholars.

inland Dutch The language of the modern-day provinces of Vlaams Brabant, Antwerp, North Brabant (excluding the westernmost parts which share coastal Dutch features), Belgian and Dutch Limburg, Gelderland, eastern Utrecht, Overijssel, Drenthe and Groningen. Also included in this study is the Lower Rhine area around Cleves, Geldern and Xanten, up to Krefeld, which now lies in Germany.

Low Countries The entire area, at any point in the last two millennia, corresponding to the modern state of the Netherlands, the northern half of Belgium, French Flanders and the Lower Rhine area in Germany. Geomorphologically, this corresponds to the western fringe of the North German Plain. Hydrographically, it encompasses the southeastern shores of the North Sea, with the lower basins of the rivers Scheldt, Meuse, Rhine, and Ems, and some smaller streams.

Lower Rhine The geographic area which in modern Germany is referred to as *Niederrhein*, encompassing the districts Cleves, Wesel, Viersen, Neuss, Heinsberg, and the cities of Krefeld, Duisburg and Mönchengladbach.
**Middle Dutch**  The Germanic dialects spoken and written between 1200 and 1500 within the modern administrative borders of the Netherlands and Belgium, with the addition of some areas where Dutch no longer functions as the main language of communication. In particular, these are French Flanders (east of Calais) and the northern part of Lower Rhine (Cleves, Geldern, Wesel). I distinguish *Early Middle Dutch* (1200–1300) from *Late Middle Dutch* (1300–1500).

**Modern Dutch**  The variety which functions as a standard language in the Netherlands and the northern half of Belgium (Goossens 1985: 200). The vernacular dialects which are rooted by this standard are therefore the Modern Dutch dialects. There is a natural external linguistic border with French, and an internal one with Frisian, as spoken in most parts of the province of Fryslânt. The Dutch-German state border is not a strict linguistic border as far as the dialects are concerned, but is used as an eastern limit of Dutch for practical purposes. I distinguish *Early Modern Dutch* (1500–1700) from the later varieties.

**North Sea Germanic**  This term is mostly used in a descriptive sense, referring to the West Germanic languages spoken along the North Sea coast; that is, in modern times, English, Dutch, Frisian, and Low German. It was originally coined by Maurer 1942 and understood in a historical-genealogical sense, defining a certain division of Proto-Germanic. Nowadays many scholars use the term as an alternative for Ingvaeonic. In view of its multiple meanings, I will avoid its use except for citations from other scholars.

**Old Dutch**  Strictly speaking, this concerns the Germanic dialects spoken and written between, approximately, 500 and 1200 within the modern administrative borders of the Netherlands and Belgium, plus a few adjacent areas in which Dutch no longer functions as the main language of communication, in particular, northwestern France and Lower Rhine. In citing linguistic forms, I will mainly use the collection of Old Dutch texts as acknowledged by the *ONW*. In particular, this includes texts written further east than the present-day Dutch border, and which could also be argued to count as Old Low or High German. The main distinction between Old and Middle Dutch is the reduction of unstressed vowels to schwa in the latter variety; this reduction took effect in the second half of the twelfth century. Secondary sources on Old Dutch are, among others, Blok 2003, Gysseling 1992, Quak 1992, Hofstra 2003, van der Horst 2008, Klein 2003, Quak & van der Horst 1997, 2002, Schoonheim 2008, Tiefenbach 2003.

**Old Frisian**  Aside from a small number of runic inscriptions, Old Frisian comprises the oldest attested stages of Frisian, until ca. 1600.
Proto-Frisian  The last reconstructible stage to which the various Frisian varieties (as represented in West Frisian, East Frisian, and North Frisian dialects) go back. This would have to be about the eighth century. In addition, Proto-Frisian can also refer to unattested dialects of Frisian which predate the attestation of Old Frisian in the thirteenth century.

Map 1. Provinces of the Low Countries

province  The modern administrative unit which represents the largest territorial subdivision of the states of the Netherlands and Belgium. Anachronistically, the modern names can also be used for the same geographic areas in earlier centuries, when their administrative make-up may have been very different. Map 1 indicates the position of the provinces in the Netherlands (1–9, 13, 17), Flanders (11, 12, 14–16), and two adjacent areas of France (10) and Germany (18).

In the discussion of dialect features, I will often use larger geographical units, which are roughly made up of several of the modern provinces taken together. This is the legend to Map 1:

Flanders: 10+11+12
Brabant: 13+14+15
Limburg: 16+17
Holland: 6+7

western Dutch = coastal Dutch: 10+11+12+9+7+6, sometimes also the western half of 8 and the westernmost part of 13
inland Dutch: 3+4+5+8 (east)+13+14+15+16+17+18, after 1400 also +2
northeastern Dutch: 3+4+5, often +8 (east), after 1400 also +2
| **Rhine delta** | The area along and between the Rhine, its affluents and its branches (Waal, Lek and IJssel) west of the modern Dutch-German state border. |
| **Ripuarian** | The modern dialects spoken in Germany between the Benrather Line in the north (the isogloss $p/t/k > f/ts/ch$) and the $dorp/dorf$ isogloss in the south. Linguistically, Ripuarian is a Middle Franconian dialect situated between Low Franconian in the north and Moselle Franconian in the south. Geographically, Ripuarian encompasses the area west of the Rhine between the Lower Rhine and the Eifel, including the cities of Aachen, Cologne and Bonn. East of the Rhine, a large part of the Land of Berg belongs to Ripuarian. |
| **Saxon** | The medieval and modern dialects in the northern part of the Continental West Germanic dialect continuum, as far as they do not continue an Anglo-Frisian or Proto-Frisian stage. The exact meaning of the term depends on time and tradition. Krogh (2013) defends the independent linguistic status of Old Saxon as different from Old Franconian. The term Saxon is also used traditionally for northeastern dialects of Dutch. Goossens 2008: 20–62 argues at length that it is impossible to reliably define *Nedersaksisch* [“Low Saxon”] as opposed to *Nederfrankisch* on the basis of the modern dialect. |
| **West Friesland** | The northern part of North Holland, east of Alkmaar, which is traditionally referred to as West-Friesland in Dutch usage. The local term for the Hollandish dialect of this area is *Westfries*, which we shall not use. |
| **West Frisian** | The standardized Frisian language of Fryslân will be called *Modern West Frisian*. If a reference to the western part of medieval Frisia in general is meant (be it only in Fryslân or also in what is now West Friesland), or to its language, I will use *Westerlauwers Frisia(n)*. |
| **West Germanic** | The last reconstructed stage of language from which English, Frisian, Dutch, German and all their dialects have inherited their common features. A guess (for it is only a guess) as to the time when the West Germanic unity broke up is around 200 CE. |
Investigation of the early history of Dutch requires handling a larger number of different sources.

3.1 The Old Dutch corpus

The selection and dating of the Old Dutch corpus follows the Oudnederlands Woordenboek (ONW), which appeared online in 2009. I have also used the Old Dutch corpus, made by the Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie in Leiden, which served as the input for the online version (online at gtb.inl.nl). The corpus offers the complete evidence as far as appellatives and toponyms are concerned, but personal names are only subsumed inasmuch as they concern surnames derived from appellatives.

The Old Dutch corpus consists of the following sources (I refer to the ONW for references on the scholarly editions of the texts):

- The Malberg glosses in the Lex Salica and the Pactus Legis Salicae. This is the oldest material which can with some right be regarded as reflecting non-Frisian dialects spoken in the Low Countries, roughly dated by ONW between the years 507 and 768. In the Latin text of this legislation of the Salic Franks, the juridical terms describing the crime or offense are often given in their vernacular form, or rather, in a very deformed version of the original vernacular word. The manuscripts were copied in the Carolingian period by scribes who spoke a Romance dialect. For many of the glosses, it is very hard to tell what the original Frankish term must have been. The Malberg glosses have been integrated in the online version of the ONW since April, 2012. For nearly each gloss, Arend Quak has written an extensive commentary. Some recent studies on selected words are Quak 2008a, 2008b, and Seebold 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2008, 2010.

- There is a small number of short formulas and sentences from various centuries which may be considered Old Dutch or close to it: the Westphalian horse and worm blessing (891–900), the Utrecht baptismal vows (791–800; Forsachistu diobolae etc.), the Nederberg baptismal vows (811–812; Pompas autem nos dici-mus siniu gelp ando sinan uuilleon), the Northern Lower Rhine blood blessing (1001–1050), the Rochester poem (1083–1110; Hebben olla uogala nestas [h]
agunnan hinase hi[c] [e]nda thu u[uat] [u]mbida[n] [uu]e nu}, and a sentence from Munsterbilzen (1130; Tesi samanunga vvas edele. Unde scona).

Due to the symbolic status and the literary character of the Rochester poem, it has been much discussed since its discovery in 1932. The following reading is by Louwen 2009: 77:

Hebban olla uogala nestas hagunnan
hinase hic enda thu
uuat umbidan uue nu

The text may be regarded as the translation of the Latin text Abent omnes uolucres nidos inceptos nisi ego et tu. Quid expectamus nunc ‘All the birds have started (building) nests except for me and you. What are we waiting for?’, which is written on the same folio.

In recent years, the discussion has focused around the status of these lines as either Old Dutch or Old English, or both. Cotman & Taeldeman 2003 argue that the lines were Old Flemish, but de Grauwe 2004 concludes that they could just as well have been “intended as Kentish” with a West Flemish substrate (p. 53). His main argument was that there are hardly any characteristics that allow us to decide between an Old Kentish and an Old Flemish origin, and that an English place of writing might be considered more likely. Kwakkel 2005, however, established that the hand that wrote the lines was a continental one, and Louwen 2009 concluded that the language was a mixture of Kentish and Flemish. In my view, the non-English characteristics of the text, such as the 3pl. ending -an, are a strong indication for Flemish origin, and they weigh heavier than the alleged non-Flemish features that could point towards an English origin. But the matter hinges on very little material, so future finds may well change our views on the Rochester poem once more.

c. The Wachtendonck Psalter and its glosses (ca. 901–1000). This is the oldest of the three longer texts of the Old Dutch corpus. It is a translation of the Latin Vulgate, and it seems to first have been written in a Middle Franconian dialect before it was reworked into an eastern Low Franconian one. No medieval manuscripts with the text survive. All that we have exists in copies and letters from the modern era. See Kyes 1969 and Quak 2010 for the philological problems involved in the study of these texts.

d. The Leiden Willeram (ca. 1100). This is an Old Dutch translation-plus-reworking of the High German translation-plus-commentary by abbot Willeram of Ebersberg of the Song of Songs made in approximately 1059–1065. The Dutch remake was probably done in the Egmond monastery in North Holland. At the end of the sixteenth century, the manuscript ended up in Leiden University Library. The text shows a mixture of High German features which were retained from the original with Old Dutch features which the Egmond translator must
have introduced. Initially, it was thought that the dialect of the Leiden Willeram author was Ripuarian or Moselle Franconian, but scholars now think that he spoke the dialect of North Holland, as evidenced by some features which may be explained as Frisianisms. See Sanders 1971 for an edition and Sanders 1974 for a linguistic study of the Leiden text. Klein 1979 provides an analysis of the pronouns and Schwager 2014, a graphemic analysis.

e. The Middle Franconian Rhyming Bible (1151–1200). This is the third substantial text in Old Dutch. Actually, it was probably written in Werden an der Ruhr in Westphalia, so that the term ‘Old Dutch’ is somewhat misleading. The language of the text cannot be far removed from what was spoken in the southeast of the Low Countries. This text, too, has some High German features, for which see Klein 2003.

f. Vernacular glosses in Latin texts, such as the Reichenauer glosses (750), a list of pagan practices (791–800), the northeast Lower Rhine Prudentius glosses (951–1000), the Orosius glosses from St. Omars (1001–1100), the names of months and winds from Holland or Utrecht (1046–1100), and the Letterswerve fish names (1159–64).

g. Place-names. The toponyms from documents until 1225 have been collected comprehensively in Gysseling 1960a (for the Benelux, northern France and western Germany), and those until 1200 also in Künzel, Blok & Verhoeff 1989 (for the Netherlands). The etymology of toponyms which are only attested after 1200, many of which have roots in the Old Dutch period, can be studied with the help of Debrabandere et al. 2010 for Flanders, van Berkel & Samplonius 2006 for the Netherlands, and by searching the extant corpora of Middle Dutch non-literary documents.

h. Personal names. Many personal names are attested in several hundreds of compound place-names of the type Babanpol ‘Babe’s pool’, Alerdeskirka ‘Alard’s church’, etc. (Gysseling 1966a). ONW only includes simplex names when they are surnames which (also) occur as appellative nouns, as in Wouterus Alf ‘Walter Alf’, Riquardus blauot ‘Richard bluefoot’, etc. All personal names in the documents from the abbeys of Ghent are studied in Mansion 1924 (for the period until 1000) and Tavernier-Vereecken 1968 (1000–1253). The latter gives a very complete discussion of all attestations. The Antroponymisch Woordenboek, which intends to provide the full anthroponymic evidence of Old Dutch, was not yet online when this book was written. The names from other regions (as would occur, e.g., in the Fontes Egmundenses for North Holland) have not been systematically collected and are left out of this study.

ONW also includes the Runic inscriptions from between 500 and 900 which were found in Frisian territory, viz. in Britsum, Arum, Westeremden, Toornwerd, Raskwerd, Bernsterburen, and Oostum. Yet ONW explicitly calls some of these Old Frisian, whereas all of them may be Old Frisian. Thus, they fall outside the scope of a strictly defined Old Dutch. Only the inscription *hapupuwas ann kusjam loguns* from Bergakker (401–410) in the Betuwe is geographically in the right place, but it is so old that it can almost count as Common West Germanic (cf. Bammesberger 1999).

### 3.2 The Middle Dutch corpus

Due to the availability of the *Vroegmiddelnederlands Woordenboek* (VMNW), which covers the thirteenth century, I have found it useful to distinguish Early Middle Dutch (1200–1300; note that this date differs slightly from Pijnenburg 1997, who dates Early Middle Dutch from ca. 1200–1350) from Late Middle Dutch (1300–1500; compare the dating from ca. 1350–1550 in Willemyns 1997). The VMNW is built on the collection of texts known as the *Corpus Gysseling* (CG) which was edited in 1977 and 1980. Because the thirteenth century is the first century in which vernacular texts start to be produced in substantial numbers from a range of geographically identifiable places, the reader will often find that I base my discussion of linguistic features on their occurrence and distribution in the Early Middle Dutch corpus. The VMNW was finished in 1998. Since then, a few additional texts have been found. One might dispute the omission of some other texts from the VMNW (e.g. the *Limburgse Sermoenen*). I have not systematically taken those texts into account in dealing with the thirteenth century.

The *Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek* (MNW) is very different from VMNW, in that it was compiled in the nineteenth century with the aim of describing the Middle Dutch language from 1200 to 1500. Thus, the choice of texts is necessarily eclectic. Also, MNW has a strong bias towards literary texts. Medieval literary texts can rarely be ascribed to one single geographic point, unlike charters and other official texts. Yet ascribing a particular phenomenon to a local or regional dialect will often appear fundamental in our linguistic discussion. Furthermore, MNW largely depends on nineteenth-century critical editions of the texts, which often have regularized spellings. This reduces their value in dealing with phonological issues. Still, for the fourteenth and fifteenth century, no alternative, comprehensive and searchable representative corpus is available, so that I will use MNW to pass approximate judgements over certain features and their distribution in Middle Dutch. To be sure, various scholars are making efforts to fill the corpus gap of Middle Dutch, and it may be hoped that soon a decent alternative to MNW will be available.

Online, one can already find some partial corpora. An eclectic corpus of non-literary texts from the fourteenth century is CRM14, which has good coverage of
all regions of Dutch. Another searchable corpus is the *Digitaal Oorkondenboek Groningen en Drenthe* at www.cartago.nl, which contains all charters from those two provinces until 1600. Some other corpora can be found via the website of the Huygens Institute in The Hague (resources.huygens.knaw.nl). The website of the *Digitale Bibliotheek voor de Nederlandse Letteren* (*DBNL*, at www.dbnl.org) focuses on literary texts from all periods of Dutch. It can be searched and it uses the most recent editions available.

### 3.3 The Modern Dutch corpus

The Modern Dutch corpus (1500 to present) is accessible online through the *Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal* (*WNT*), which was started in the 1800s but was completed only in 2001. Hence, the content and quality of the entries vary, but in general, the citations provided by the *WNT* give a reliable impression of the semantics and morphology of Dutch words, and of the period when they were most used in literary texts. Since the language underwent increasing standardization in the course of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and since books were printed mainly in Holland and Flanders, the *WNT* corpus has a distinct bias towards western Dutch. The same is true for the Modern Dutch texts collected in *DBNL*, which represents an improvement with regard to *WNT* inasmuch as it contains many more texts, such as the corpus of Early Modern Dutch songs and many plays, and is fully searchable. An important separate corpus for investigating the language of what became the Dutch standard, is the collection of Bible translations at www.bijbelsdigitaal.nl.

Hand-written texts from after 1500 are not systematically collected anywhere. Since the language of charters and other official documents became standardized after 1600, they are not very important for the study of regional variation. But ego-documents are known to preserve many regional and local features at all periods, such as the *Sailing Letters* from the 1600s and 1700s.

### 3.4 Dialects of Modern Dutch

The distribution of variants in the dialects of Modern Dutch has been charted since the second half of the nineteenth century. See van der Sijs, van Reenen & Rem 2013: 211–13 for a brief survey of dialect enquiries of Dutch, and Kruijsen & van der Sijs 2010 for a more detailed discussion of the different dialect enquiries, regional dictionaries and dialect atlases of Dutch and the adjacent areas of Germany. The present investigation is based on the dialect surveys which are electronically available. Winkler’s dialect survey of the early 1870s is available online at *DBNL*. 
The data from the Willems Survey of the 1880s can be consulted online at http://bouwstoffen.kantl.be/, which is searchable and provides scans of the handwritten enquiry forms. The Schrijnen, van Ginneken & Verbeeten enquiry (SGV) of 1914, which focused on southern Dutch, has been made accessible on the CD-Rom which accompanies Kruijssen 2006. The data from the 150 phrases and words in the Reeks Nederlandse Dialectatlassen (RND), published in separate volumes between 1925 and 1982, and which treats all Dutch dialects in a dense net, only became available online in 2016, but I have on occasion consulted them to answer specific questions. The most recent, full-scale dialect investigation is the Goeman, Taeldeman & van Reenen Project (GTRP). Its data were collected between 1980 and 1995, and it focuses on phonology and morphology (Goeman & Taeldeman 1996). The GTRP has resulted in the publication of the Fonologische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten (FAND) and the Morfologische Atlas van de Nederlandse Dialecten (MAND; see the bibliography for references). The raw data on which the FAND and MAND are based can be consulted online at www.meertens.knaw.nl/mand/database/, and I have made frequent use of them. The application at www.meertens.knaw.nl/kaart/ allows each researcher to make his own dialect maps of the Dutch linguistic area.

There have been other dialect surveys, most of them in written form, which were distributed in part or all of the Dutch area for specific research questions. Most of these were issued by the dialect institutes of the universities of Groningen, Nijmegen, Ghent and Leuven, or by the P. J. Meertens Institute in Amsterdam. A number of dialect maps which were made on the basis of these surveys, but which were never published, can be found at Kaartenbank (www.meertens.knaw.nl/kaartenbank/), together with a large number of published maps. Other online resources are the dialect atlases of Flanders (WVD), Brabant (WBD), Limburg (WLD) and Zealand (WZD), which are partly based on the dialect surveys mentioned above. For Brabant and Limburg only part of the vocabulary has been made accessible online, viz. the “general vocabulary”, as opposed to the “professional vocabulary” of agriculture and craftsmanship. The data from Zealand can be found indirectly through the Woordenbank van de Nederlandse Dialecten (www.woordenbank.be), whereas the Flemish data are indexed and linked to the published pages of the WVD at www.wvd.ugent.be/register/. The Woordenboek van de Achterhoeksje en Liemersche dialecten is searchable online at www.ecal.nu, the Woordenboek van de Overijsselsche dialecten at www.onderzoekoverijssel.nl, and the Woordenboek van de Drentse dialecten (Kocks 1996–2000) is searchable online at woorden.huusvandetaol.nl.

4. See also http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/projecten/mand/GTRPdata.html.
5. At http://dialect.ruhosting.nl/wbd/.
Other dialect evidence can be retrieved from printed publications, which are then referenced. For our purposes of tracing the history of coastal Dutch, it is important to note that the vocabulary of Flanders, Zeeland and South Holland below the Meuse is well described in *WVD* and *WZD*, as well as in *de Bo* 1892 and several local dictionaries. North Holland north of the River IJ is treated in detail and with specific attention paid to archaic words in *Boekenoogen* 1897 (of which *Boekenoogen* 2004 is a reprint with very minor additions) and *Pannekeet* 1984, but for South Holland between Rotterdam and Amsterdam, we lack a lexicological work of similar scope and quality. For this area, then, we must mainly rely on the data from the various dialect surveys, which often disregard the less frequent vocabulary.

### 3.5 Onomastics

The state of Old Dutch onomastics has been sketched above. From the twelfth century, Christian names start to replace Germanic names as first names, so that names lose much of their importance for this investigation. Still, for specific morphological questions, such as the development of the diminutive suffix, first names render important information in Middle and Modern Dutch. A priori, surnames represent the most interesting onomastic evidence for the history of the vocabulary. Surnames can be derived from first names (*Janssen*, *Peeters*), from toponyms (*van Helden*, lit. ‘from [the village of] Helden’, *Brusselmans* ‘[son of someone] from Brussels’, *van der Hoek* ‘from the corner’, *Ten Kate* ‘at the farmstead’), from professions (*Bakker* ‘Baker’, *Schreurs* ‘Taylor’s’), and from personal qualities (*de Goeij* ‘the Good’, *Zwart* ‘Black’). The surnames develop according to the changes of the regional dialect and hold much information about the linguistic history of Dutch since ca. 1200.

Apart from the corpus of Middle Dutch literary names, which is of little relevance to us, there is no corpus of given names from before the twentieth century. Yet the registers of several regional archives have been indexed and they can be searched for the occurrence of a specific name.

For modern surnames there are two electronic databases, one for the Netherlands (*Nederlandse Familienamenbank* at www.cbgfamilienamen.nl/nfb/) and one for Belgium (at www.familienaam.be). The former database includes brief, eclectic explanations for only a subset of the names. The surnames occurring in Belgium have been discussed as to their origin and spelling variation in the dictionary by *Debrabandere* 2003. Among the older studies into the etymology and spread of surnames, the most valuable ones are *Winkler* 1885 (reedited as *Winkler & Nijen Twilhaar* 2007), *Boekenoogen* 1897: lxxxix–cxviii, and *van der Schaar* 1953. More recently, the methodology of Dutch surname onomastics has been refined as regards the interpretation of the regional spread of names and the etymological explanations. Relevant investigations are *Goossens* 1978, 1996a, *van Loon* 1980, 1981, *Marynissen*

Western Germany is also relevant for the interpretation of Dutch names. The modern spread of surnames in Germany can be investigated through the website Geogen (http://christoph.stoepel.net/geogen/en/Default.aspx). Kunze 2003 is an excellent atlas with many examples and ample background information and/or metadata.

### 3.6 Low German

As there was no linguistic border between the Netherlands and Germany until the twentieth century, Low German is an important comparandum for the study of Dutch. The oldest phase is usually termed Old Saxon, and its vocabulary is now accessible in Tiefenbach 2010. The grammar is treated in Gallée 1993, and Schlaug 1955 and 1962 collect many of the Old Saxon personal names.

For the vocabulary of the Middle Low German period, I have mainly used Schiller & Lübben 1875–81, which is accessible online. A reliable corpus of Middle Low German, comparable to the CG for Early Middle Dutch, is a gap that will eventually be filled by the projected Referenzkorpus Mittelniederdeutsch / Niederrheinisch (see Peters & Nagel 2014). For the grammar of Middle Low German, Lasch 1914 and Sarauw 1921 are especially useful for phonological issues, while morphology is the main concern in Sarauw 1924. Modern Low German dialects are represented by several regional dictionaries, such as those of Westphalia, of Low Saxony, of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, and other regions.

### 3.7 High German

The most important comparandum for Dutch are the dialects of Ripuarian and Moselle Franconian, the vocabulary of which is collected in Rheinisches Wörterbuch. The medieval language is available in the dictionaries of Old High German, for which also the EWAhd, which has reached the letter l-, is an important and very detailed source. For the grammar of Old High German, see Braune & Reiffenstein 2004. The Middle High German vocabulary can be retrieved through the Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch Online (www.mhdwb-online.de/index.html) and extra attestations can be found in Deutsches Rechtswörterbuch (drw-www.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/drw/), specifically for legal texts (finished as far as s- in early 2015). The language of Modern High German until the middle of the nineteenth century is found in Grimm’s Deutsches Wörterbuch. A number of regional dictionaries of the High German dialect area can be consulted online at www.regionalsprache.de.
3.8 Frisian

The Old Frisian corpus can easily be consulted using Hofmann & Popkema 2008. Evidence from later centuries of Westerlauwers Frisian can be found in the Integrated Frisian Language Database at http://tdb.fryske-akademy.eu/tdb/index-en.html. The modern vocabulary is incorporated in the Wurdboek fan de Fryske Taal / Woordenboek der Friese Taal at the INL website. Dialect data for Modern Westerlauwers Frisian are included in the GTRP dataset, and on occasions they were taken from monographs and local or regional dictionaries such as Hof 1933, Spenter 1968, and others. Relevant toponymic evidence is collected in Gildemacher 1993, 2007, 2008.

Dialect material from modern East and North Frisian was not systematically included, but was adopted from a variety of sources.

3.9 Old French

Since we have so few actual Old Dutch texts, borrowings from Old Dutch or Old Franconian into Old French are a potentially valuable source of information. A recent and reliable monograph on this issue is a desideratum. In general, the topic has been addressed more often by Romanists than by Germanicists. See von Wartburg 1971: 56–60, Stefenelli 1981, Holtus 1990: 520–21, Pfister 1998 and Haubrichs & Pfister 1998: 252–61 for eclectic surveys.

As to the appellative vocabulary, ONW incorporates French words that were included by von Wartburg in volumes 15 to 17 of his Französisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (1922–2003). Many topics were also discussed by Gamillscheg 1970. The French toponyms of Germanic origin can be found in Nègre 1990–98.
The spelling of Dutch

Little research has been devoted to the rise of Dutch spelling system(s) in the Old Dutch and Early Middle Dutch period. Even for Late Middle and Early Modern Dutch, most attention has focused on spelling norms and spelling debates rather than on the actual variation in a larger corpus of texts. In general, we observe the slow increase of vernacular writing in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, first in names, then in small phrases, and, finally, in longer coherent texts. Depending on one’s point of view, one may stress the remarkable similarity in the solutions chosen by different people in different regions for the application of the Latin alphabet to Dutch, or one may emphasize the likelihood of multiple origins of Dutch writing. The two main areas in which Dutch vernacular writing began seem to have been the southeast (Limburg, Cleves/Guelders) and the southwest (Flanders). In the southeast, literary production starts around 1200 with the Servatius fragments, the Aiol and the fragments of the romance Floris ende Blanchefloir. In Flanders, non-literary texts are first preserved from the 1230s, with some indications of slightly earlier beginnings. As is to be expected, the writing system of the southeast is close to that of Ripuarian (also to northeastern Old French?), whereas the Flemish spellings have more in common with those of Old French in Picardy (Pijnenburg 1997: 76–77), e.g., in using <u> for /y/, <gh> for /g,γ/ before front vowels, and <ou> for /u/. The external history of the shift from Latin or Old French to Dutch has been treated in a number of recent publications, including Gysseling 1971, Burgers 1996, Croenen 1999, Dijkhof 1999, Beyers 2000, Vanhoutte 2002, Dijkhof 2003.

A general introduction to the application of the Latin alphabet to the spelling of (Early) Middle Dutch is Goossens 1997. He concentrates on the deviations between the phonemic systems of Latin and of the Dutch dialects, and on the ways in which different regions have tried to remedy the shortage of Latin vowel graphemes. Quak & van der Horst 1997: 42–43 offer some general remarks on the spelling in Old Dutch documents, such as the occasional occurrence of <ht> instead of <th> to render /p/, and the sporadic vowel doubling to indicate long vowels, as in Heembeke ‘Hembeke’. Pijnenburg 1997: 75–78 argues that Middle Dutch spelling stems from “at least” two different spelling traditions, viz. a Middle High German one, which is mainly reflected in the literary tradition of Limburg and Cleves/Guelders, and a North French and Picardian one, which was followed mainly in Flanders. For instance, <u> indicates /u/ in southeastern Middle Dutch, as it does in High German, whereas the same sign is used for /y/ in Flanders, as it is in French orthography.
In fact, the same geographic division can already be observed in the Old Dutch period. The Wachtendonck Psalter and the Leiden Willeram both have a High German model, and the former was written probably not far from the Benrather Line, maybe in Munsterbilzen in southern Limburg (Quak 2010: 72). As for the toponymic evidence, the early medieval attestations (until ca. 1000) show more or less direct influence from Latin spelling, whereas Late Old Dutch names, especially in the southern Low Countries, are closer to the Old French system. Of course, the transition from Latin to French is a fluid one. Thus, the voiceless velar fricative /x/, which later became /h/, is rendered by <ch> in early (Merovingian) names. Initial sl- and sn- can be spelled as <scl->, <scn- > in Old Flemish (Sclota), which Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 591f. explains as a Romance spelling habit. This spelling peculiarity persists until the Late Middle Dutch period, cf. van Loey 1976: 90, de Vaan 2007: 316–7. Other examples are the sporadic use of <g> for /j/ (e.g. Agnardus beside Ainardus, Einhardus, Mansion 1924: 135), and of <ch> for /k/ (Wivechin /wīvekin/). The sign <z> used for /ts/ and /dz/ in Old Dutch belongs both to the Old French and to the Old High German system.

Van Loey 1976 provides a wealth of data on Middle Dutch spellings, but his treatment is selective and rather brief. The most detailed study of a Middle Dutch graphemic system is that of the Ghent leprosy documents of 1236–37 by Larsen 2001. Other detailed studies which include graphemics are those of Goossens 1992a for the Servatius fragments (ca. 1200), of de Man & van Sterkenburg 1977: 55–80 for the Glossarium Bernense. Mihm 2001 is a comparative and methodological study of the graphemic systems of several Low German, Ripuarian and Low Franconian texts from the twelfth and thirteenth century. A number of issues remain disputed, such as: the question of whether <gh> indicates palatality of the velar stop/fricative, or whether it was used, on the contrary, to indicate that /g/ was not palatalised or assibilated; the question of the origin, date, spread and phonetic reality of <e> and <i> as length markers for long vowels; the question about the backness or frontness of the rounded vowels signalled by <u> and <o>. Wherever relevant, these questions will be discussed in the chapters below.

In the running text of the content chapters below, I will often use the orthography of Modern Dutch in italic script in order to refer to the pronunciation and/or phonemic value of Dutch (dialect) words (except when vowels are preceded by an asterisk or put between phonetic brackets or phonemic slashes, in which case IPA signs will be used). Thus, a statement “boer became buur” refers to a phonemic reality “/bu:r/ became /by:r/”.

The grapheme-to-phoneme value of the Modern Dutch vowels and consonants is indicated by Tables 1 to 3. The trigraphs aai, ooi, oei, auw, ouw represent predictable combinations of the initial digraphs plus /j/ or /w/. The tetragraphs ieuw, eeuw represent combinations of /i/ and /e/ plus /w/.

The consonants present fewer complications than the vowels, at least at the phonemic level, and disregarding word-internal sandhi and the use of consonant
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Graphemes in modern loanwords from French, English, and other languages. The most important distributional rules are that geminate digraphs (<bb>, <mm>, etc.) are identical in value and pronunciation to singulates, and that word-final voiced obstruent graphemes represent a voiceless pronunciation in isolation.

Table 1. Simple vowel graphemes of Modern Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grapheme</th>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;i&gt;</td>
<td>/i/ (in closed syllable)</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>kist ‘chest, box’, pittig ‘crisp, racy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>/e/ (in closed syllable)</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>pet ‘cap’, petten ‘caps’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;e&gt;</td>
<td>/e/ (in open syllable)</td>
<td>[e:] before r</td>
<td>peren ‘pears’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;a&gt;</td>
<td>/a/ (in closed syllable)</td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>kat ‘cat’, katten ‘cats’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;a&gt;</td>
<td>/a/ (in open syllable)</td>
<td>[a:] before r</td>
<td>schare ‘host, band’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;u&gt;</td>
<td>/œ/ (in closed syllable)</td>
<td>[œ]</td>
<td>nut ‘use’, nuttig ‘useful’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;o&gt;</td>
<td>/o/ (in open syllable)</td>
<td>[o:] before r</td>
<td>huren ‘to rent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;o&gt;</td>
<td>/o/ (in open syllable)</td>
<td>[o:] before r</td>
<td>boren ‘to drill’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Vowel digraphs of Modern Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grapheme</th>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;ij&gt;</td>
<td>/ɛi/</td>
<td>[ɛi]</td>
<td>spijt ‘remorse’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;ie&gt;</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>ziet ‘sees’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;ee&gt;</td>
<td>/e/ (in closed syllable or absolute auslaut)</td>
<td>[e:] before r</td>
<td>zwier ‘elegance’, kreet ‘slogan’, peer ‘pear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;ei&gt;</td>
<td>/ei/</td>
<td>[ɛi]</td>
<td>meid ‘girl’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;eu&gt;</td>
<td>/œ/</td>
<td>[œ]</td>
<td>leut ‘fun’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;aa&gt;</td>
<td>/a/ (in closed syllable)</td>
<td>[a:] before r</td>
<td>raat ‘honeycomb’, raar ‘strange’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;au&gt;</td>
<td>/aw/</td>
<td>[aw]</td>
<td>saus ‘sauce’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;oo&gt;</td>
<td>/o/ (in closed syllable)</td>
<td>[o:] before r</td>
<td>boot ‘boat’, boor ‘drill’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;oe&gt;</td>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>roet ‘soot’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;ou&gt;</td>
<td>/aw/</td>
<td>[aw]</td>
<td>boer ‘farmer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;uu&gt;</td>
<td>/y/ (in closed syllable)</td>
<td>[y:] before r</td>
<td>kluut ‘pied avocet’, huur ‘rent’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;ui&gt;</td>
<td>/œy/</td>
<td>[œy]</td>
<td>kruit ‘gunpowder’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Main consonant graphemes of Modern Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graphemes</th>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Graphemes</th>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Graphemes</th>
<th>Phoneme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;p&gt;, &lt;pp&gt;</td>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>&lt;t&gt;, &lt;tt&gt;</td>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>&lt;k&gt;, &lt;kk&gt;</td>
<td>/k/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;b&gt;, &lt;bb&gt;</td>
<td>/b/, -/p/#</td>
<td>&lt;d&gt;, &lt;dd&gt;</td>
<td>/d/, -/t/#</td>
<td>&lt;g&gt;, &lt;gg&gt;</td>
<td>/g/,-/x/#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;f&gt;, &lt;ff&gt;</td>
<td>/f/</td>
<td>&lt;s&gt;, &lt;ss&gt;</td>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>&lt;ch&gt;</td>
<td>/x/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;v&gt;</td>
<td>/v/</td>
<td>&lt;z&gt;, &lt;zz&gt;</td>
<td>/z/</td>
<td>&lt;ng&gt;</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;w&gt;</td>
<td>/w/</td>
<td>&lt;n&gt;, &lt;nn&gt;</td>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>&lt;h&gt;</td>
<td>/h/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;m&gt;, &lt;mm&gt;</td>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>&lt;j&gt;</td>
<td>/j/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

History of research on the ‘Frisian question’ in Belgium and the Netherlands

The different character of western Dutch when compared with central and eastern dialects has been commented on since the nineteenth century. One of the most striking aspects of the ongoing discussion is the variation in the terminology applied to the putative pre-Franconian layer in coastal Dutch. In the present survey, I will focus on the discussion as it has developed in the Netherlands and Flanders. General surveys of the “Ingvaenic discussion” – as far as it applies to the Low Countries and Low Germany and has been carried on in German, English and other languages – can be found in Schults Garfinkle 1975, van Bree 1987, Krogh 1996 and Nielsen 2000b.

Winkler

A physician by education but a philologist by vocation, Johan Winkler (1840–1916) had grown up in Leeuwarden. This may explain why he became, in the words of Meertens (1958: 5), a “Frisomaniac”, who studied and promoted the Frisian language. He was adamant that “Netherlandish” did not equal “Hollandish”, and that Hollandish dialects were no better or more valuable than other dialects. In 1870, he starts collecting as many dialectal renderings as possible of the parable of the Prodigal Son. Winkler 1874 introduces and illustrates 186 “Nederduitsch en

7. English Willebrord knew well. / [As he was] born of Northumbria, / – for the English have sprung from Lower Saxony, as one reads –/ he knew the Frisian language rather well: everyone can understand that well.
Friesch” dialects from northern Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium and France. It is the first comparative dialect survey of Dutch and Frisian dialects, and still a valuable source of information about traditional dialects. In the introduction to the chapter on North Holland, Winkler (1874 II: 1–6) elaborately discusses the dialectal position of Hollandish in general. According to him,

uit een dialectologisch oogpunt genomen moet noordelijk Noord Holland of West-Friesland als een voortzetting van de provincie Friesland worden beschouwd, behooren de tongvallen van Kennemerland en Amstelland tot Zuid-Holland en maken de tongvallen van het Gooiland, even als de daar aan nauw verwante dialecten van de provincie Utrecht, een overgang van de hollandsche (friso-frankische) tot de zuiver frankische tongvallen uit.

He (p. 4–6) even provides a full-fledged theory of the contact origins of modern Hollandish. The rhetoric is outdated and frisocentric, many facts are wrong, and the core claim was already contested in the year the work appeared (by Cosijn 1874), but the idea that Holland once spoke Frisian and later shifted to Franconian has stood the test of time. To Winkler, the colloquial language of Holland is “een, eerst in betrekkelijk laten tijd ontstaan mengelmoes van friesch en nederduitsch, van westerlauwersch-friesch en frankisch-nederduitsch.” Note that Winkler here uses the traditional term “nederduitsch” to refer to both Dutch and Low German dialects. He is convinced that Holland and western Utrecht were frisophone in the first millennium. Their dialect would subsequently have become Hollandish through the influence of Franconian from Brabant, Flanders and Guelders. The “mishmash” of Frisian and Franconian must “certainly” first have gained a foothold in southern South Holland, since Dordrecht is the oldest commercial town of Holland.

8. According to the preface of the edition, Winkler was inspired for his enterprise by F. J. Stalder, *Die Landessprachen der Schweiz oder schweizerische Dialetkologie, mit kritischen Sprachbemerkungen beleuchtet. Nebst der Gleichnissrede von dem verlorenen Sohne in allen Schweizermundarten.* Aarau, 1819. But the earlier dialect enquiry by the French imperial *Bureau de Statistique*, held between 1806 and 1812 under Charles Etienne Coquebert de Montbret, had already relied on dialect translations of the parable of the Prodigal Son. This enquiry provides some of the very first Dutch and German dialect texts in the modern era, e.g. from Cologne, Krefeld, Clevens, Wesel, Venlo, Roermond, Weert and Maastricht, cf. Maes 2005 and Bakker & Kruijsen 2007.

9. “from a dialectological point of view, northern North Holland or West Friesland may be regarded as a continuation of the province of Friesland, the dialects of Kennemerland and Amstelland belong to South Holland, and those of Gooiland, as well as the closely related ones from the province of Utrecht, represent a transition from Hollandish (Friso-Franconian) to purely Franconian dialects” (Winkler 1874 II: 1; see already Winkler 1868: 9–13).

10. “a rather recent mishmash of Frisian and Low German, viz. of Westerlauwers Frisian and of Franconian Low German.”
Then, from Flanders and Brabant, which had already been Christianized for a longer period, “development and civilization” were introduced to the Frisians of Holland. Towns started to grow, and “strangers” from the southern provinces settled in them and greatly influenced their language: “zoodat weldra de stedelingen, de poorters geen friessch meer spraken, maar nederduitsch, even als in de steden van hun zuidelijke en oostelijke buren (…). De dorpelingen rondom de steden hebben echter hun oude friesche moedertaal zekerlijk nog langer gegesproken”\(^{11}\) (p. 5), until, eventually, the villages too adopted the new speech of the Hollandish towns. Winkler is “pretty certain” that Frisian had died out south of the river IJ by the sixteenth century, whereas it may have survived somewhat longer in rural Waterland or remote parts of West Friesland.

Most of Winkler’s linguistic judgements are value judgements, such as that dialects can be “ugly”. But his familiarity with Frisian enabled him to make at least a few concrete linguistic observations. Of the dialect of Schagen, and, in general, that of West Friesland, he notes that it has “generally preserved intact the Frisian syntax and the Frisian pronunciation of consonants, and it also contains many purely Frisian words, or partly corrupted words which clearly betray their Frisian origin. But the vowels of this dialect are nearly all pronounced in the novel, Hollandish way” (p.33). By and large this view of the West Friesland dialect has been confirmed by later research.

Boekenoogen and Te Winkel

Winkler’s collection had great influence on Dutch linguistics and dialectology in the first decades after its publication. One of the first scholars who tried to conduct a more profound study into this topic was Boekenoogen 1897. In the book’s introductory chapters “De Volkstaal in Noord-Holland” and “De Volkstaal in de Zaanstreek”, he discusses a large number of differences between North Hollandish and Standard Dutch. He concludes that “the peculiarities of North Hollandish cannot be explained from the Franconian dialect of Holland. We must seek the explanation elsewhere, viz. in the fact that the language which used to be spoken in North Holland was a dialect of Frisian” (Boekenoogen 1897: iv). By way of proof for this claim, he adduces, among other things, North Hollandish names which seem to show Frisian sound combinations (e.g., Joermoit beside Evermoit), Frisian-like reflexes of Germanic phonemes (e.g., ie instead of ee for Germanic *ai, and j- for
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g-), and extra-linguistic information. An example of the latter is the claim, made in 1599 by a headmaster from Barsingerhorn, that the local population spoke “half Frisian, half English” (Boekenoogen 1897: i–lxxiii).

In his influential history of Dutch, Te Winkel (1901: 787) starts from the traditional division of the Low Countries into three tribes, the Frisians, the Saxons and the Franks. The Frisians would originally have occupied all of the modern provinces of Groningen, Fryslân, western Drente and Overijssel, northwestern Gelderland, Utrecht, North and South Holland, Zeeland, and northwestern Flanders. Subsequent admixture between the three tribal dialects would have resulted in three “mixed languages” spoken at present in the western provinces. With this view, and with the dialect divisions he makes, Te Winkel stays rather close to Winkler’s proposals, but he gives a more detailed discussion. Te Winkel (on p. 787 and on the dialect map which accompanies the article) distinguishes (1) Hollandish, a “Frisian-Franconian mixed language”, spoken in modern South Holland and southwestern North Holland; it can be further subdivided into West and East Hollandish. (2) Hollandish-Frisian, which would have resulted from a more recent “mixture” of original Frisian with adstrate Hollandish. Te Winkel further subdivides this category into North Hollandish and “Beach- and Overmaashollandish”, the latter spoken in the conservative villages of the South Holland coast and around the mouth of the River Meuse. (3) Frisian-Franconian, defined as a mixture of Frisian with West Franconian, which was spoken in an area between Hollandish and the interior, comprising southeastern North Holland and the provinces of Utrecht, Zeeland, West Flanders and French Flanders. Te Winkel (1901: 805–7) also lists a larger number of “Frisian” dialecticisms in the modern standard language. Most of these we would now regard as “Hollandicisms”, and many will be discussed in the subsequent chapters. Te Winkel’s view survived until 1925, up to and including Verdam 1923: 46–51. The latter goes so far as to call the Hollandish coastal villages with conservative dialects “Beach Frisian” rather than “Beach Hollandish” like Winkler and Te Winkel did.

Van Wijk and van Haeringen

Van Wijk coins the term frisisme ‘frisianism’ in 1911 (1911: 181, 186; his spelling friesisme of 1909 did not gain wider currency) in reference to Boekenoogen’s observations from 1897. Van Wijk calls for a re-evaluation of Te Winkel’s terminology.

12. Van Wijk uses the term in the same way as I do here, viz. ‘a trace of the Frisian language as preserved in Hollandish or another language’. In the pejorative meaning ‘interference of Frisian when a native speaker of Frisian speaks or writes Dutch’, frisisme is first attested in Dutch in 1917 (based on the DBNL corpus).
He proposes to reserve “Frisian-Franconian” for the erstwhile Frisian area of North Holland and the Gooi (p. 180). As to the larger coastal area from Flanders to Holland which has a long fronted vowel æ as the counterpart of Dutch aa from PGm. *ê, he argues that this must be regarded as an originally Franconian dialect, into which some Frisian “elements” have been adopted. He goes on to ask (p. 186): “The main question then becomes, whether such frisianisms are due to Frisian overlordship or to continued contact between Frisian and western Low Franconian. Such contact could already have started in the period when the Salian empire arose in southeastern regions [of the Netherlands]. Such a hypothesis would also explain the frisianisms in West Flanders.”

Among the first to answer van Wijk’s call for more detailed investigations is van Haeringen (1921, 1923a, 1923b, 1927). In 1923a, he argues that real or apparent frisianisms in western Dutch should be divided into two categories: 1. Isolated words which in their phonology show Frisian, non-Franconian developments, such as ladder ‘ladder’ and baken ‘beacon’. 2. Sets of words which all show the same Frisian sound changes, and look like they developed according to a general rule.

Mansion, Kloeke and Heeroma

The term *Ingvaeronic* as it has been used in historical linguistics seems to have entered Dutch scholarship from German, where we find it, among others, used by Siebs (1889: 6, as “ingaevonisch”; Siebs actually discourages using the term, and prefers “englisch-friesisch” for the common ancestor of Frisian and the insular Anglo-Saxon dialects) and by Franck (1910: 2). In Dutch, I first encounter *Ingvaeonisch* and *Ingvaeonisme* in Mansion 1924, who has a chapter on Invaeonisms in Old Dutch personal names and place-names (p. 114–7). It is also clear that the article by Wrede 1924 was intensively read by Dutch linguists. The terms *Ingwaeoons* and *Ingwaeonisme* – after 1951 also spelled without the a – soon become commonplace. Kloeke 1932 publishes an article on the loss of nasals before a fricative in Dutch. He talks about an opposition between Ingvaeonic and Franconian and omits all mention of the Frisians. In fact, Kloeke (p. 338, also Kloeke 1950: 145) explicitly states that he wants to avoid the old tribal denominations, as they can lead to aprioristic thinking.

Heeroma joins in the discussion in 1934 and keeps developing his views on the matter until his death in 1972. Of all Dutch scholars, he has contributed by far the most articles to this question. In 1934, Heeroma dismisses views that regard the different coastal provinces as linguistically separate entities (in the way that Te Winkel did), and instead posits that they can be seen as a single unity. In support, he adduces shared features such as the æ-reflex of PGm. *ê and the unrounding of
˚ü to i or e, which is found in the same words everywhere along the coast. Heeroma observes that such features do not match the developments in Frisian proper, and agrees with van Wijk that the original coastal dialect must have been Franconian. He terms it Zeefrankies ‘Sea Franconian’. In his 1935 PhD dissertation, Heeroma aims to increase our knowledge of the Hollandish dialects. He compares their medieval characteristics, as they emerge from non-literary sources, with the phonology of modern dialects of the local dialects of North and South Holland, such as those of Texel, Wieringen, Enkhuizen, Egmond aan Zee, Volendam, Assendelft, Katwijk, and Scheveningen. Heeroma (1935: 134) declares that he has “defrisianized” North Holland by arguing that most of the deviant phonological features of North Hollandish are merely relics of the erstwhile, original Hollandish dialect. These relics are much less numerous, according to Heeroma, in South Holland, because of subsequent waves of innovations from the south (Brabant) and the east (Utrecht), which affected South Holland more than North Holland. Heeroma 1939: 235 justifies his deviating view of matters: “From the start, the thought imposed itself on me that North Hollandish and the Groningen dialect must represent the original autochtonous ‘Dutch’, and that Frisian had to have been imported there.”

In 1943a, Heeroma already retracts his minority view that all of Dutch would be Franconian-based. According to this article, it was the Ingvaeones who settled in the western and northern Low Countries. Heeroma invokes an alleged distinction between West and East Ingvaeonic in order to explain the different character of Hollandish and Zealandish. The latter two dialects would go back to West Ingvaeonic whereas Frisian would be based on East Ingvaeonic. Krogh (1997: 24) ascribes this shifted viewpoint to the Second World War: “Vor dem Hintergrund des Zweiten Weltkrieges war die These von einem wenigstens teilweise nicht-fränkischen, sprich: nicht-deutschen, Niederländisch wohl attraktiver.” See also Hoekstra 1995 on the political background of Heeroma’s ideas on Frisian and Ingvaeonic. Other relevant publications are Heeroma 1936 (on uier ‘udder’ and other “Ingvaeonic” words), 1939 (on Ingvaeonic in the larger context of West Germanic), 1942a, 1948, 1951a, 1965a, 1965b, 1968a, and 1968b, to mention only the most explicit papers.

Schönfeld 1946 accepts a Frisian substrate for North Holland but objects to views that Frisian had been spoken elsewhere, such as in South Holland or Flanders. In his historical grammar of Dutch, starting with the third edition of 1932, Schönfeld has collected evidence for ingvaeonisms in Dutch (last version: Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: xxxiii–xxvii). Schönfeld’s approach was influential because of the popularity of his handbook.
Chapter 5. History of research on the ‘Frisian question’ in Belgium and the Netherlands

Back to Frisian: Gysseling, Blok, Miedema

The question of what to call the non-Franconian elements and developments in western Dutch has remained at the forefront of the discussion until the present day (Krogh 1997). Opinions have swung like a pendulum back and forth between ‘Ingvaeonic’ and ‘Frisian’. The term ‘North Sea Germanic’, which has been popular in German and English scholarship, has been less successful in Dutch, maybe because ‘Ingvaeonic’ had already established itself (Miedema 1970: 2).

The detailed case studies, often based on Old Dutch evidence, by the historian Blok (1958, 1959ab, 1963, 1965, 1969, 1971, 1991) and the philologist Gysseling (1960b, 1962) restore the Frisians as the possible donors of important features of the western dialects. Gysseling (1962: 22) states: “Nothing holds us from calling all of the early medieval Frisian empire, which also comprised Zealand (…), Holland, Utrecht, the Veluwe and Drente, frisophone. But its Frisian will have differed only little from the neighbouring dialects.” The contributions by the frisianist Miedema (1970, 1971, 1977, 1987, 1988) go in the same direction. Miedema 1971 calls the coastal dialects from before the franconization “Early Old Frisian”.

Taeldeman on Flanders

For Flanders, Taeldeman 1982 offers a maximalist enumeration of possible Flemish ingvaeonisms. He assumes that (West) Flanders was part of the original Ingvaeonic territory:


From this initial Ingvaeonic stage, Taeldeman distinguishes a second, later period. This would have involved the spread of Frisian from the north into western Flanders, which, according to the now obsolete theory of periodical transgressions of the North Sea, would have been largely uninhabited between the fourth and the seventh century. Taeldeman:

The most important reason for the latter caveat is the absence of many of the Flemish ingvaeonisms in Frisian itself.

Another source for the Ingvaeonic character of Flemish is, in Taeldeman’s eyes, the continued contact with England. He claims that Flanders adopted a rather large number of features from English in the period between 1000 and 1500, such as the apocope of final schwa, verbal *da*-support, and others. This line of thought was not new, as it was preceded, among others, by Weijnen 1965a. It has never become popular, however, probably because compelling linguistic arguments are missing. To my mind, none of the features allegedly deriving from contact with English must necessarily have arisen in Flemish through contact (with English or with another overseas variety of Germanic). Krogh (1997: 28) argues that the nominative and accusative plural masculine ending *-s*, which is most frequent in Flemish, may have arisen in the Franconian dialect of early medieval Flanders under the influence of the neighbouring Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon dialects. But the borrowing of such a basic morphological feature, in isolation from the rest of the morphological system for which such borrowing does not have to be assumed, is hardly likely. A better, language-internal explanation has been provided by Marynissen (1995: 203–24), who has rendered all previous accounts of the spread of *s*-plurals in Dutch obsolete. Of course, allowance must be made for the occasional English loanword brought to coastal towns by fishermen and traders (see, e.g., Meertens 1942: 161 on the Katwijk dialect).

van Bree and Bremmer

The terms Ingvaeonic and ingvaeonism are also explicitly preferred to Frisian and frisianism by van Bree (1997a, in particular p. 24–6). In his short monograph, he tries to answer two questions: (1) How did the Ingvaeonic variety of West Germanic arise?, (2) How were the western Low Countries de-ingvaeonized? In order to come closer to the answer than his predecessors, he invokes the help of van Coetsem’s views on language contact processes. This results in by far the most detailed, most inclusive and most nuanced discussion of the Ingvaeonic question of its day. For instance, van Bree also includes syntactic questions in his discussion. Van Bree has since continued to work on Frisian substrate effects in Drente and in Low Saxony
(van Bree 2000, 2003), in North Holland (van Bree 2012), and, a related topic, on the origins of Town Frisian (van Bree 1994, 1997b, 2001, van Bree & Versloot 2008).

Bremmer (1997a, 2008) returns to the view that the coastal zone of Holland was frisophone before it became Franconian after 1100: “Such [linguistic] features allow us to assume that in the inhabitable parts of Holland between the coast, the Meuse and the IJssel, an early form of Frisian was spoken, with a concentration on either side of the mouth of the Old Rhine. This Frisian speaking area was gradually rolled back to the north” (Bremmer 2008: 295).

In his article, Bremmer tries to determine whether the coastal dialects of Holland, Zealand, and Flanders were Frisian or Ingvaeonic before they shifted to Franconian. He draws up a relative chronology of sound changes which the coastal dialects shared with Frisian, but which are absent from inland Franconian speech. The earlier changes he calls Ingvaeonic, the more recent ones (those typical of West Frisian), Frisian. Since some typically Frisian changes (WGm. *e and *i > iu, WGm. *þ- > t-) are occasionally found in names in the Old Rhine area, but hardly ever further south, Bremmer (p. 293) concludes that Holland was the southernmost frisophone area. Zealand and Flanders, in his view, did not get past the Ingvaeonic stage. Bremmer (1997a: 72, 2008: 293, 2009: 22) introduces the term “Proto-Frisian” in a linguistic context, to refer to the changes leading up from (in his terms) Ingvaeonic or North Sea Germanic to attested Old Frisian proper.

Goossens and Buccini

Another landmark for the present era of research is set by Goossens 1981. He identifies an important structural difference between western and eastern dialects of Modern Dutch, viz. the presence versus the absence of secondary i-mutation. In this conception, Flanders, Zealand, Holland, as well as northwestern Brabant and western Utrecht belong to the western dialects. Goossens’ theory provides a new basis for the reconstruction of the Dutch (dialectal and standard) vowel systems, and also allows for a redefinition of what had previously been called the Ingvaeonic or North Sea Germanic dialects of Dutch.14

13. The term “Proto-Fries” had already been coined by the historian Boeles in 1951, in the context of archaeological cultures in Frisia. In German, I find “Proto-Friesisch” used in the linguistic sense by Klein 1990: 199, who takes it from earlier publications by J. J. van Weringh.

14. Goossens (2008: 83) still speaks of “Ingvaeonic” dialects as opposed to Franconian ones, though “with a certain reluctance, because I do not wish to suggest any contrast between “tribes”, but would merely like to refer to groups of speakers, the WGerm. dialects of which clearly differed among each other.”
This opportunity is seized by Buccini (1989, 1992, 1995, 2003, 2010). In an explicit combination of language contact theory, as developed by van Coetsem (1988), with the structural opposition between coastal and inland Dutch, as posited by Goossens (1981), Buccini argues that a language shift from Ingvaeonic to Franconian can account for the absence of secondary \(i\)-mutation in coastal Dutch. Here is a summary of his views in his own words:

the Dutch failure of secondary umlaut is the result of language contact between Ingvaeonic speakers of the coastal areas and Frankish speakers of the interior – a contact in which the Ingvaeonic speakers acquired Frankish but in so doing disrupted the development of (secondary) \(i\)-umlaut. This contact occurred in the seventh and eighth centuries, when the process of \(i\)-umlaut had already run its course in Ingvaeonic but had only entered the first, limited stage of primary umlaut in Frankish. In the process of acquiring Frankish, Ingvaeonic speakers surely imposed various features from the stable domains of their language onto Frankish, including reduced nonprominent vowels, but likely failed to acquire non-salient, subphonemic phonetic processes of the target language. In other words, they acquired Frankish without any incipient secondary \(i\)-umlaut process, and also without \(i\)-umlaut conditioning factors in most positions. As a result, there arose a structurally independent Dutch language – a form of Frankish but one with markedly individual phonological and morphological characteristics.

(Buccini 2010: 306)

This theory is more explicit than some of the earlier proposals, which makes it easier to falsify its claims. Note that, in Buccini’s view, which he makes explicit especially in his 2010 article, the Ingvaeonic substrate underlies all of coastal Dutch, from North Holland to West Flanders.

van Loon: No substrate

In his recently updated and extended historical phonology of Dutch, van Loon (2014: 90–105, 159–73) also discusses the main phenomena of the coastal/inland Dutch divide. Van Loon rejects Buccini’s explanation of the absence of \(i\)-mutation in coastal Dutch (p. 165) and explains all features which have been ascribed to a Frisian or Ingvaeonic substrate by means of language-internal developments of the local dialects, which, to be sure, share the oldest layer of Ingvaeonic developments, such as the loss of nasals before fricatives with subsequent compensatory lengthening of the vowel and the unrounding found in \textit{pit}, \textit{stik}. There would have been no linguistic break between the settling of the coastal area by the West Germanic speakers of an Ingvaeonic dialect and the modern varieties. This view basically coincides with that of Heeroma and Schönfeld. Van Loon explicitly connects his explanation with the
famous *litus Saxonum* of the fifth-century Notitia Dignitatum. He (p. 103) usefully cautions that the presence of Frisian names in South Holland of the tenth century points to the cohabitation of Frisians and Franks in that area; in other words, the names do not necessarily imply that the area was monolingually Frisian.

Van Loon also offers a novel interpretation of the western lack of *i*-mutation. He suspects that unstressed *-i* which caused *i*-mutation was reduced to schwa in western Dutch a few centuries earlier than in inland Dutch (p. 164), and that this is why there is no *i*-mutation of long vowels or of the diphthongs *ai* and *iu* in western Dutch. Subsequently, analogy would have removed *i*-mutation from most of its short-vowel targets. Van Loon also explicitly takes issue with Buccini’s explanation, although he offers no principled arguments against a substrate scenario. In a way, van Loon’s tentative solution combines “de oude dualiteit (…) tussen het Ingwooons en het Centraal-Nederlands”¹⁵ (p. 91) with an internally motivated, phonological difference in the application of *i*-mutation. Thus, his explanation is similar to Buccini’s in phonological and geographic terms, but, according to van Loon, the differences between coastal and inland Dutch had internal rather than external causes.

**Schrijver: Latin substrate**

A different direction of research is taken by Schrijver (1999, 2002, 2008, 2014), who stresses the possible contribution of Celtic and Romance dialects to the rise of the Dutch linguistic landscape. Schrijver introduces the term “coastal Dutch” in English,¹⁶ but in a different way than I use it here. Schrijver (1999: 6) defines coastal Dutch as

---

¹⁵. “the old duality (…) between Ingvaenonic and Central Dutch”.

¹⁶. The prefix *kust* ‘coastal’ has slowly gained some currency in Dutch publications. In 1926a, Kloeke comments on the use of “ingwäonisch” in a 1919 article by Frings, and equates the meaning of *ingvaeoonsch* with *litoraal* “littoral” (p. 7). In subsequent decades, one finds the sporadic usage of the term *litoraal* in the context of Ingvaeonic in the writings of Kloeke and Heeroma. Gysseling 1943 discusses “Kustwestvlaams”. Gysseling 1966b: 208–12 introduces “Kustmiddelnederlands” and “Kustnederlands”, of which the former is adopted by Willemyns 1997: 181 and the latter by Heeroma 1973 and Ryckeboer 1997, among others. Subconsciously, the term coastal Dutch may also have been made acceptable by the use of *kust* in Schönfeld & van Loey’s discussion of Ingvaeonic (from the seventh edition in 1959). They address the opposition between the coast and the interior, claim that “De oude onderlaag, die langs de kust woonde, (…) werd min of meer verfrankischt” [“The old substratum, living along the coast, (…) was more or less franconized”] (p. xxxii), and say that *delf* ‘canal, ditch’ is a coastal word, and can therefore be called Ingvaeonic (p. xxxiii). The term “Kusthollands” (Weijnen 1976: 176) is a counterpart of Gysseling’s “Kustwestvlaams”, and may also have been influenced by the term “Strandhollandsch” (‘Beach Hollandish’) in Winkler (1874 II: 74) and Te Winkel (1901).
the early medieval Germanic dialect or dialects, closely related to the other North Sea Germanic dialects, Old English and Old Frisian, that were spoken along the Dutch and Flemish coast and in which originated the Ingvaeonisms that are found in Middle Dutch Franconian texts.

The main hypothesis in Schrijver 1999 is that a number of coastal Dutch developments, such as the fronting of *ū and *u, may be due to a British Celtic substrate on the Continent. Between the fifth and the ninth centuries, the speakers of Celtic along the Dutch and Flemish coast would have shifted to West Germanic, while introducing a number of phonetic features that we find reflected in the British Celtic languages.

In 2002, Schrijver (p. 102–9) revokes his hypothesis of a direct transfer from British Celtic to Germanic, and replaces it with a two-step scenario. Initially, in Roman Imperial times, the Celtic spoken in the Low Countries as well as in Lowland Britain was replaced by Latin. This Latin showed a number of substrate features which derived from Celtic. Subsequently, northwestern Romance, as it had developed from Latin, was replaced by the West Germanic dialects of the new settlers. In the Low Countries, this gave rise to coastal Dutch and Frisian. In this way, the Celtic features managed to enter coastal Dutch, Frisian and English, but indirectly, through a Romance intermediary.

In 2008, Schrijver introduces a novel, three-way distinction between coastal Dutch, Western Dutch and Eastern Dutch. Whereas his Eastern Dutch coincides with what I term inland Dutch, the coastal area is now subdivided into a littoral area, which Schrijver equates with traditional Ingvaeonic or North Sea Germanic, and a western area which is “wedged in” between the coastal and the inland dialects. Western Dutch is mainly defined by Schrijver as the basis of the modern standard language.

Schrijver 2014 devotes an entire chapter to the origins of Dutch (p. 122–57). Western Dutch is now defined as the area comprising Flanders, Zealand, Holland, plus the extreme west of Brabant and Utrecht (p. 126). It is thus similar to what I call coastal Dutch. Schrijver applies “coastal Dutch” to a subset of Western Dutch (p. 127): “The Western Dutch area contains the debris of a lost variety (…). This variety was more akin to Frisian and English than to Eastern Dutch.” In fact, coastal Dutch “is an early form of Frisian” (p. 130). Schrijver usefully points out that the term “Frisian” does not mean the same to linguists as to historians: “For a historian, Frisians are persons who lived in Frisia and took part in aspects of its culture to such an extent that this shaped a common identity. To linguists, Frisians are people who spoke Frisian. The two do not always match.”

Schrijver identifies coastal Dutch by surviving words and names in Western Dutch. Among the examples, he cites i-mutation of *ū and *u followed by unrounding,
the raising of *æ to ie, and others. Most of these examples will be discussed in the present study, and I will not anticipate my conclusions here. Schrijver sees coastal Dutch gradually being replaced by Western Dutch, first in Flanders, then in Holland, then in Zealand, and finally in the north of North Holland.

The distinction which Schrijver makes between coastal and Western Dutch seems artificial. One of his main witnesses for coastal Dutch, viz. the unrounding yielding pit and brigge, is found (in traces) in all of Flanders, Zealand and Holland, and would therefore geographically qualify for Schrijver’s Western Dutch. As the main feature of Western Dutch, Schrijver (p. 131–5) regards the absence of i-mutation on *a, *u, *ū, *ō and *au, and the effects of spontaneous fronting on these low and back vowels. Again, I have to refer to the discussion in the chapters below for detailed comments, but several facts go against the proposed geographic concept. For instance, there is no evidence for an old, spontaneous fronting of *a to e, and the fronting of *ū and *au includes (South) Brabant, and may actually have started in that area.

Schrijver (p. 140–1) does not altogether reject Buccini’s theory about a language contact origin for the lack of secondary i-mutation in western Dutch, but argues that the substratum responsible for these developments may rather have been of the Romance kind. In his view, the different vowel systems of Old Picardian, Old West Walloon and Old East Walloon (as reconstructed for the tenth century) closely correspond to the vowel systems that are reconstructed for Eastern Dutch, Central Dutch and Western Dutch, respectively. Some of the corresponding features would be (from east to west):

- no fronting in East Walloon and Eastern Dutch;
- fronting only of *ū in West Walloon and eastern Central Dutch;
- fronting of *ū, *u, *uo in Picardian and Central Dutch;
- fronting of *ū, *u, *uo in Picardian and Flemish, with the caveat that Flemish *uo has a different origin than Central Dutch *uo.

17. He does not say why Zealand would have held on to coastal Dutch longer than Holland. Maybe this is based on the suggestion, already made by Winkler in 1874, that the replacement by Franconian first took hold in the larger towns, of which medieval Zealand had only few (Middelburg and, to some extent, Zierikzee). It is a fact, in any case, that modern Zealandish generally retains more non-standard dialect features than modern South Hollandish.

18. Schrijver (p. 136) introduces a fourth geographic variety, viz. “Central Dutch”, which he identifies with “a wide band in the centre of the Netherlands and Belgium”. The area is defined more precisely on p. 148 as “Belgian Brabant, Antwerp, and Dutch central and western Brabant as well as western Gelderland.” It is characterized by the presence of secondary i-mutation (an eastern feature) as well as “spontaneous fronting to varying degrees” (a western feature).
From the fact that Germanic rather than Romance must have been the language of the socio-political elite of the southern Low Countries in the early Middle Ages, Schrijver (p. 151) infers that the spontaneous fronting in Dutch is an Old French substratum feature. The isoglosses seen in southern Dutch would reflect the same isoglosses which were already present in the Romance substratum.

But many isoglosses may have changed their course over the centuries. For instance, the fronting of *au to *õ to *uo to *yø in East Flanders is regarded by Schrijver as the result of old, spontaneous fronting (p. 146). But Dutch dialectologists have established that the fronting applied earlier in Southwest Brabant and thence spread to the towns of East Flanders. It had not yet reached Ghent in the sixteenth century (Taeldeman 1985: 200–1, Goossens 1992b).

The vowel systems of the four Romance and Dutch contact zones “in the first millennium (prior to secondary i-umlaut)” are compared on p. 147–9, but the Dutch facts are presented in such a way as to maximize the similarity with Romance. For instance, Tables 2 and 3 claim that Central Dutch occasionally had a fronted reflex *y of short *u, which would increase the parallelism with the vowel systems of West Walloon and Picardian. Yet I know of no evidence that we must assume such fronting for the first millennium. In the Middle and Modern Dutch period, the position before r (often before rC) is conducive to fronting, but that is clearly conditioned by the phonetic features of r and does not have to go back to Old Dutch (cf. van Loon 2014: 229). Table 2 also posits ñ as the reflex of *ũ in eastern Central Dutch, which is probably untrue for the first millennium. See § 16 for the traces of a back vowel in Brabant.

Table 3 assumes a general, spontaneous fronting of WGm. *õ via *uo to *yø in Central Dutch, although fronting is attested only rarely in the medieval and modern record. Two objections spring to mind. Firstly, such an early, general fronting of *uo is contradicted by the fact that all of Brabant originally possessed the

---

19. It has been observed (Grootaers 1942: 221, Weijnen 1964: 12–3, van Bree 1996: 270) that the modern isogloss of h > zero in southern Dutch is continued on the French side of the language border in the same direction, and some scholars have tentatively ascribed this coincidence to a common substratum. Yet the isoglosses must have run differently in the Middle Ages, both on the Dutch side (where h > Ø spread east from Flanders) and on the French side, where Ø- may have spread from the Isle de France northward into Picardy and Hainaut (Bourciez 1971: 125). Thus, the present coincidence of the isoglosses on both sides of the linguistic border is not necessarily ancient.

20. This objection does not have to be detrimental to Schrijver’s hypothesis, since in Walloon, too, there are indications that the isogloss between western ñ and eastern ũ has shifted eastwards in the course of the later Middle Ages. Whereas nowadays only the province of Liège retains *iũ as a back vowel, the results of *iũn show that, until at least 1200, Namur had also retained the back vowel (Remacle 1948, chapter I, § 26).
reflex of *-mutation where it was not morphologically functional, \(^{21}\) such as in the counterparts of StDu. groen ‘green’ < *grōni-, droog ‘dry’ < *draugi- and schaar ‘scissors’ < *skēri-. If *uo had already been fronted to *yø before *-mutation took place (as per Schrijver’s chronology), the modern reflexes of words with and without *-mutation of *ō should be the same, but they are not. Secondly, South Brabant had unrounding of front rounded vowels at least since the fourteenth century, and maybe earlier. The unrounding must post-date secondary *-mutation. In Brussels and Antwerp, unrounding was apparently abandoned for sociolinguistic reasons, and from these two cities, the front rounded vowels were (re)introduced into the surrounding countryside, leaving only a few relic forms with unrounding outside the productive unrounding areas of Leuven, Boom and Aalst in the twentieth century (Goossens 1963, 1992b, 2014).

It seems likely that the unrounding of *ų̄, *ȫ, *ȫü as found in South Brabant acted as a pull factor for the palatalization of old *ū and of *au, which started in southwestern Brabant and thence spread to East Flanders, see above. Just such a case of unrounding as a pull factor for vowel fronting is attested in Belgian Limburg, which also has a fairly large area with general unrounding of front rounded vowels (it may in fact have formed one single area together with South and Central Brabant, see Goossens 2014). Here, we have recent, twentieth-century evidence that suggests that unrounding fed the subsequent and more occasional fronting of old back vowels, for which there was now room (Goossens 1992b: 30 on Hasselt, Goossens 2013: 39–44 on Belgian Limburg in general). Of course, other factors may have been involved in the changes among the long vowels, especially the rise of new long vowels from open syllable lengthening of short vowels around 1200.

**Dutch and Romance**

Schrijver’s theory has the merit of pointing out that continued language contact between Romance and Germanic in the Low Countries deserves more attention than it has hitherto received. It is not that the topic has been completely out of people’s minds, but most studies have looked at individual features in isolation without much general discussion. Also, most investigations present the Romance speech area (in this case, northern French) without much discussion of its variation and changes in time, that is, taking into account the possibility of shifting isoglosses. The contact between Dutch and French has been investigated by, among others,

\(^{21}\) Even where it was later removed by paradigmatic analogy, secondary *-mutation originally must have reached westwards to Antwerp and the Dender river, compare the map loopt ‘walks’ in FAND II/III for *au and the discussion in Belemans & Goossens 2000: 177–8 for *ō.
Salverda de Grave (1901, 1906, on the French loanwords in Middle and Modern Dutch), van Ginneken 1934 (a general claim), Grootaers 1942 (on the loss of initial *h*), Weijnen 1964 (a maximalist collection of possible influences), Weijnen 1967 (on Romance lexicon in Dutch), van Hoecke 1978, 1979, 1980, 1988 (on the diphthongization of short *e* in Dutch and northern French), de Rooij 1965, 1991 (on syntactic features), Ryckeboer 1991 (on unconditioned fronting) and 1997 (various topics), Kruijsen 1995 (concentrated on a small region but very detailed), de Schutter 1992 and 1999 (summarizing), and Besse (2003). Frings & Müller 1966–68 is also very relevant for the Dutch linguistic area. In short, Dutch and French contact still appears to be an open topic for the future, and one that may well turn out to have its repercussions on our views of coastal versus inland Dutch. Such investigations will also have to take into account the toponymical evidence. It is notoriously hard to interpret, but it does show that there were both remnants of an old Romance population who managed to survive for some period in the germanophone area and later migrations from Wallonia into the Old Dutch area (Tummers 1962, van Durme 1996, 2002, Haubrichs & Pfister 2014). Inspiration may be sought in the better-studied history of Moselle Romance, a Romance speech area which became isolated from Gallo-Romance but survived until at least the tenth century. The gradual replacement of Romance by Franconian along the Lower Moselle was described in the following three stages by Wolfgang Kleiber (as cited by Post 2004): (1) Franconian-Romance bilingualism with Franconian being the dominant language, (2) Romance was reduced to agrarian vocabulary, mainly winemaking, and tended to become a domestic language only, (3) Romance was reduced to ever smaller communities which became individual linguistic islands before dying out. This may have applied in a similar way in the Dutch-Romance contact zone in northern Gaul, but it is also reminiscent of the possible scenario for the replacement of Frisian by Hollandish in North Holland after 1200.
CHAPTER 6

The western Low Countries in the Early and High Middle Ages

Language history implies social history. It is therefore important to study the geographic and socio-economic situation between 500 and 1200, with a view to determining possible sociolinguistic scenarios for language replacement in the western Low Countries.

6.1 Physical geography in the Early Middle Ages

Few European landscapes have changed their aspect so drastically over the last two thousand years as the Low Countries. Each minor change in the climate had the potential to cause major changes to the natural landscape and to the ways in which people could make use of the landscape. Reconstructions of the Dutch landscape before 1000 CE show enormous differences in land use compared to the present-day situation. At the beginning of the Common Era (Vos et al. 2011: 63), instead of the open connection of the Zuiderzee or IJsselmeer with the Waddenzee that we find in the modern period, the northern Low Countries harboured a central lake, Lake Flevo. This body of sweet water was connected with the North Sea by tidal gullies through the salt marshes of the Wadden (‘Mud flats’). The waterway between Lake Flevo and the North Sea widened in the Carolingian period, when Medemblik became an important town for the purpose of trade and military strategy. Lake Flevo now received the name Aelmere. In the same period, marine influence on the southern coast of Lake Flevo increased, and the IJssel river attained its status as a major route for international traffic. After 1200, the Almere had become an actual sea, the Zuiderzee.

Map 2 reproduces the paleogeographic map in Dijkstra 2011: 14, showing the situation not too long before the first reclamations were started. Of modern Holland and Zealand, up to 90% was covered with peat bogs rising a few meters above sea level (peat bogs similarly dominated southern and eastern Fryslân, and large tracts of the eastern and southern Low Countries). The bogs themselves must have been unfit for permanent human occupation, but people probably visited them on a regular basis and exploited their limited possibilities. It is likely that the bogs were used
for transhumance, serving as summer pastures for livestock (de Bont 2014: 72). The bogs may also have been used – and there is evidence that this started in the Roman period – for extracting peat and salt (de Cock 1969). They were intersected by smaller and larger natural drainage streams which provided easy access for small boats (de Bont 2012: 40). In North Holland, an archaeological find dated to ca. 800 CE that was found in a former bog area may belong to an erstwhile settlement along a small bog stream, the *Bamestra* (de Koning 2012: 18). In Zealand, there are traces of habitation in the peat area from the Roman period (Kuipers & Swiers 2005: 24).

The so-called older dunes stretched along the coast and provided a sandy underground which was suitable for habitation and agriculture. This strip was around 5–10 kilometres wide, but in the course of the Middle Ages, its west side was covered by the sand of the younger dunes, which could develop to a height of several dozen meters. Zealand and western West Flanders largely consisted of salt marshes, which had developed from the earlier intertidal mud flats and sand flats which were inundated daily by the sea. After 500 CE, the tidal creeks filled up and the salt marsh landscape developed (Deckers 2013: 13).

The variable influence of the sea on the growth and erosion of the land was explained by scholars in the second half of the twentieth century by means of the transgression model, which assumed different periods of transgression (also called the “Dunkirk transgression periods”) and regression (“Carolingian regression”) of the North Sea. It was assumed that the sea level had risen and sunk to various degrees at different intervals. This explanation has now been given up due to a lack of conclusive geological evidence and because the relevant geophysical facts, such as medieval inundations, can be explained differently (Berendsen & Stouthamer 2001, de Boer 2005, Baeteman 2009, Deckers 2013: 13). Also, the early medieval hiatus in traces of human occupation along the coast which used to be invoked in support of a period of North Sea transgression, has partly been filled by new archaeological finds. The differences in the interaction between the sea and the coast at different places and moments in time are now regarded as the result of the joint influence of a few geophysical factors: (1) the continually decreasing speed of the rise in sea level in the course of the Holocene, (2) the morphology of the underlying, non-marine sediments, (3) the changing sediment balance in the tidal basin (de Boer 2005: 50). This revised view of the early medieval landscape history also implies that the coastal plains were probably suited for permanent settlement much earlier than had previously been assumed by archaeologists, possibly already in the sixth century (Ervynck et al. 1999). Recently, archaeological evidence has indeed been found for settlements from ca. 650 in Flanders and Zealand (Deckers 2013: 13).
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Map 2. Paleogeographic map with a reconstruction of the western Netherlands ca. 750 CE (taken from Dijkstra 2011: 14, Figure 1.2; translated by Dijkstra)
6.2 Settlement in the Early Middle Ages

Due to the natural landscape of the Low Countries, the settlement history has in the twentieth century often been described in terms of a contrast between inhabited and uninhabited areas. This terminology may convey the impression that different population groups were living in isolation from one another, which would have certain consequences for our assessment of the linguistic situation. More recently, archaeologists have shifted their discourse to an opposition between (cultural or economic) centres versus their periphery (Theuws 1990). This allows for (more) continuity of habitation, also in areas without a dense population, and hence calls for a reconsideration of the possible linguistic scenarios. The surge in archaeological excavations since the 1990s, together with the improved methods of historical geography, has resulted in a different and more fine-grained picture of the medieval history of many areas. The transition from the Roman period to the Merovingian one, and from the Early to the Late Middle Ages, is now better understood and is viewed as a more gradual process than it was before.

In North Holland, archaeologists previously assumed a habitation hiatus between the fourth and the seventh century (thus still Besteman 1990), but it now appears that, if the area was depleted of people at all, this situation cannot have lasted for more than a few generations between 350 and 450 (de Koning 2012: 19). Some prehistoric hydronyms surviving in North Holland may even be interpreted as a sign of population continuity between Antiquity and the Middle Ages. Habitation may have been most persistent in Kennemerland (on the older dunes) and on Texel and Wieringen. Since the younger dunes covered part of the older dunes under a thick layer of sand in the Middle Ages, whereas some other parts of the older dunes were washed away by the sea, it seems likely that many archaeological traces of earlier habitation are still hidden under the sand whereas others were lost to the waves (Besteman 1990: 93). The finds of ‘Frankish’ pottery in fifth-century strata show that North Holland was in contact with, among others, the middle Rhine and Mosel areas. Also in the fifth century, ‘Anglo-Saxon’ fibulae are absent from finds in North Holland, whereas they do appear in Frisia east of the Vlie. De Koning (2012: 26) infers that North Holland may have had a “restbevolking” and that it did not attract migrants because of its position away from the main traffic routes to Britain, viz. the Rhine in South Holland and the Vlie in Frisia. From the seventh century on, the number of settlements increases, maybe (but not necessarily) due to recolonization from Frisian territory elsewhere. Many explanations exist for the survival of the name of the Frisians from Antiquity (Latin Frisii, Gr. Phríssioi) into

22. “remnant population”.
the Merovingian (Fresones, Greek Phríssones) and Carolingian (Fresones, Fresiones) periods. This survival did involve some formal modifications, in particular, we find *n*-stem inflection in the medieval variants and variation between *i*- and *e*-vocalism in the first syllable which was absent in Antiquity. I am sympathetic to the idea that the ancient Frisians had disappeared, whereas their name had survived in Romance speech. It was then borrowed back into the Germanic dialects (Rübekeil 2014: 66), reaching the Frisians themselves via the intermediary of the Merovingian Franks (Bazelmans 2009: 331). This could explain the emergence of Old Franconian and Old Frisian /e:/ from what, in Latin and Greek, may have been short /i/.

Dijkstra 2011 provides a recent survey of the archaeological situation in South Holland, more specifically, along the estuaries of the Rhine and the Meuse. He assumes a steep drop in habitation in the Late Roman period (after 260) without a complete depopulation. People may have continued to live there, especially along the rivers and on the older dunes (*strandwallen*). After 450, traces of human activity slowly increase again. Arguments from toponymy and archaeology suggest that, after 500, settlers spread from the Rhine estuary to reclaim the sandy soils west of the bogs, both between the Meuse and the Rhine (South Holland) and north of the Rhine (Dijkstra 2011: 93). There are also toponymical and archaeological indications for deforestation of the woods on the old dunes south and north of Haarlem in the Carolingian period. The resulting settlements were probably given up in subsequent centuries because of the sand-drifts that created the younger dunes (Dijkstra 2011: 88).

Whereas the Rhine estuary was important for trade and settlement from the Roman period on, the Meuse-Merwede estuary may have had narrower river banks which were less favourable for settlement purposes. The region does not play a significant political role until the late Carolingian period. Dijkstra (2011: 89) thinks that the Meuse estuary may have seen “een sterk aandeel van 9e-10e-eeuwse kolonisten uit het Midden-Nederlandse rivierengebied en/of de Brabantse regio” since, in the Late Middle Ages, we find jurisdiction delivered locally by sheriffs, as in Zealand and Brabant, rather than by *asega*’s as in Frisia (Blok 1963; see below on *asega*). If this reasoning is correct, the assumed colonization from the east and southeast may have had a significant effect on the linguistic situation in the region.

For Zealand and coastal Flanders, we must distinguish between the coastal plain, which became permanently inhabitable around the Merovingian period, and so-called “Sandy Flanders”, the inland area between the coastal plain in the west and the river Scheldt in the southeast. For the coastal plains, Loveluck & Tys (2006: 156) conclude that there may have existed “a settlement hierarchy of Flachsiedlungen”.

---

23. “a large proportion of 9th-10th-century colonists from the Middle Dutch river area and/or Brabant”.  

farmsteads on the contemporary ground surfaces of silted-up tidal channel ridges, focussed on nucleated settlements of multiple households, located on terp mounds such as Leffinge and Bredene”. About the sandy inland area, Vermeulen 2001 argues that “small groups of Germanic farmers” had been able to settle there in Late Antiquity, and that its occupation shows continuity throughout the Merovingian period, even if only in the shape of small settlements. From the seventh century onwards, archaeologists discern “larger rural entities, probably focused around major villae”, as well as the development of non-rural settlements along the rivers Scheldt and Lys. The most important town was Ghent, whereas Antwerp must have had some regional importance already in the sixth to eighth centuries, but was still a “a semi-rural dispersed type of settlement” (Devos et al. 2013: 169).

6.3 The high medieval reclamations

Very roughly, land reclamations in the western Low Countries could take three different forms: (1) deforestation of woodlands, (2) enclosure of salt marshes and river banks that had been raised above the water level by natural processes, (3) drainage and parceling of peat bogs. The first is the oldest method. In the western Low Countries, it only applied to the wooded parts of the older dunes in Holland and to some inland parts of Flanders. Place-names such as Voorhout are a reminder of this period, as is the name Holland ‘Woodland’ itself (see below on this name). Method (2) may already have been practiced in Roman times (as shown by the finds of culverts from the Roman period), but it is especially well attested for medieval Zealand and West Flanders. Method (3) was applied on a large scale in Holland, Utrecht, and parts of northwestern Brabant, Zealand and Flanders throughout the Middle Ages. Subsequently, through soil compaction and erosion by wind and water, large tracts of reclaimed land became permanent lakes in the later Middle Ages. Between 1500 and 1940, many of these lakes were drained mechanically in order to convert them to agricultural land.

The peat reclamations consisted of “het systematisch ontwateren in de vorm van lange opstrekkende percelen en het beheersbaar maken van het waterpeil, zodat de grond ook voor akkerbouw gebruikt kan worden”24 (Dijkstra 2011: 94). Note that the peat bogs were originally higher than the rivers to which they drained. The bogs were dome-shaped, with the highest point in their centre, which would thus act as a watershed. A general, English introduction to the topic is TeBrake 1985,

24. “the systematic drainage of the land in the form of elongated plots and bringing under control the water level, so that the land can also be used for agriculture".
who mainly focuses on South Holland. De Bont 2012 and 2014 offers detailed, up-to-date explanations of the physical and human aspects of peat reclamation.

It is unknown when peat reclamations in the Low Countries first started, but there is some consensus that northern North Holland and Fryslân set the ball rolling. For North Holland, Besteman 1990: 110–1 suspects that reclamations had started on a modest scale in the Carolingian period, judging by toponyms in -more ‘moor’ which are attested for the ninth century in locations around Texel, in West Friesland and in Kennemerland. It is thought that this toponym refers to the original presence of a peat bog (see also de Cock 1969). There are also some archaeological finds which attest to human activities within the northern peat bogs. Some place-names in -heem in the area suggest a pre-1000 origin. By the tenth century, reclamations had also started in the bogs directly east of Kennemerland, such as in Assendelft. On the basis of toponyms and a geographical reconstruction of the reclamations, de Bont (2014: 127) concludes that the eastern part of the Kennemer bogs up to the Great Hollandish watershed (that is, the area to the southwest of modern Amsterdam) had been largely reclaimed by the year 1000.

It is unclear why the reclamations were started precisely in this period. Besteman (1990: 93–6, 110) enumerates a number of push and pull factors:

- The old areas of settlement, on the older dunes and along the few inhabitable river banks and on Pleistocene sands, such as Texel, may have become overpopulated due to population growth since the Merovingian period;
- Sand-drifts in the dunes caused the loss of agricultural land and eventually of settlements, forcing people to look for new territories;
- The peat bogs may have become drier in the centuries leading up to 800 due to improved drainage, which itself must have been the result of the inroads made by the North Sea on the land: the creation of the Rivers Reker (between Kennemerland and West Friesland) and Marsdiep (south of Texel), and the widening of the Vlie which led to the rise of the Zuiderzee;
- The aforementioned new waterways also caused the loss of previously inhabited or cultivated land.

Ultimately, it was probably a combination of human factors (overpopulation, desire for increased agricultural gain) and natural causes (improved drainage, loss of agricultural and inhabitable land to the sea and to the shifting dunes) that impelled people to convert the peat into agricultural land. Once the process was under way, subsequent changes, such as the oxidation and lowering of the land, and the economic and demographic dynamics, imposed the continuation of the reclamations. Historians have also pointed to a “run for the bogs” (wedloop om het veen) between the bishop of Utrecht and the count of Holland in the eleventh century as far as the
The date of the reclamations in North Holland is confirmed by what we know from Fryslân and western Overijssel. Recent archaeological insights suggest that reclamations east of the Vlie probably started around 800 south of the Frisian terp area, around modern-day Sneek. The reclaimers advanced further south and east into the bogs in the following centuries (Mol 2011: 47). For the peat regions of northwestern Overijssel, which belonged to the bishop of Utrecht (the Oversticht, as opposed to the Nedersticht which is the modern province of Utrecht), the investigations of local historical conditions by Mol 2011 suggest that reclamations had been initiated from the town of Vollenhove by 950. These were followed by clearings on a larger scale around 1050. They had a manorial structure, with colonists becoming serfs. The so-called free, commercial reclamations known from the Utrecht and South Holland context followed between 1075 and 1150 (Mol 2011: 82–83).

Northern South Holland and Utrecht, whose peat areas drained into the Rhine and the Vecht, have also been studied intensively. It is generally assumed that the reclamations started in the eleventh century and soon acquired a very organized and large-scale character. In Nedersticht, the wilderness which was being cultivated was to a large extent the dominion of the bishop of Utrecht, whereas in Holland, it was the count of Holland who owned (or usurped) the rights of use. In his ground-breaking study of 1956, van der Linden shows how the reclamation was organized. The reclaimed land was settled by colonists or copers ('buyers'), who bought the use of the land from the bishop or count in a contract called cope (whence the many place-names ending in -koop, such as Boskoop). The bishop or count could sell the concession of parceling the land to a locator, a go-between. Van der Linden himself thought that the colonists soon acquired the status of free men, but it has since been shown that most of them probably remained in a state of domain serfdom or ministerialiteit (Buitelaar 1993, Kuiken 2006), similar to what Mol has claimed for the Oversticht. In Amstelland, de Bont 2014: 219 tentatively identifies the original locator of the Amstel reclamations as the “Lord of Amstel” whose castle may have stood at the site of Ouderkerk aan de Amstel. His family was loyal to the bishop of Utrecht, and the first representative of the family is mentioned in 1105 as Wolfgerus, scultetus de Amestello. If this identification proves to
be correct, it would point to the eleventh century as the start of the reclamations in Amstelland. The settlers might have had an eastern origin, in Nedersticht, since Amstelland only became part of Holland in 1285.

The main developments in the reclamations of South Holland are discussed by TeBrake 1985: 185–220 (for Rijnland), Lugt 2012: 107–23 (Leiden and Zoeterwoude), de Bont 2000 (for Delfland), and others. The main rivers, the tributaries of which first served as starting points for the peat reclamations, are the Old Rhine between Leiden and Utrecht, the Hollandse IJssel between Nieuwegein and Rotterdam, and the Meuse-Merwede delta, from which Maasland (Maassluis, Vlaardingen) and later Delfland were reclaimed. A study of the toponyms in the area reveals that the oldest names are situated along the banks of the Rhine with some on the old dunes. The names in -heem are interpreted by Dijkstra 2011: 90–2 as a slightly more recent layer but still predating the reclamations. We find heem-names derived from personal names, such as Rothulfuashem, West- and Ostsagnem, Upwilcanhem, located along the Rhine and its direct tributaries. Dijkstra ascribes them to individual reclamations starting from the mouths of the Rhine's tributaries. Nearly all Old Dutch heem-names in Rijnland disappeared between 1000 and 1200, with the exception of Sassenheim and Hillegom, which had become parishes. The other settlements moved into the peat area and acquired new names (in -woude, -veen, -koop, -dam, -brug, etc.). Chronologically, the start of systematic peat reclamations in South Holland is dated by Henderikx 1987: 56–62 to ca. 950 at the earliest, which matches the data for Neder- and Oversticht. By the middle of the eleventh century, three villages in the middle of the reclamations already have churches, viz. Leimuiden, Rijnsaterwoude, and Esselijkerwoude, which were daughter churches of the church at Oegstgeest. By 1300, the largest part of the peat bogs had been brought into cultivation, but a few smaller settlements date to the fourteenth century. As to the origin of the settlers in the newly reclaimed territories, TeBrake (1985: 185–6) states that “there is no evidence of any significant migration into Rijnland from other areas. To all intents and purposes the reclamation and colonization of Rijnland’s peat-bog wilderness was carried out by Rijnlanders originating in the nearby dune and riverbank settlements.” He goes on to argue that natural population growth in the western Netherlands in the relevant period was sufficient to additionally “provide colonists for numerous land-reclamations and colonization schemes elsewhere, especially in northwestern and northern Germany.” The local origin of settlers is mainly concluded from a negative argument, viz. the absence of any indication in the historical records for a foreign origin of the population. A positive indication is sporadically found in the form of the settlement names. For instance, Scharwoude in North Holland was probably a colony of nearby Schoorl, and Zoeterwoude in South Holland was a colony of Zwieten, situated downstream from Zoeterwoude along the Rhine.
For the village of Aalsmeer, Kloeke 1934: 68 introduces the possibility that its dialect could stem from migrants from Waterland (north of Amsterdam) who had moved here in the past. Kloeke does not specify when this would have happened, but notes that Aalsmeer was known to be a haven for mennonites, and that Waterland also harboured many mennonites. But this, of course, would not take us back before the sixteenth century. Kloeke himself does not rule out the alternative option, viz. that the Aalsmeer dialect simply retains more archaic Hollandish forms than most of the surrounding dialects (which were influenced by Amsterdam and Haarlem). In fact, this is now the common view, since the linguistic character of the archaic dialect of Aalsmeer fits in perfectly with the other dialects of North and South Holland (van Bree 2004: 42). The village is located at the border of both provinces. The archaic sound of its dialects is due to its geographic isolation in the past: locked in between the Haarlemmermeer to its west and other lakes on all other sides, Aalsmeer remained relatively immune to pre-1900 linguistic influence from the main urban centres of Holland.

Vreeken 2001 takes Kloeke’s theory one step further: he assumes that the first settlers of Aalsmeer came from northern North Holland, where they moved away because of deteriorating water conditions. The village would have been founded by Countess Petronilla of Holland between 1125 and 1129. This date seems rather late in the context of the other reclamations, although we have no hard evidence to reject it. More importantly, the arguments presented by Vreeken for the role of Petronilla are uncompelling. Aalsmeer was donated in 1133 to the abbey of Rijnsburg, in order to help finance its foundation. But that does not exclude the possibility that the village was already several decades old. In fact, it would make more sense, if financing a contemporary project was the aim, to donate land that was already and consistently producing revenues. The linguistic justification of Vreeken’s assumptions has now been dismissed.

The same chronology and geographic succession of settlements as in the north, viz. firstly along the larger rivers, then further inland, is found in the Meuse-Scheldt-Demer area (Theuws 1988: 170–7, 182–3), and in northwestern Brabant (Leenders 2013). The situation in Zealand was different because the peat which covered most of this area at the start of the Common Era disappeared due to human activities. In the Roman period, draining and clearing took place on a large scale here, see Leenders 2004: 147, de Boer 2005: 53. The drained areas oxidated and were flooded first, followed by inundations of the other peat areas of Zealand. What used to be the mouth of the river Scheldt became an estuary with salt marshes (Vos et al. 2011: 66–8). In the course of the first millennium CE, the deposition of marine sediments raised these marshes, until many of them became permanent dry land. Especially the tidal channels, inverted because of their sandier soils and now turned into creek ridges, became suitable for human habitation. The larger part of such
early concentrations of habitation are found on Walcheren, Zuid-Beveland, Tholen and Schouwen. Walcheren harboured an important trade settlement in the Early Middle Ages (of which the remnants are now located off the coast), and later, the towns of Middelburg, Zierikzee and Aardenburg developed. The first dikes to safeguard these lands from future floods were built in the eleventh century. For surveys of the medieval geographical history of Zealand and Zeeuws Flanders, see e.g. Vos & van Heeringen 1997, Kuipers & Swiers 2005: 27–42, 213–24, Beenhakker 2009, and for specific regions, e.g. Gottschalk 1984, de Boer 2005 (for Zeeuws Flanders), Dekker 1971 (on Zuid-Beveland). For the linguistic history of Zealand, this survey implies that there was probably no complete break in inhabitation. Nevertheless, the amount of land suitable for cattle grazing and later for agriculture must have increased during Carolingian times or even before. The area must have been able to sustain more people with every century, and the main question is where they came from. It is possible that most of the new settlements were populated from the ‘old land’ of Walcheren, Zuid-Beveland, Tholen and Schouwen. But since Zealand south of the Scheldt (that is, south of the modern Oosterschelde)\(^{25}\) belonged to the county of Flanders, it is also possible that migrants came in from Flanders. At the very least, commercial activities were initiated by Flemish abbeys and overlords.

The Flemish landscape, including that which is now Zeeuws Flanders, is divided between the coastal plain and the sandy inland, and it is the former that is most relevant to our settlement history. The first references to settlements or individuals associated with settlements in the coastal plain date from the end of the eighth century. They were grants of seasonal grazing land to the abbey of St. Peter’s in Ghent, and an estate associated with at least one settlement in the coastal plain, near Oostburg (Loveluck & Tys 2006: 155). The relevance of these data for the start of human inhabitation may be small, however, since it is now assumed that the Flemish coastal plain was inhabited all through the transition from Antiquity to the Middle Ages. Soens, Tys & Thoen (2014) give the following summary of the society that may be reconstructed for the Early Middle Ages:

The populations of this coastal landscape, largely located close to tidal channels, possessed a maritime focus within a landscape which is unlikely to have fulfilled all their subsistence needs. The primary activities for the nutritional support of their households would have focused on sheep husbandry and fishing (…). The population, like others involved in specialist production of limited products, must also

\(^{25}\) In the Early Middle Ages, the Scheldt may have had its mouth north of Schouwen, possibly jointly with the mouth of the Meuse. This is argued by Rombaut 2009: 58–68, though it seems not to have met with general acceptance. For instance, Beenhakker 2009: 74 retains the Oosterschelde as the main artery, but concedes that the Scheldt may have had another side-branch to the north which fed into the Meuse.
have been involved in a significant degree of exchange for the provision of the cereal component of their diet, the importance of exchange networks being reflected in the presence of significant quantities of imported pottery (…). They probably exported wool or finished woollen textiles (the so-called “pallia fresonica”), fish and salt (…). This early medieval coastal society can be labeled a free peasant society, where most land (apart from the terps) was unembanked tidal marshland, which was held and used in common by the villagers. This was not a miserable society: from Friesland we know that such free peasant traders (“Bauernkaufleute”), could reach relatively high living standards. (Soens, Tys & Thoen 2014: 138–9)

The process of embanking, which started around 1000 CE in coastal Flanders, is ascribed by the authors to the “increasing pressure by territorial lords on the traditionally ‘free coastal societies’” (p. 140). They hold that the coastal wetlands were “usurped” by the count of Flanders and his agents, and that large monastic institutions would have joined in the process in a second phase. By the thirteenth century, a “densely populated peasant economy” had arisen in Flanders (p. 144).

6.4 Economy and government

Trade and economical dependencies indicate the direction of human contacts and point to possible hierarchical relationships between (groups of) humans, which may in turn influence linguistic change. The political status of regions may not have had the same defining influence on linguistic habits as in modern times, but it seems likely that the territorial organization did have repercussions for the direction of change. This may especially be the case where land reclamations are involved. A well-known example is the gift of an estate of reclaimable wilderness by the king or the count to an abbey or a bishop’s church, which then organized or oversaw the clearances locally.

There is an extensive body of literature on the economical and political developments in the Low Countries in the Middle Ages. Verhulst 2002 provides a general survey of the economical system in the Low Countries in the Carolingian period, whereas van Bavel 2010 deals with the period from 500 to 1600. The development from the early medieval economy to the capitalist market economy which dominates the Low Countries after 1300 is discussed, among others, by Hoppenbrouwers (1990) and van Bavel (2010).
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Agriculture and trade

The Merovingian period is generally characterized by local subsistence economies, in which pastoral farming was very important or dominant in all parts of the Low Countries. In the most fertile areas available before the reclamations, such as Haspengouw, southwestern Flanders, Friesland and the Guelders river area, agricultural activities were mainly organized in manors, which developed from the late sixth century onwards (van Bavel 2010: 76–9, 126). There were also manors in the less fertile, sandy regions of the interior, such as the Veluwe, Overijssel, Drenthe, and the Campine region in Brabant (p. 79), but in low densities and mainly from the Carolingian period on. Serfs had to perform duties on the demesne of their overlord. Grain production became more important due to the more efficient labour division, which allowed for an increasing population especially in the Carolingian period. There were trade centres at strategic points along the main water arteries (Dorestad, Oegstgeest/Katwijk, Antwerp, Ghent, etc.) which facilitated “inter-national” trade (Vervloet 2007). Local specialization may have existed in various parts, such as sheep breeding in western Flanders.

The number, scale and scope of the various local and regional centres which can be deduced from the archaeological evidence is interpreted differently by Loveluck & Tys 2006 and Dijkstra 2011. The Frisian terp dwellers of the Carolingian period are generally interpreted by archaeologists to have been “free peasant traders” rather than an aristocracy (Loveluck & Tys 2006: 149). The latter authors extend this view to coastal Flanders, stressing the relative independence of the coastal dwellers until ca. 1000 CE: “Where the evidence is available a significant proportion of coastal dwellers in marginal landscapes also appear to have been ‘free proprietors’, although some were tied to inland estate structures” (Loveluck & Tys 2006: 161). Dijkstra (2011: 319–22) cautions that the apparent richness of the coastal settlements may partly be due to the better preservation of archaeological finds in the clay of the coastal area than on the sandy inland soils. He also regards the idea of completely free, trading peasants in the Merovingian and Carolingian period as an anachronism, which transposes a situation known from late medieval Frisia to a much too early period. Furthermore, transport is also problematic. Dijkstra adduces evidence that river transport along the Moselle and Rhine was in the hands of a small group of professionals in the ninth century, and concludes that the Frisian merchant and/or skipper was a member of a small, specialized group. Finally, as long as we do not know how imported goods arrived at their archaeological destination (by local or long-distance transport, from specialized tradesmen or from local pedlars), we should be hesitant about calling all settlements in which imported goods were excavated and which were situated along a water course “trade centres”.
Freedom and slavery

For sociolinguistic purposes, it would be relevant if a certain region or a certain layer of the population were clearly subservient to a town or to the regional aristocracy. In the Early Middle Ages, the main societal categories are those of the free, the serfs, and the slaves. Van Bavel (2010: 75–86) summarizes our knowledge as follows. The manorial system which came into place from the sixth century – and which did not continue in an unchanged way the Roman system of villae with its slave population – gave the manorial lord substantial control over the peasants who lived on the manor and depended on it. “Serfs were not allowed to leave the manor without the lord’s consent and owed part of their labour and specified products to him”. In addition to working their own tenured land, serfs were also required to work on the lord’s demesne land and provide other services. An advantage for the serfs, which must have played a role in the acceptance of the manorial system by the unfree, is the pledge of protection by their lord in times of insecurity (p. 80). Van Bavel adds that there were diverse forms of manorial organization. In some cases, “the stress was more on levies than on labour services, and the manor did not have a large demesne” (p. 75). Hence, “there were many degrees of freedom or unfreedom, resulting in diversity, in law and in practice, even after people were integrated into a manorial regime.” Manorialism is regarded as an “exploitative”, that is, non-contractual and involuntary relation between the lord and his serfs. The latter had only limited mobility, but had more secure access to their land compared with later centuries. We have already seen that the density of manors differed per region, with the largest number of manors on the most fertile soils (Haspengouw, Guelders, etc.), smaller manors on the sandy soils, and their nearly complete absence elsewhere (e.g., in Holland). Thoen 2001: 106 states that “serfdom (in the classical sense of judicial dependence) was weak in Flanders.”

Historians agree that slavery – as opposed to serfdom – gradually disappeared from western Europe after the Roman era. In the Low Countries and northern France, slaves were replaced in a relatively short period of time after 700 by tenants and serfs, except maybe for Frisia, where they remained until the early ninth century. In the new situation, previously enslaved people merged socially with the class of serfs and impoverished freemen into a heterogeneous category of serfs. In southern France and in Italy, slaves were still commonly employed until the tenth century, and the trade in slaves remained alive in the southern Low Countries until at least the eleventh century (p. 77). At least up to the ninth century, it is thought that the Frisians played an important role in trafficking slaves from Scandinavia and the Slavic countries to southern Europe. Van Bavel ascribes the replacement of slavery by serfdom in the Low Countries to the economic success of the manorial system,
with its better possibilities to adapt to economic fluctuations than a system with permanent slavery. Also, labour-saving changes between 800 and 1200, such as water mills, sickles and scythes, heavy ploughs and horses made it less profitable to keep a large population of agricultural slaves. Christianization and the notion of inherited freedom (in Frisia) can merely be regarded as additional factors in the demise of slavery in the Low Countries.

We are now in a position to judge the merits of Buccini’s proposal (2010: 309–12), viz. that slavery was an important part of the Merovingian economy, and that, of the local Ingvaeonic-speaking population of the Low Countries, “many [were] probably enslaved”, whereas others were “bound with onerous debts of work on [the] Frankish-run estates” (p. 310). Buccini brings this argument in a bid to explain the linguistic changes in the coastal area, in particular, the shift from Ingvaeonic to Franconian. According to his reasoning, the conquest of the coastal Low Countries by the Merovingian Franks would in part have been motivated by the capturing of slaves. Gradually, the slave population would have been absorbed by the peasant population. The slaves’ (Ingvaeonic) dialect would have been stigmatized, which would explain the low status of many coastal Dutch forms in Dutch. This theory is at odds with the absence of evidence for manorial organization in Holland and in western Flanders. Also, western Flanders, Zealand and Holland were only thinly populated in the Merovingian period. For the dunes and river banks of South Holland, Dijkstra 2011: 97–103 calculates that the total farming population may have been between 2,400 and 3,100 inhabitants. The non-farming population would certainly have been very small. Such numbers would hardly make for an attractive goal for slave-raiding. All in all, the slavery argument brought forward by Buccini fails to convince. Of course, one might argue that the same linguistic scenario would hold if we replace slaves by serfs. That is, if we shift the stage to the eighth or ninth centuries in Flanders, and assume that the local serf population, which may have become more numerous, outnumbered the Carolingian overlords whose speech they nevertheless started to adopt.

Developments after 1200

In the early stages of urbanization, between 1100 and 1300, the core areas of economic activity in the Low Countries were Flanders and Artois. Whereas towns in Flanders had already developed in the twelfth century, Holland became “stedenland”26 (Hoppenbrouwers 2002: 118) in the thirteenth century, with Dordrecht,
Vlaardingen, Leiden, Haarlem, Alkmaar and Delft at the forefront, followed by a number of smaller urban nuclei, such as Amsterdam and The Hague (Renes 2008). During proto-industrialization, in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, Flanders remained one of the core areas, but the centre of gravity subsequently shifted to Brabant (1300–1600), and, especially after 1585, to Holland (Blockmans 2010, van Bavel 2010: 372–409).

The historians’ observations are largely in line with the origin and the direction of spread of linguistic innovations in this period, as has been observed by many linguists. In Early Middle Dutch, the area with most linguistic innovations seems to be West Flanders, and Brabant adopts certain features from its western neighbour Flanders, such as h-loss and the fronting of WGM. * ū (Willemyns 1997: 175). During the thirteenth century, Brabant also develops its own innovations, such as unrounding in *zullen and schwa syncope in verb forms (Mooijaart 1992: 309–12). The Hollandish scribes are influenced by scribal practices from Flanders (Berteloot 1984: 100), and the language of Utrecht loses some of its eastern features and gains southern ones (such as l-vocalization in *alT, *olT, and diphthongization of *ē to ie; Pijnenburg 1997: 72). After ca. 1400 (Willemyns 1997: 175), and in particular after 1550 (Taeldeman 1985: 194), linguistic features start to spread from Brabant, westwards into East Flanders and eastwards into western Limburg, respectively. After 1550 there is also a clear spread of Brabantish features into Holland and Utrecht (such as -cht for -ft, and the diphthongization of MDu. /i:/ and /u:/). In Modern Dutch, we find that the archaic, medieval features of South Hollandish, in which it used to agree with North Holland and Zealand, have retreated to the previously most isolated coastal villages, whereas the urban centres have become more ‘Brabantish’. In turn, since the seventeenth century, the language of urban Holland has exerted a strong influence on Utrecht and the eastern provinces beyond (Kloeke 1927). See Willemyns 1997: 180–86 and Goossens 2008 for general surveys.

6.5 Frisia

The erstwhile frisophone character of North Holland is historically well documented (Bremmer 2008). The dialects of that province also retain a number of features which can only be explained by a Frisian substrate (see the summary in van Bree 2012). It is less certain whether and to what extent the coastal area south of the river IJ was fully or partly frisophone at any time before the twelfth century (Bremmer 2008), and it is controversial whether Zealand and Flanders were also Frisian territory at any point in time; a summary of scholarly opinions can be found in Krogh 1997: 22–3. Here we will review the main indications for the extent of Frisia and of the Frisian language south of the IJ before 1200.
Map 3. The limits of the Lex Frisonum (ca. 802–803) and the Utrecht diocese (ca. 780). (taken and translated from Dijkstra 2011: 360, Figure 8.6)

According to the Lex Frisonum, collected at the beginning of the ninth century when the area called *Frisia* was at its maximum size, it was delineated by the river Weser in the northeast (in reality, by the eighth century, Frisians may already have started to colonize what would become the North Frisian islands off the Schleswig coast) and the Sincfal in the southwest (the later Zwin). The diocesan division of the Low Countries in 695 made Utrecht the seat of a bishopric stretching from the Sincfal to the northeast, including the later provinces of Zealand, Holland, Utrecht,
Fryslân, Drenthe, northwestern Guelders and western Overijssel. The border between Frisia and Flanders may in the late seventh century have coincided with the southern limit in which Willibrord preached (Lebecq 1984 I: 103–5). This has been interpreted as a sign that all of this area was Frisian, in an ethnographic and/or linguistic sense, but of course we cannot be sure. For instance, Blok (1978: 28) states about the Carolingian division in 839 that Frisia north of the Meuse fell to Lotharius, whereas Frisia south of the Meuse fell to Charles. Yet the text of the Annales Bertiniani, to which Blok explicitly refers, only states *ducatum Fresia usque Mosam* ‘the duchy of Frisia up to the Meuse’ for Lotharius’ share, and *inter Mosam et Sequanam* ‘between the Meuse and the Seine’ for a certain part of Charles’ share, but there is no mention of a Frisia south of the Meuse (ed. Waitz, 1883, p. 21). The term *Fresia citerior* is used once by Bede in his Ecclesiastical History, book V, 10. It is often assumed to have been a generally used term for ‘Frisia closest to England’, that is, the Dutch coast of Zealand and Holland (in Lebecq’s view) or ‘Frisia closest to Austrasia’. The latter interpretation is probably correct, but this does not necessarily imply that Fresia citerior lay south of the Rhine, as many historians assume. It seems that Dorestad and Utrecht were part of Bede’s Fresia citerior, but both are situated on the Rhine. It certainly does not follow that Zealand (south of the Meuse) or even South Holland (south of the Rhine) belonged to Frisia. How far inland Frisia stretched is unclear. In many accounts, Utrecht and Dorestad are placed in Frisia, and traders from Dorestad were generally referred to as ‘Frisians’ throughout Europe in the eighth and ninth centuries (Lebecq 1984, *passim*). But there is also some agreement among historians that ‘Frisian’ should not be taken as a linguistic definition, at least, not for the areas which were to become Utrecht, the Betuwe, and Overijssel. A toponymical argument for this view is the name *Fresionowic* ‘Vreeswijk’ for a settlement at the junction of the Lek and the Hollandish IJssel, which is attested in the Utrecht Register of Goods. The name suggests that, in that area, the presence of Frisians was noteworthy.

Linguistically, a number of juridical terms provide clues to the erstwhile frisophone – or, if we want to be very careful, at least partly frisophone – character of southern Holland and western Utrecht. The phonetic form of these words can only be explained on the basis of Frisian developments, and the terms are restricted to an area bordering on historical *Frisia*.

Old Frisian *ā-sega/-siga/-syga* ‘law-sayer’, cognate with Old Saxon *eosago*, was borrowed into Hollandish as /a:sige/, yielding Late Medieval Dutch *asighe, asich, azing* ‘officer of the law’. Asega jurisdiction is thought to have applied in all of Holland from Rijnland between Katwijk and Bodegraven northward, and in the later province of Utrecht west of the river Vecht (Blok 1963: 248, 255–61). In Rijnland, the institution of *asichdoem* or *aasdom* ‘asegahood’ lasted until the end of the sixteenth century.
Hollandish *aft* 'lawful' is a loanword from Old Frisian āft, eft 'in accordance with the law; married'. Aft occurs as a variant for Standard Dutch echt in a number of Middle and Early Modern Dutch rules and stipulations from South and North Holland, mostly in the fixed collocations *afte(n)dach* 'lawful day for judgements', *afte(n) claghe(n)* 'lawful complaint(s)', and *afienstoel* 'seat of the judge'.

Old Frisian bodthing is a ‘court case on invitation’, which the count could call once every four years, and which lasted for one week (Blok 1991: 20). The compound may contain the abstract *buda-* ‘bid, invitation’ or a truncated form of the agent noun *budan-* ‘envoy’. The assimilation of d to th (which became t in Frisian but d in Franconian) yielded Old Frisian *botting*, attested as buttink ‘a certain tax’ in two Latin documents from Egmond in North Holland (1130–61), but the noun reads buding, loc.pl. bûdingun, in Latin sources from the Franconian area of the twelfth century (ONW s.v. botthink). Documents from the Hollandish chancellery in the Hague between 1280 and 1342 mostly refer to it as bottinghe (dat.sg.), once buttinghe (1321), with Frisian -tt-, but -dd- is also once found (boddinc 1332). Gosses (1915) had determined the areas in which botting was known in the twelfth to fourteenth century in Holland, viz. Kennemerland, western Rijnland, western Delfland, and maybe the town of Rotterdam. He originally suggested that this represented the inhabited area in the early eleventh century, which was concentrated on the old dunes and along the mouth of the Rhine. The botting area would have been restricted to the westernmost reclamations only.

A clearly North Hollandish noun is *deimt, deint* (Boekenoogen 2004: 88), a borrowing from Old Frisian deimeth ‘the amount of grassland a man can mow within one day’ (corresponding to MDu. dachmaet, Low German Damet). Rentenaar (1972: 294) gives a map of the spread of deimt in North Holland. There, the noun is restricted to eastern regions (West Friesland, Waterland). Bremmer (2008: 290) suggests that this distribution “could mean that the surface measure became popular only after the year 1000 (by estimate) and is a possible indication therefore, of the extent to which Frisian was spoken at the time”. That is, Frisian would have already retreated to eastern North Holland in the twelfth century. Although this interpretation is not compelling (the word could have had a larger spread at an earlier stage), it does seem likely that the word has always been restricted to North Holland, and was therefore borrowed at a relatively recent date. A typological parallel is the borrowing of the same Old Frisian word, but in the local East Old Frisian form *dimêth*, into East Frisian Low German Dimaat, Dimt (Spenter 1983: 772).
Among the evidence for the erstwhile presence of Frisian in future Holland are a number of toponyms which, in their medieval and/or modern form, show linguistic traits belonging to Old Frisian. For example, near Leiden, *Radenburch* (12th c.) became *Roomburg*, and *Forschate* (11th c.) changed to *Voorschoten*. These compounds contain WGM. *rauda- ‘red’ and *skauta- ‘corner, section’, which had become *rād*, *skāt* in Old Frisian, but *rōd*, *schōt* in Old Dutch. Similarly, the name of modern-day *Zoeterwoude* near Leiden is clearly the result of a conscious translation to Franconian of erstwhile *Suetan* (attested in the tenth century), which represents Old Frisian *swēten* from Proto-Germanic *swōti ‘sweet’*. The name may have been motivated by local hydrography. Blok (1959b: 17) suggests that the small river to which *Suetan* originally referred may have been the first stream of ‘sweet’ (drinking-) water when one sailed up the Rhine from the North Sea. This solution is supported by the fact that, on the palaeogeographical map of Holland in ca. 750 AD (see Map 2 above), the salt marshes stretch just beyond the confluence of the Rhine and the *Swēte*.

Map 4 (after Blok 1959a, map I) indicates toponyms in southern Holland which by their phonological make-up betray a Frisian origin or contain coastal Dutch features. They are clearly concentrated around Leiden, Rijnsburg and Noordwijk, but can also be found in Delfland and at other inhabitable places from around the year 1000.

---

27. Blok (1959a: 17–22) gives the following enumeration of the phenomena subsumed on Map 4: 1. Disappearance of *n* before *th*, *s* plus rounding of a preceding *a* to *o*; 2. *à < au*; 3. *a < ai*; 4. *i*-mutation of *u > i*, *e*; 5. *i*-mutation of long vowels and diphthongs; 6. *iu* as a rising diphthong; 7. apocope of *f* after *l*; 8. *thh > tt*; 9. *th- > t-*; 10. *hs > ks*; 11. *ag > ei*; 12. genitive plural in *-a*. Except for nr. 7 (which is disputable) and 12 (which is morphological), these items will be discussed in the present study.
Another source of evidence consists of personal names. Of course, people are mobile, so the presence of a Frisian-like name in Zealand or Flanders does not have to mean that the area itself was frisophone. In North Holland, the Frisian character of anthroponyms until ca. 1200 is quite clear, even if most of the Old Dutch sources in which the names occur were written in Franconian territory, so that many names may have been defrisianized in written transmission (Quak 2012a). In the thirteenth century, a number of Frisian phonological features remain in the North Hollandish names, though most of the names found after 1260, including the hypochoristic ones, already conform to the pattern found further south (de Vaan 2012b: 116–17, Bremmer 2012: 128).

A few onomastic elements in Holland have clear morphological links with Frisian. Van der Schaar 1953: 199–201 points to the diminutive names in -tet. In Frisian, diminutives in -(t)et were formed on monosyllabic stems, e.g. Aget (to Age), Aitet (to Aje, Aite, Ait), Altet, Diedet, Eltet, Galtet, Wultet. In North Holland, Middle Dutch names in -tet are also derived from monosyllabic stems. Van der Schaar therefore interprets them as frisianisms: Aiftet (1343), Aefytt (1514 near Hoorn), Altet (1108), Eltet (1343), Entet (1343), Ettet, G(h)eltet (Bommel 983, Egmond 1162, Vronen 1343, Nuwelant 1345), Meintet (Bommel 983, Alkmaar 1116), Meintetus (Medemblik 1118, 1130, 1127), Mentet (Vronen 1343/4), Oistet (Grootebroek 1343, Vronen), Oytet (Outdorpe, Vronen 1343), Rictet (near Assendelft 1182–1206), Witet (Alkmaar 1116).

Modern Westerlauwers Frisian boai ‘boy’ seems to have a counterpart in Middle Dutch booi, boye ‘son’ or ‘brother’, attested in names in North and South Holland. Examples from South Holland include Diddeboy (1343), Hanneboy (1317), Clayboy (to Claes) (1334), Moneboy (1337), Nanneboy (1334), Neyteboy (1344), cf. van der Schaar 1953: 201. For haringhe hughe pauels boye (Dordrecht, 1284–85), VMNW assumes that boye means ‘brother’, since a hughe pauwels broder occurs in Dordrecht at the same time. In Flanders, Early MDu. boye, boeye is attested as an appellative and a surname, e.g. jhan die boie ‘Boy John’ (Bruges, 1279). Hollandish -boy can be derived from PGM. *bōjan-, cognate with reduplicated *bōban- whence MoHG Bube ‘boy’, MoDu. boef ‘villain’ (Seebold 2011: 157). It is difficult to explain as a frisianism: even if MoWF boai is derived from the Late OWFri. by-form broar from OFri. bróther, bróder, brór (as suggested to me by Jarich Hoekstra; see Heeroma 1970: 120 for the co-occurrence of broer and broar in Frisian), broar presupposes the loss of intervocalic th, which is dated to the fifteenth century in Westerlauwers Frisian. If coastal Dutch boye were a loanword from a Proto-Frisian word with the same th-loss, the latter change would have to be dated incredibly early in the southwestern dialects.

Another possibly Frisian name in South Holland is Nanne, Old Frisian Nanna, which in VMNW occurs thrice as Namme, gen. Nammen, in charters from the Hollandish chancellery (1280–87). In CRM14, Namne is found in Haarlem, Amsterdam (once even with unreduced second vowel as nannakiin 1396), Delft and Gouda, besides
in Groningen and Kampen. In Fryslân and Groningen, it is generally regarded as an abbreviated form of Johannes (Debrabandere 2003: 889). Yet a hypocoristic first name *Nanne, male and female, is also underlyingly present in the Brabantish and Limburgian surnames Nenkinus (Gotem, 1260) and Nennen, Nennens (from the 14th c.), cf. Debrabandere 2003: 889. Hence, it is not completely certain that South Hollandish Nanne is a Frisian relic.

6.6 Holland

The beginnings of the county of Holland are discussed by Blok 1991. The name probably goes back to the toponym Holtlant in the Utrecht Register of Goods of the ninth century (transmitted in a copy from the eleventh century). It seems likely that Holtlant refers to a location in Rijnland, and local geography suggests that it was located on the older dunes or on the banks of the Rhine or one of its immediate tributaries. In the area north of Leiden we still find the toponyms Voorhout and Noordwijkerhout which contain -hout ‘wood’. Holtlant may thus originally have referred to the wooded, sandy soils on both sides of the mouth of the Rhine (Blok 1991: 14), which was the original power base of the Gerolfing counts. Their lineage ruled Holland from ca. 885 to 1299. Gerolf, who was referred to as comes Fresonum, assumed power around 885 when the East Franconian King Arnulf endowed him with, among other things, an area near the mouth of the Rhine (Blok 1991: 14), which was the original power base of the Gerolfing counts. Their lineage ruled Holland from ca. 885 to 1299. Gerolf, who was referred to as comes Fresonum, assumed power around 885 when the East Franconian King Arnulf endowed him with, among other things, an area near the mouth of the Rhine. In the next decades, the territory of his successors was expanded by several royal gifts which may have had the aim of strengthening the count’s position in defending the coast against the Vikings. In the tenth century, the Gerolfings rule from the mouth of the Meuse to the Vlie.

Burgers (1999: 204–5) has shown that already in the 1060s, the county is referred to as Holdland on three occasions (Florentius comes Holdlandensis) in the Annales Egmundenses of the abbey of Egmond in North Holland. At the same time, foreign reports still refer to the area as Frisia, Fresia. This shows that the name shift in non-local usage occurred around 1100. In 1101, -ltl- has assimilated to ll and the name appears as Hollant (Florentius comes de Hollant). Burgers (1999: 206) explicitly links the expanded application of the name Hollant to the peat reclamations in the area. Such a link would be understandable in view of the other (indirect) indications which suggest that the western part of the Holland/Utrecht peat area was reclaimed by people from the old land close to the mouth of the river (e.g., from towns such as Oegstgeest and Rijnsburg) and from the old settlements on the river banks (such as Koudekerke, east of Leiden).

According to Burgers (1999: 207–9), the process of peat reclamations was to a large degree responsible for the detachment of Holland from Frisia in name and
identity. The onomastic evidence, as we have seen above, shows defrisianization of a number of toponyms in South Holland. Burgers hypothesizes that among the reclaimers of the Hollandish-Utrecht fenlands, there were speakers of Franconian dialects from further inland. In this way, the ethnic and cultural homogeneity of the original county (of what became Holland) gave way to diversity, “waarbij de oorspronkelijke Friezen ten zuiden van het IJ in de 11e eeuw blijkbaar een minderheid gingen vormen” 28 (p. 207). The Frisians became concentrated in West Friesland, and the county split into a non-Frisian and a Frisian part. Cultural differences as well as the spatial separation may have led to an increased sense of identity among both peoples, according to Burgers. A toponym such as Vriesencop (South Holland, 1275) seems to testify to the perceived foreignness of “Frisians”. In the twelfth century, the animosity between the Frisians of West Friesland and the Hollanders of Kennemerland is an established fact.

As attractive as this scenario may be when looking for the motives for the linguistic franconization of South Holland, it is clear that it requires some assumptions for which we have no positive evidence. We do not know whether the coastal area was “ethnically and culturally homogeneous” to begin with, nor do we know whether the Frisians became a minority in their own county in the eleventh century due to inward migration of people from further east. In particular, the alleged large-scale immigration of speakers of other dialects is not proven by any records. The alternative view, viz. that the reclaimations were carried out by local people, who for social or economic reasons adopted the speech of Utrecht and beyond, is still a possibility. The western Dutch reclaimations started in a period (around 1000) and in a region which lacked a pre-existing manorial structure and where no (significant numbers of) slaves were available anymore. “The main organizers were the territorial lords, the Count of Holland and the Bishop of Utrecht giving their vassals or stewards, religious institutions, or others the right to develop the organization on the ground as entrepreneurs” (van Bavel 2010: 83). People had to be attracted to settle in the newly claimed land, and the territorial lords profited from their work through fiscal, military, and judicial revenues (p. 85) rather than through land ownership or close control of the labour force, as used to be the case on the manors. To this aim, the colonists acquired a larger degree of freedom than was customary on the ‘old land’, where pre-1000 power relations held.

28. “in which the original Frisians to the south of the IJ apparently became a minority in the eleventh century”.
6.7 Flanders

The rise of Flanders as a powerful region is comparable to that of Holland in many respects. After Baldwin I, who came from the Carolingian power base around Laon in northern France, had been given several pagi as a loan, among which the pagus Flandrensis (viz., modern Bruges and surroundings), his son Baldwin II profited from the power vacuum in the Low Countries which arose in the period of the Viking raids in the ninth century. At the end of the that century, he ruled in much of the area between the sea and the Scheldt, down to Artesia in the south. The name of Flanders was now applied to all of this area (see § 21.1 on the disputed etymology of the county’s name). Manorial organization was almost absent in Flanders, which meant that, when reclamations started, new settlers acquired a degree of freedom similar to that in Holland. But in Flanders the count was already a large landowner on the coastal plain. He sold much of his land to religious institutions and rich burghers, who invested in the reclamations between 1180 and 1300. In this way, much larger land holdings developed in Flanders than in Holland. As a result, cities and urban elites emerged earlier and obtained stronger positions than in Holland (van Bavel 2010: 85).
Chapter 7

The study of language contact

The importance of language contact for the study of language change has been clear to scholars at all stages of modern linguistics. Of course, many of the early references now make a naive impression. For instance, Ypeij (1812: 303) claims that the dialects of Holland and Utrecht are “het zuiverst, of, met andere woorden, het minst gemengd met vreemde dialekten”. Since the writings of Hugo Schuchardt (1884, 1885: 16–7) and Hermann Paul (1886: 337–49), among others, most handbooks of comparative linguistics refer to language contact as a major cause for linguistic change. The many linguistic studies since the 1880s have enormously increased our knowledge in two respects: 1. The variety and geographic spread of the languages studied, 2. The ways in which language changes internally and externally (socio-linguistically) because of contact between speakers.

7.1 Theory and terminology

Intimate details of language variation are particularly important when trying to gauge language change due to external interference. We may distinguish the direct exposure of speakers of different varieties to each other’s language from the indirect influence of one variety on another by the mediation of a third party (speakers or linguistic phenomena). For instance, when discussing language contact between Dutch and French in Haspengouw (southern Belgian Limburg), Kruijssen (1995, 2014) distinguishes three contact zones depending on the distance to the linguistic border. Within a radius of zero to five kilometers from the linguistic border, the French influence on Dutch dialects is the greatest, and it may be assumed to result from direct exposure of at least a significant number of Dutch dialect speakers to French. The next zone is defined between 7 and 12 kilometers from the border, and the third zone is situated at around 25 km from the French linguistic area, and is even less influenced by French. Here, it may be hypothesized that French influence was filtered through the primary and secondary contact zones, and needed no or few speakers who were in direct contact with French. Another, more widely known example of a similar tripartite division is the distinction made by Pfister 29. “the purest, that is, the least mixed with foreign dialects”.

29. “the purest, that is, the least mixed with foreign dialects”.
between three different zones of Old Frankish lexical influence in the Gallo-Romance area: (1) A narrow border strip running from Picardy to Lorraine, in which heavy Frankish lexical influence can be observed in all semantic fields, pointing to a long period of bilingualism between adjacent dialects; (2) An intermediate area between the aforementioned northern strip and the Loire, which was part of the early medieval Frankish power base and hence underwent significant superstrate influence in specific semantic fields, e.g. warfare and administration; (3) The remainder of France, where Frankish words mainly entered through the vehicle of Merovingian and Carolingian chancellery speech.

Linguistic variants can basically arise in two ways, and one may also distinguish two different kinds of selection. Firstly, variation continually arises at the physiological level, that is, through the actions of the articulatory organs and the perception of the acoustic apparatus. Such variation is elementary in understanding why sounds change in the direction that they do, and why other changes are not found or rarely found. Secondly, variation also incessantly arises at the individual cognitive level, such as the parsing of speech signals into distinct phonemes, the morphological analysis of words, the metonymic extension of word meanings to other words, the metaphorical application of lexemes to completely different concepts, or the conversational implicatures that each social group develops over the course of time. These semantic and pragmatic aspects of variation are particularly relevant to etymology, the study of the development of the meaning of words, which will concern us in many of the subsequent chapters.

Language variation becomes language change through the selection of variants. Here too, it is possible to distinguish two different processes, although in the study of past language contact we cannot always tell them apart. Firstly, variants are selected at the language acquisition stage by infants adopting their caregiver’s language (Tomasello 2003) or languages (see Genesee & Nicoladis 2007 for the normality of interference between the available languages in multilingual L1 acquisition). Secondly, selection will continue to take place at all subsequent periods in life due to the social environment of humans, such as their close family or their peer group (Milroy & Milroy 1985). The most critical periods for this kind of selection are childhood and adolescence, but a certain amount of selection continues all through adult life. In theory, one might want to differentiate between active, post-infancy selection, and the passive deselection of variants which may result from either the loss of cognitive faculties or the cessation of exposure to a certain variety. Particularly in situations of language shift, deselection or language attrition can play an important role (Schmid 2011).

The foundations of a more theory-oriented approach to language contact were laid in the 1950s by authors such as von Wartburg (1950), Weinreich (1953, extended posthumous edition in 2011), and Haugen (1953). Since Thomason &
Kaufman (1988, esp. 37–57) and van Coetsem (1988), the topic of language contact has become firmly entrenched in most linguistic research agendas. The literature on all kinds of aspects of language and dialect contact has exploded, involving issues such as: which elements can be transferred, what are the specific processes involved in the incorporation of transferred elements, which structural situations of language contact can be envisaged. It is impossible to provide a reliable summary here that does justice to the various subfields. Among the more recent, anglophone surveys of language contact in linguistics are van Coetsem 2000, Thomason 2001, Winford 2003, 2005, Matras 2009, Trudgill 2011, Hickey 2013b, and the various contributions to Hickey 2013a. Of specific relevance to our investigation are the topics of dialect contact (Trudgill 2010, Britain 2013) and language contact as a heuristic tool in etymology (Mailhammer 2013).

In Dutch and Frisian linguistics, the approach by van Coetsem 1988 and 2000 has been influential, in particular through the reception of his ideas by Cor van Bree. The latter has written about the theory and mechanisms of language contact (van Bree 1996: 255–303, van Bree & Versloot 2008: 21–31, 209–17), about the development of Town Frisian (van Bree 1994, 1997b, 2001, van Bree & Versloot 2008), about the Frisian substrate in northeastern Dutch (van Bree 2000, 2003) and in North Holland (van Bree 2012). See § 5 for the study of the contact between Dutch and French dialects.

The main theoretical concepts I use are taken from van Coetsem (1988, 2000), but many aspects of his theory are, in one way or another, part and parcel of all contemporary theories about language contact. As opposed to the earlier cover terms of substrate, superstrate and adstrate, which combine a socio-economic observation on the relative status of speakers of contact varieties with a judgement on the outcome of the linguistic process, van Coetsem separates the social (extralinguistic) dimension of language contact from the internal linguistic aspects. The most basic distinction at the social level is that between L1 (Language 1, usually the native language of a speaker) and L2 (a language acquired at a post-infancy stage). Of course, a speaker can be exposed to, or impose upon others, more than one non-native language, hence the optional presence of L3, etc. Van Coetsem arrives at an explicit definition of the social status of contact varieties via the term “agentivity”. This leads to the distinction between a source language and a recipient or target language.

A feature that was not stressed much by van Coetsem is the structure of the speech community in which the changes take place. As shown by various sociolinguistic studies, linguistic innovations depend for their spread on the status and the level of activity of the innovating speakers in their community. Therefore, it matters how tightly knit a community is. For innovations from outside to be adopted at all, there have to be speakers who are open to influence from outside. Hence, the degree of openness of a community also matters. In the end, it is both
the “network of relationships among speakers” (Ross 2003: 176) and the individual need or openness of speakers for outside influence which determines the speed and direction with which innovations from outside are adopted.

As regards the linguistic dimensions of language contact, the first aspect defined by van Coetsem is the kind of transfer shown by the features in question: borrowing or imposition (shift). Borrowing can be defined as the transfer of a linguistic feature from L2 to L1, whereas imposition involves the transfer of a linguistic feature from L1 to L2. The second case usually implies that the speakers of L1 are aiming to learn L2, regardless of the question whether they retain their L1 or intend to give it up (the latter may only be the case after a few generations of bilingualism).

A second aspect is the position of linguistic elements on a scale of stability or “stability hierarchy”. According to van Coetsem’s theory, borrowing from L2 into L1 favours the adoption of unstable features, such as vocabulary and derivational morphemes. Conversely, when imposition from L1 onto L2 takes place, stable elements such as phonetics and syntax get transferred more easily. This question is among the most discussed in contact linguistics: can we make out a reliable hierarchy of transferability of linguistic elements (see, e.g., Matras 2007)? Or, rephrased with van Coetsem, is there a hierarchy of the likelihood with which specific items remain stable in the speakers’ grammar as they shift from L1 to (a differently structured) L2? Van Bree & Versloot 2008 and van Bree 2012 have applied the different degrees of stability of linguistic features to their analysis of the Frisian substrate in North Holland and of Town Frisian (which turns out to be sixteenth-century Hollandish speech which started to be spoken in the towns of Fryslân and further developed in a frisophone environment).

7.2 The reconstruction of language contact

Indications for language contact in the past can be of language-internal nature or they can belong to the language-external sphere. Language-internal clues can be either of a synchronic or of a diachronic nature.

At the synchronic level, language contact can leave traces in irregularities within the linguistic (phonetic, phonological, morphosyntactical, derivational, etc.) system that are difficult to explain on the basis of hypothetical system-internal developments. Of course, such traces are the object of interpretation and cannot be regarded as first-hand proof for language contact. Diachronic traces of language contact can be detected by comparing different stages of the same language, or different dialects or languages. For instance, the observation of a change in morphology or syntax between different generations of speakers of the same language can be interpreted as the result of language contact if there are other factors pointing
in that direction. Many changes can also be observed in real time, viz. if we have documentation from different periods. We might witness changes between the linguistic system of an earlier period (of which we may have only written records) and that of a later age, changes of a kind that lead us to believe that language contact promoted the changes.

Language-external information about contact-induced change usually consists of the explicit mentioning of a shift in language from one period to another, or of the migration of speakers. Inasmuch as this information stems from historiography, it must be regarded as indirect and hypothetical. We are unable to check whether, to mention just one example, the “Frisians” mentioned in medieval sources indeed spoke a pre-stage of the language which we now call Frisian. For the modern period, of course, we stand on firmer ground, since sources are more detailed about the contact or migration that took place and more explicit about the linguistic features involved.

By way of illustration, I will give a concrete example as described by Maes 2012. The village of Meijel, in the southeast of the Netherlands, is situated on a small sandy ridge in the middle of a large expanse of moors, the Peel. The Peel was largely uninhabited until the late nineteenth century, and it forms the main border between the cluster of dialects in Limburg and those in North Brabant. The village of Meijel is first mentioned in a written document from 1326, and was probably founded in the thirteenth century or a little earlier. See Map 5 for the situation in the early seventeenth century.

The Meijel dialect has been described at several points in the twentieth century, and there is even an early dialect text from 1807. It turns out that Meijel has changed sides with regard to the \textit{sch}/\textit{sj}-isogloss in Limburg, the so-called \textit{Panninger Zijlinie} or ‘Panningen Side Line’. This important shibboleth was identified by Schrijnen (1902: 252), who also gave its name (Schrijnen 1907: 82). It is the isogloss that demarcates the eastern pronunciation \[\textit{ʃ}]- and the western pronunciation \[\textit{sx}]- of word-initial \(*\text{sk}*\)- in words such as StDu. \textit{schoon} ‘beautiful’ and \textit{schijnen} ‘to seem’. We know from Schrijnen’s work and from the SGV dialect enquiry of 1914 that Meijel used to have \[\textit{sx}]- until ca. 1900.\footnote{The spelling of the 1807 dialect text does not allow us to distinguish between the relevant variants of the pronunciation of \textit{sch}-.

We also know, from subsequent dialect descriptions, that Meijel must have shifted to saying \[\textit{ʃ}]- early in the 1900s, and that this pronunciation became general by the 1930s (Maes 2012: 57). It follows that the word-initial cluster which corresponds to Dutch \textit{sch}- has shifted its pronunciation from \[\textit{sx}]- to \[\textit{ʃ}]- in a very short period of time, probably among speakers born at the end of the nineteenth century who did not yet serve as informants for Schrijnen’s enquiry in 1902.
In order to explain this quick shift, Maes (2012: 59) invokes socio-economic changes in the village as listed in Lucassen 1991: 14–6. In the course of the nineteenth century, the population of Meijel grew and changed through an immigration of speakers from other Limburgian villages, who were attracted in particular by the ongoing reclamations of the hitherto uninhabited moors. In a census from 1909, only two thirds of the local population declared they were autochthonous. Twenty-five percent of the population was born elsewhere, mainly in Limburgian villages to the southeast of Meijel, such as Roggel, Helden and Heythuysen, which have [ʃ]-. Only 6% of the people born elsewhere came from [sx-]-speaking Brabant. Thus, the internal constellation of the Meijel population changed rapidly, and the variant [ʃ-] was generalized by the younger generations.

Another important factor which became influential around the same time was the increasing mobility of people due to improved roads, public transport (regional tramways) and bicycles, later followed by motor cars. Meijel administratively belongs to the province of Limburg, and around 1900, the rise of new, regionally organized agricultural unions, trade organizations, banks, sports clubs, and other peer groups, all conspired to integrate the village more into [ʃ]-ful Limburg than it had hitherto been (Lucassen 1991: 13).

Similar studies of historical change in individual dialects have, for earlier periods, mainly been done on urban dialects. For cities we often possess more information on the demographic structure than for villages. Also, medieval and early modern written documents, in general, and geographically localisable documents, in particular, tend to be restricted to towns and cities.
An early example of the study of a city dialect is Lasch 1911–12 on Berlin. The city is located in the county of Brandenburg, which generally shows a Low German dialect variety. In the beginning of the twentieth century, the traditional Berlin dialect seemed to show a mixture of Low German and High German elements, so it used to be described as a corrupted but basically Low German dialect. Lasch shows that the Berlin dialect only agrees with Low German if the same features are found in the High German of Upper Saxony, to the south of Berlin. The features in which Berlin deviates from Low German are also in agreement with the Upper Saxon dialect, especially that of Leipzig. Since we know that Leipzig was the foremost political and cultural centre of eastern Germany to which Berlin was orientated in the sixteenth century, which is also the time when official documents in Berlin start to be issued in High instead of Low German, Lasch logically concludes that it was the High German variety of Leipzig which was introduced in Berlin around this time. Lasch also addresses the phenomenon of substrate influence, that is, she explains that the Berlin population of the sixteenth century would not have been able to faithfully copy the Leipzig pronunciation because the native phonology of Berlin’s original Low German dialect would have caused a number of mismatches and replacements. For instance, instead of Leipzig tswe ‘two’, Berlin has swē, with replacement of the unknown affricate ts- by its closest counterpart, the fricative s-. Such a change is now routinely acknowledged as a substrate feature. Lasch furthermore signals the retention of the Low German form of some high-frequency function words, such as ik ‘I’, det ‘that’, wat ‘what’, olle ‘old’, mank ‘many’, and of “colloquial” words, such as Kute ‘pit’, Besinge ‘berries’, kieken ‘to watch’. The retention of these and other Low German characteristics is ascribed to a prolonged period of bilingualism in the city, with the lower classes holding on to Low German longer than the higher ones.

Boyce & Howell 1996 show that much work by historical linguists, on Dutch and on other languages, has relied on the notion of ‘prestige’ to explain the spread of innovations through a community. They argue that modern sociolinguistics has proven this notion to be wrong, at least for a majority of cases. Instead, they propose to replace the “status-based” model of change by a “solidarity-based” one, which relies on the analysis of social networks. According to this theory, a closely-knit network with strong ties favours language maintenance, whereas a loosely-knit network with weak ties favours innovation (see Milroy & Milroy 1985, and others).

The main point of applying network theory to language change in the past is clear. In order to assess the possible influence of social history on language change, we must try to analyse the socio-economic situation in terms of the speaker networks that may plausibly have existed. Hendriks & Howell 2000 argue that the linguistic influence of the southern Protestant immigrants around 1600 on the language of Holland has been seriously overrated. According to them, “the economic
success of a given immigrant population does not necessarily translate into eco-
nomic, social or linguistic influence, nor can we assume that a given immigrant
group necessarily came into intense contact with the local inhabitants or other
immigrant groups” (p. 265). Hendriks-Boyce (1998) has shown that the reflexive
pronoun *zich* was introduced in northern Dutch by immigrants from the east who
spoke varieties of Low German. These included refugees from Flanders and Brabant
who first settled in the German Rhineland and only later moved to Holland. Howell
2006 stresses the fact that, for various reasons, the population of pre-industrial
Europe was highly mobile, down to the remotest corners of the countryside. The
poor hygiene in towns caused a relatively high urban mortality rate, which pro-
vided constant in-migration from the countryside. Thoen 1993 investigates the
origin of new citizens (*poorters*) immigrating into Bruges, a city with at least 42,000
inhabitants between the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. At all times between
1331 and 1478, more than half of the immigrants into Bruges had traveled from
over 35 kilometers away. During a peak in the fifth decade of the fifteenth century,
the majority of immigrants even came from over 50 kilometers away. By compari-
sion, the much smaller town of Oudenaerde (ca. 5,000 inhabitants), 30 kms. south
of Ghent, recruited three quarters of its immigrants from at most 20 kilometers
away during the whole of the fifteenth century. By and large, these proportions are
still valid in present-day Europe: the bigger the city, the larger its catchment area.

“Immigration inevitably results in dialect contact” (Howell 2006: 212), which in
turn can lead to dialect leveling and koineization. As a result, “the notion that each
feature of a given urban vernacular must have come from a specific source dialect”
must be given up (p. 223). In addition to the reduction of the number of variants
(leveling), dialect contact “often yields forms not present in any of the contribut-
ing dialects, such as the collapse of Middle Dutch /i:/ and /ei/ as a single phoneme
realized as [ej] in some northern Dutch urban vernaculars.” Goss & Howell 2006
illustrate this phenomenon in more detail on the basis of in-migration to The Hague
in the seventeenth century with reference to the development of diminutive endings
and /ei/-diphthongs.

7.3 Substrate layers

If a Proto-Frisian language was spoken in the western Low Countries before the
area turned Franconian, the former variety can be regarded as the *substrate* which
was submerged by the superstrate of Franconian Dutch. Within Europe, hundreds
of known instances can be listed of one dialect or language becoming a substrate
variety and subsequently disappearing. The historical details are documented better
in some cases than in others. The main factors determining our judgement of each
phenomenon are the time frame of the contact (more recent contact usually leaves clearer traces) and the availability of written records of the contact varieties. For instance, we can make better guesses for Romance substrates than for Celtic ones, because Latin is attested much better than the ancient Celtic languages.

How can a substrate layer be detected in the surviving variety? Which features do we expect to leave traces in the superstrate? Does the disappearance of the original variety mean that it was always in a sociolinguistically subordinate position with regard to the surviving variety which we call the superstrate? There is no one-size-fits-all answer to these questions. In principle, any element of a linguistic system can change through borrowing or imposition. Nevertheless, we can observe some general tendencies. Van Bree & Versloot (2008) distinguish between internal and external inflexion, and between primary, secondary and tertiary lexicon. Under external inflexion they understand affixation, whereas internal inflexion refers to vocalic ablaut, such as in the strong verbs. The primary or central lexicon is defined as normal, every-day words such as ‘sleep, eat, drink, walk, sun, rain, ill’, the secondary lexicon as local and emotional words for small plants and animals, old agricultural terminology, household terms, childrens’ games, local toponymy, and emotional. The tertiary or peripheral lexicon they define as words of “de grote cultuur”31 (p. 26), such as ‘car, computer, washing machine, electricity, race, telephone, intelligent’. See also van Bree 2008a, 2012: 192 for this distinction.

Van Bree & Versloot (2008: 30) arrive at the following stability hierarchy, from most stable to least stable: 1. prosody, 2. syntax, 3. external inflexion, 4. secondary lexicon, function words, 5. derivation & composition, 6. internal inflexion, 7. lexical phonology, 8. primary and tertiary lexicon. This hierarchy reflects rather well the scale from ‘most abstract to least abstract’, or from ‘least conscious to most conscious’ linguistic features. The relevance of this general scale or hierarchy has been confirmed for many known or possible language contact situations. Stable features, such as prosody, phonetics and syntax, are more likely to signal the presence of a substrate layer than lexical phonology or the tertiary lexicon. Of course, such results can only be established through a comparative analysis, on which see below.

Van Bree & Versloot are well aware that, in particular, the boundaries between primary, secondary and tertiary lexicon are hard to determine. This has an important consequence for their practical application. Whereas the three-way distinction of the lexicon turns out to be a useful tool in determining the inherited or borrowed status of a language’s lexicon as a whole, the same distinction has little heuristic value when applied to individual lexemes. There is no way to establish whether a word meaning, for instance, ‘hut made out of sods or straw’, belongs to the central

31. “the larger culture” or “the culture at large”.
lexicon (because people live in it), to the peripheral lexicon (because people now live in stone houses but are aware of traditional house construction), or to the secondary lexicon (because the huts look different in each village and are referred to in a depreciatory way). Therefore, the three-way lexicon distinction holds no clue to the etymology of a word: we cannot say that ‘hut’ is more likely to be borrowed from a substrate because it belongs to the secondary lexicon, or that it is probably an inherited word because it is of prime importance to the way people live. Every word can be borrowed, and every word can undergo an unforeseeable semantic shift. Therefore, only a cumulative analysis of the lexicon in different categories can theoretically yield information about substrate layers – and still there is no guarantee that the conclusion will be correct.

Of particular interest to our investigation is the case of Groningen. This province once spoke Frisian but it was defrisianized between 1300 and 1500. Moreover, it is disputed whether the town of Groningen itself was frisophone. Heeroma & Naarding (1961) defend the idea that it was. They ascribe the defrisianization of Groningen to the establishment of the episcopal court (from Utrecht) in the town. This would have caused the other members of the town’s elite to shift to an early type of ‘Town Frisian’. When Groningen also became a member of the Hanseatic league, in which Low German was the lingua franca, Groningen shifted to Low German and this variant was then adopted by the surrounding countryside, the Ommelanden. But the influence and, in fact, the mere existence of a linguistic Hanseatic language is called into question by Niebaum (2001: 431–9), who dismisses the frisophone status of the town of Groningen. According to him, the town represented the northernmost tip of a Low Saxon wedge within frisophone territory. Unfortunately, there is currently no consensus on the matter. Van Bree (2000, 2003, 2008b) shows that some syntactic phenomena of Groningen and northern Drenthe might be due to an erstwhile Frisian substrate. Van Bree 2017 discusses evidence from all linguistic categories, and concludes that it is mainly the lexicon which provides evidence for Frisian substrate in Groningen, whereas the influence on morphology is of a more indirect nature. However, a more comprehensive study is needed to settle the matter.

Further east, along the German North Sea coast, there are of course several other areas where Low German has replaced a variety of Frisian. See for general surveys Spenter 1983: 767–77, Niebaum 2001, Scheuermann 2001, and Versloot 2001a. Here I will only mention the Low German of the region Ostfriesland, between the mouth of the Ems and the Weser. Remmers (1994) gives a general introduction to this contact situation, while his later essays treat Frisian substrate words in Low German in alphabetical order (Remmers 1995, 1996). Versloot 2013 offers an interpretation of the lexical substrate in the Low German dialects of Jeverland (northeastern Ostfriesland), where defrisianization took place in the seventeenth
century. Here, synchronically transparent correspondences between Frisian and Low German underwent sound substitution (e.g., *t(h)iuksel ‘drawbar’ was replaced by düüssel), whereas opaque formations and Frisian words without a Low German correspondence were adopted unchanged (e.g., dimaat a land measure containing Old East Frisian di ‘day’, kwiddern ‘to talk’). Some local words of Frisian origin may already have been borrowed by Low German before it spread to Jeverland although clear examples of this type are difficult to find.
CHAPTER 8

Working hypothesis and approach

The point of departure for this study is the observation that, on the synchronic, modern-day level, we can distinguish between coastal and inland Dutch. Both varieties are defined in a historical way, viz. with regard to the absence or the presence of secondary i-mutation. The question is whether we can set up a scenario of linguistic changes that explains how the split between coastal and inland Dutch came about. Based on the historical evidence and on linguistic clues, I assume the existence of a Proto-Frisian population along the coast down to the Rhine estuary in South Holland. The hypothesis to be tested is the possibility that the deviant character of coastal Dutch as a whole, that is, including the area south of the mouth of the Rhine, was caused by language contact between Proto-Frisian and the local Old Franconian dialects. Section 8.1 sketches the reasoning behind this working assumption and explains the analytical procedure followed in the subsequent chapters. Section 8.2 compares the historical phonology of Frisian and Franconian in the period between the break-up of West Germanic and the end of the Old Dutch period, around 1200.

8.1 Frisian and Franconian until 1200

The Germanic dialect continuum which existed in northwestern Europe at the beginning of the Common Era eventually brought forth the North Germanic and West Germanic language groups (Nielsen 2000a). The strict separation between the latter two entities is the result of developments in the centuries following on the Anglo-Saxon migration to Britain, which created a geographic gap between the erstwhile adjacent northwest Germanic dialects. From ca. 200 to 450, before the migration of the Anglo-Saxons to Britain, there was a West Germanic dialect continuum on the continent. The northern or northwestern part of this continuum was an important centre of linguistic innovations, such as $a > o$ before NC, the loss of nasals before fricatives other than $*x$, and the (initially allophonic) palatalization of velar stops. Some of these Anglo-Frisian innovations (cf. 8.2.3, 8.2.4) spread further south than the North Sea coast, but they are only minimally represented in the central and eastern dialects of Dutch. In view of the linguistic border between Frisian and Franconian in historical times, it is likely that the Frisian language was
brought into Frisia by migrants from further northeast (Sebold 1995: 13). Judging by the hiatus in habitation in Fryslân between ca. 300 and 425, which has been established by archaeology, the newcomers filled the gap left by the ancient Frisii (Bazelmans 2009: 326, Nicolay 2010: 125). The latter may or may not have been speakers of a Germanic dialect.

Between 250 and 400, speakers of West Germanic cross the Roman limes and spread southwest into the Low Countries. It is unclear when this spread started and how fast the Low Countries became germanophone. The two languages which we know were spoken in the area at the time were Celtic (Schrijver 1999, Schumacher 2007) and Latin (Weijnen 1999: 33–7). They may have been separated according to regions or settlements, or they may have cohabited in various places. When Celtic became extinct, is unknown.

A major bone of contention is how much continuity in habitation we may infer for the Low Countries between the Roman and the Merovingian periods. Archaeologists and, in their wake, historians, assume either a general break in habitation or a very severe reduction of the population between ca. 270, when sources report the withdrawal of the Roman forces from the Limes, and 358, when the Franks are said to enter the region. Yet it is also generally admitted that there is some structural transfer of settlements and organization from the Romans to the Merovingians in the Guelders river area and in the fertile loess area of South Limburg. Other areas of sporadic continuity may have included the banks of the larger rivers and the old dunes along the North Sea coast. To a linguist, the assumption of a prolonged period without any significant settlement in the Low Countries is unexpected because there is no linguistic break (i.e., no sharp dialect boundary) between the putative form of West Frankish (whence Old Dutch arose), spoken in the Merovingian period, and the dialects further east. Hence, if the discontinuity scenario is correct, the attested medieval Franconian dialects must reflect the language of the newcomers who filled the empty space. If, on the contrary, there has never been a complete break in habitation in the Low Countries, we can deduce that the language of the Franks erased all traces of earlier, pre-fourth-century Germanic dialects. Of course, these considerations only have value if there ever was

---

32. Van Loon (2014: 46–50) holds a different view, viz. that Germanic speakers had already moved into the southern Low Countries in the third or second century BCE, at the latest. He supports his view with the remarks made by Caesar and Tacitus on the different Germanic and Celtic tribes, and the etymology of some of the tribal names as Germanic. It is quite conceivable that he is correct, and that Celtic-Germanic multilingualism reigned for several centuries even before the Roman era, but this will make no practical difference for our purposes. We find no traces of a pre-Imperial Germanic dialect in the Low Countries that would have failed to share in later pan-Germanic innovations. To all intents and purposes, the West Germanic of the Low Countries goes back to dialects spoken there in Late Imperial times.
any significant difference between the dialects of the earliest migrants and those of the Salian Franks to begin with.

After the migration of the Angles and Saxons to England, from about 450 onwards, the continuous spread of Anglo-Frisian linguistic innovations from the north into the Low Countries comes to a halt. In the sixth and seventh centuries, the Frisians extend their influence and/or their physical presence southward along the coast, possibly bringing along Proto-Frisian linguistic innovations. Proto-Frisian and Old Franconian had experienced some centuries of separate development, as a result of which two different linguistic systems now come into contact in the Low Countries. For South Holland, there is evidence that settlers originating from the Rhine estuary went on to reclaim the sandy soils west of the bogs, between the Meuse and the Rhine and north of the Rhine, after 500 (Dijkstra 2011: 93).

From the seventh century on, Franconian starts to expand from the southeast toward the west and northwest (Buccini 2003: 206–17), which repressed some of the Proto-Frisian characteristics of the coastal dialects. According to onomastic material, such as place-names with Frisian phonology in Holland and Utrecht, the actual shift to Franconian can be dated the earliest in Flanders (if there ever was such a shift in this area), viz. to the ninth century, and later in Holland and Utrecht, viz. to the eleventh (Blok 1959a, Heeroma 1965a: 18–9). For Holland, it seems plausible to link the language shift to the large-scale reclamations of the peat bogs, even if no explicit mention of this link exists in contemporary documents. The timing is exactly right, since reclamations in Kennemerland were already well under way in the tenth century (de Bont 2014: 127). Several scholars have speculated about the nature of this link. Dijkstra (2011: 89) has argued that colonists from the Guelders river area and/or Brabant may have come west to the Meuse estuary in the ninth or tenth century. For the reclamations in Amstelland, de Bont 2014 points to the appurtenance of this area to Nedersticht until 1285, so that its colonists may have had an eastern origin. Burgers (1999: 207–9) essentially regards the reclamation of the Hollandish-Utrecht bogs as a period of ethnic admixture, in which an originally homogeneous Frisian population receives a large number of Franconian immigrants, leading to Frisian becoming a minority language in eleventh-century central Holland, and to the rise of an ethnic border with West Friesland.

We have noted above that the scenario of a language shift accompanies the reclamations introduces a number of unverifiable assumptions. In particular, there is no evidence for large-scale immigration of speakers of different dialects. Wherever we do have concrete evidence, it points to a local origin of the settlers in the reclaimed areas (thus, for instance, in Rijnland and in Kennemerland). Therefore, it may for now be preferable to regard the linguistic shift as a gradual process. In general, language histories teach us that social and economical circumstances provide stronger incentives for language shift than the mere number
of speakers. TeBrake (1985: 222–4) notes that “the coastal dwellers were physically separated from the European continent by the broad band of wilderness” which were the bogs, though of course they had access to major river routes and to the sea. For Rijnland, in particular, the silting up of the Oude Rijn at the end of the first millennium, together with the reclamation and colonisation of new land, “began to reorient [the Rijnlanders] to inland areas instead.” Thus, very gradually, the inhabitants of Rijnland and Kennemerland began to dissociate themselves from the Frisians and formed their own new identity which involved a stronger connection with inland Europe. TeBrake furthermore points to the absence of any proof for “migration into the coastal regions by Frankish-speaking colonists that could have accounted for such a linguistic substitution.” He therefore prefers to see the francization of Holland as an example of acculturation, “no doubt greatly influenced by Flemish and Brabantine examples from the east and south.” Of course, in the absence of explicit proof for such influence, the only thing we can do is to “doubt” this transregional acculturation process. Lebecq (1984 I: 16) advocates a similar view as TeBrake. He writes: “portés par la conquête pippinide, les parlers francs finirent de s’imposer au cours des VIIIe / IXe siècles.”33 He goes on to ascribe a key role in this period to Dorestad, as a major trade centre, the rise of which was “chronologiquement associé à la domination franque sur ces régions.”34 Implicitly, Lebecq’s explanation, too, presupposes a scenario of linguistic acculturation rather than replacement.

This explanation is attractive for its balance but frustratingly vague on the details. Exactly which Flemish and Brabantine examples must we envisage? Except for Utrecht, towns were not very developed in the eleventh century. And at what speed did the shift take place, and within how many generations? Is it possible that the coastal dwellers had already been bilingual for centuries, which would make the final shift easier to explain?

For Flanders, the linguistic situation is even less clear. Flanders south of the Sincfal does not seem to have belonged to Frisia proper at any point, though in the seventh century, the vita of Saint Eligius does mention Fresiones among the inhabitants of the Flanders diocese where the saint is converting barbarians to Christianity (Lebecq 1984 II: 48). The Old Dutch onomastic evidence for Proto-Frisian features is very meagre for the southwestern Low Countries. Still, the modern dialects suggest that, at least at some point in time, nearly all of Flanders was affected by coastal Dutch features such as the loss of nasals before fricatives, the unrounding

33. “brought in by the Pippinid conquest, the Frankish dialects ended up imposing themselves in the course of the 8th-9th centuries.”

34. “chronologically associated to the Frankish dominance in these regions.”
of \(*\ddot{u}\), and the absence of secondary \(i\)-mutation. Some archaeologists now assume continued habitation in parts of Zealand and on the Flemish coastal plains from Antiquity, or in any case from Merovingian times onward. For that reason, we could assume that the Flemish coastal plain (and Zealand) in the Early Middle Ages spoke Proto-Frisian, and that this dialect, once it had become francaized, spread across all of Flanders. But in view of the relatively small size of the coastal plain, compared to the inland area where Ghent and other important towns are situated, this is not a demographically attractive scenario. An alternative solution is to hold a Romance substrate layer responsible for the coastal Dutch features of Flanders and Zealand, as per Schrijver 2014: 151. He proposes:

A Romance-speaking population that was present in the Low Countries shifted to speaking Germanic when, sometime in the early medieval period, Germanic had become the language of the socio-political elite. This population replaced the Germanic rule of secondary \(i\)-umlaut, which was foreign to Romance, with the Old French rule of spontaneous fronting of \(*\ddot{u}, \*\ddot{u}, \text{and } \*\ddot{u} \). Spontaneous fronting accordingly is an Old French substratum feature in Dutch.

As I have argued above in § 5, I think that the “spontaneous fronting of \(*\ddot{u} \)” is a different, later phenomenon, and I also think the fronting of short \(*\ddot{u} \) was not a very early development. But the Flemish fronting of \(*\ddot{u} \) and the coastal Dutch unrounding of \(*\ddot{u} \) before palatalized geminates (see § 15.2.1) could in theory be due to a Romance substrate. If we adopt this viewpoint, the geographical spread of these features throughout Flanders becomes easier to understand, as there was large-scale bilingualism with Late Latin in all of Flanders. The linguistic similarities between the coastal Dutch of Flanders, Zealand and Holland, such as regarding the fronting of \(*\ddot{u} \) and also the coastal Dutch unrounding of \(*\ddot{u} \) before palatalized geminates, may then be explained from the hypothetical spread of the Flemish-Zealandish variety of coastal Dutch northward in the Carolingian period. The date which Schrijver himself assigns to the Romance-to-Dutch shift, viz. between the eighth and eleventh centuries, seems to me too late for Flanders. Also, Schrijver’s hypothesis does not deal with the Frisian characteristics of personal- and place-names in Holland, such as \(*au > â \) and the loss of nasals before fricatives. We could therefore assume a different replacement scenario for southern and northern coastal Dutch: from Late Latin to Old Franconian in Flanders, yielding Old Flemish, and, at a later stage, from Proto-Frisian (maybe beside Late Latin) to Old Flemish, yielding Old Hollandish, in the north. Such a phased language shift from south to north would explain the nearly complete linguistic similarities between northern and southern coastal Dutch, but it would go against the idea of the language of Utrecht and, maybe, Guelders or North Brabant, being imported to Holland during and after the peat reclamations.
There may have been an additional push factor towards franconization, in the shape of the attacks by the Danes, in particular between 834 and 900, which had a negative impact on Frisian trade and which destabilized the political organization of the Low Countries in the period concerned. Just as the rise of the counties of Holland and Flanders is, in a way, the political outcome of the Viking period, the linguistic shift away from Frisian may have been caused or facilitated by a decreasing amount of trade and political cohesion within the elongated Frisian coastal area.

I arrive at the following synopsis. A straightforward interpretation of ethno-nyms would have us believe that Holland and Zealand had become Frisian in the Early Middle Ages whereas Flanders had not. Flanders in the Merovingian period must have seen wide-spread bilingualism or, at least, a mixture of romanophone and germanophone settlements, which gradually formed into the later linguistic border between French and Dutch. It is conceivable that Old Flemish resulted from L1 speakers of northern Gallo-Romance who adopted Franconian speech. Since the seventh century, the economic and political influence of inland Franconian on the coastal regions increased. The eastern and southern parts of Flanders belonged to the old land, so that the linguistic border along the Dender and Scheldt cannot be ascribed to the Pippinid and Carolingian expansion: it could be older (from an earlier substrate border, or from internal development) or more recent (if western speech spread eastwards in the later Middle Ages).

For Holland north of the Meuse, we may assume the presence of Proto-Frisian speech in the Early Middle Ages. It is unclear whether Holland between the Meuse and the IJ had been monolingually Frisian, forcing us to assume a full-scale shift from Frisian to Franconian, or whether two or more varieties of Germanic coexisted within the area, in which case the Hollandish outcome may be based on a dialect that was Old Franconian in character from the start. The full-scale franconization may have started in the ninth century, and it was achieved in any case around 1100. The change could be due to christianization (if the place-names on which the Frisian case is built remained Frisian for a longer time), to Frankish dominance, to a collapse of internal cohesion of Frisia due to the Viking raids in the ninth century, to the development of supralocal overlordship in the tenth century, or to another, unknown factor. In Holland and Utrecht, the reclamations which start in the tenth century add an important element. They allow for a population increase and open up the west to trade and traffic with the Franconian central Low Countries. The population of West Flanders and Zealand may not have been linguistically (Proto-) Frisian, but it seems to have shared at least some of the linguistic characteristics of Proto-Frisian.

In Chapters 9 to 21 below, the development of consonants (9–10), original short vowels (11–15), and long vowels and diphthongs (16–21) will be discussed. After each discussion of the evidence, a provisional conclusion will be drawn which will
focus on determining whether the available evidence in western Dutch must be inter-
 preted as the result of (1) phonological imposition from a Proto-Frisian substrate onto 
 Old Franconian, (2) lexical borrowing from the substrate into Old Franconian, or 
 whether (3) the evidence can be explained from internal developments within 
 Old Franconian. In Chapter 22, the general conclusions will be drawn.

8.2 Contrastive historical phonology of Frisian and Franconian

A linguistic shift from Proto-Frisian to Franconian would have been accompanied 
 by features of phonological imposition from the native language (L1) onto the 
 newly acquired speech (L2) which we may call Old Coastal Dutch. We also expect 
 a certain amount of lexical borrowing from L1 into L2. If this scenario is correct, 
 the Late Old Dutch phonological system would be based on Old Franconian 
 spoken around the eighth or ninth century (for Flanders) and around the eleventh 
 century (for South Holland), but adapted to the contemporaneous L1 system of 
 local Proto-Frisian or Early Old Frisian (Buccini 1995). This section provides the 
 systematic background for the concrete case-studies which will follow in the re-
 mainder of this book, by contrasting the development of the historical phonology 
 of Frisian and Franconian between ca. 400 and 1200.

8.2.1 Restriction to phonetics and phonology

The investigation will be restricted to phonetics and phonology. These fields al-
 low for the most insightful and reliable historical comparison between Frisian and 
 Franconian, more so than morphology, syntax, or the lexicon. This restriction is 
 due to the specific state of the available historical records and to the basic similarity 
 between the linguistic systems of Proto-Frisian and Old Franconian. As regards the 
 early medieval Germanic dialectal landscape, morphological, syntactic and lexical 
 evidence is much harder to interpret in a straightforward way than phonetic and 
 phonological evidence. The main reason for this discrepancy lies in the nature 
 of the oldest textual witnesses, which consist of names and a few shorter texts. 
 Furthermore, the handful of longer texts are translations and represent only a few 
 different locations. Whereas a number of phonological changes will inevitably show 
 up whenever we have a minimal amount of words at our disposal, the same is not 
 true for morphology, lexicon, or syntax. Another reason for the methodological 
 restriction to phonetics and phonology is that phonological change will – in most 
 cases, but not always – create irreversible changes to the system, which are bound 
 to be traceable even after 1500 years or so. Each dialect will have its specific set of
phonological characteristics. Of course, we know that lexical diffusion and whole-
sale language shift may have severely disturbed and obliterated earlier changes, but
on the whole, a dialect can clearly be marked as, for instance, Frisian or Franconian,
on the basis of its phonological make-up. Morphology, syntax and the lexicon do
not present such a sharp tool: they are much more susceptible to secondary spread-
ing and convergence of features which obliterate earlier divergences.

The vocabulary is subject to continuous change via borrowing and semantic
change. Many words are lost over the centuries and get replaced by new formations
or other existing words. If, for instance, a lexeme is only found in western Dutch
and Frisian, this does not necessarily imply that the word used to be absent in
eastern or southern Dutch. The geography alone does not suffice to call a word a
frisianism. That is why lists of allegedly Ingvaenic words such as those compiled
have little value for our purpose. Microtoponymical terms such as delf, dify, delfj
‘ditch’, drecht ‘water course’, kene ‘creek’, nes(se), -nis(se) ’neck of land’, schaar ‘a deep
gulley’, vliet ‘stream’, and zijl ‘water course, locks’ refer to geographic features found
particularly in the western Low Countries, and the words may for that reason be ab-
sent from dialects further east. Only phonological features, such as the unexpected
ei- in Dutch eiland ‘island’, could point to a Frisian origin (but see de Vaan 2014b on
this difficult word). The category of agricultural words, which Schönfeld & van Loey
(1970: xxxvi–vii) distinguish, is not distinctive either. It consists of West Germanic
archaisms (bul ‘bull’, wiel ‘wheel’, mijt ‘pile’), specific coastal developments which
are not necessarily of substrate origin (elder ‘udder’ is due to a local dissimilation
from *eudur, see Kroonen 2011), and local semantic innovations (arend ‘part of a
scythe’, woerd ‘male duck’).

Most of the evidence from derivational morphology is also inconclusive. The
possessive adjectival suffix -ede, as in MDu. driehoekede ‘triangular’, bullruggedede
‘hunch-backed’ (Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 148), has been cited as a Flemish
frisianism by Taeldeman (1982: 283) and is also singled out as a peculiarity of
the North Holland dialect (Pannekeet 1995: 314). But in fact we are dealing with
a West Germanic suffix *-ōdja- forming denominal adjectives, as reflected in OE
and Faltings 1996 on Frisian in particular. It may simply have been retained longer
in western Dutch dialects than in the interior. The noun suffix PGm. *-sla(n)- is re-
lected as -sel in Standard Dutch, but it is found metathesized to -eles in Old English,
Old Frisian and coastal Dutch. As I have shown elsewhere (de Vaan 2012a), the
reflex -ls- is also found in northern Low German, in Ripuarian Middle Franconian,
and sporadically in parts of the Low Countries which are generally believed to have
generalized -sl-: Antwerp, Brabant, and Overijssel. I have therefore proposed that
West Germanic underwent metathesis of *-sl- to -ls- only under specific conditions,
i.e. in intervocalic position. This resulted in an alternating paradigm, from which some dialects generalized the *sl*-variant, and others, the *ls*-reflex. It follows that coastal Dutch -*eles* may be an inherited form of Old Franconian, even if it could also have existed in the coastal substrate. The suffix -*schep*, -*schip* for inland Dutch -*schap* is discussed in § 11.3. Its western reflex with a front vowel *e* or *i* is either due to generalization of a paradigmatic variant with *i*-mutation (which was present in all of West Germanic) or to phonetic fronting of *a* in western Dutch.

Of the positional adverbs made from *bi* ‘by’ plus a vowel-initial adverb, *binnen* ‘inside’, *buiten* ‘outside’ and *boven* ‘above’ are general throughout the Dutch area. In Flemish, we also find *bachten* ‘behind’ and *boosten* ‘to the east of’. Taeldeman 1982: 284 regards *bachten* as another ingvaeonism on account of Old English *baeftan* ‘behind’ (note also OFri. *befta* ‘behind’), but it is clear that the word formation was trivial and that the tendency to form such combinations was inherited from West Germanic.

Morphosyntactic criteria are also problematic. The merger of the dative and accusative in the pronouns (Dutch *mij*, dative and accusative), the opposition between *h*-forms and *h*-less forms of the third person pronoun (Dutch *hij* vs. MoHG *er* ‘he’), and the absence of the reflexive pronoun *zich*, represent different outcomes of the same West Germanic allomorphy. Also, the most significant isoglosses in this respect run between Brabant and Limburg rather than between Flanders and Brabant. The 3sg.pres. of ‘to be’, Dutch *is* instead of German *ist*, is found further east than coastal Dutch, and includes Limburgian. The use of *w* rather than *j* as a hiatus filler in the “verba pura” (Flemish *drawen* vs. StDu. *draaien*) is also merely the generalization of one of two existing variants in West Germanic. On the reduction of the prefix *ga-* in western Dutch, see § 9.3.

Of course, one may ask why in these and other cases, western and often also central Dutch sides with Frisian (and English) rather than with German. It seems to me that such distributions go back to the migration period. In other words, there must already have been a dialectal distribution within the West Germanic continuum, and the dialects which settled in the central and western Low Countries shared a number of isoglosses with Anglo-Frisian, as opposed to the more eastern dialects. This is the best solution for a case such as *fīf* ‘five’, and it would work for the morphosyntax as well (in a similar vein, see Nielsen 2000a: 249–54).

In the field of inflectional morphology, Taeldeman (1982: 282–3) adduces a few nominal endings as ingvaeonisms. Yet none of them holds water. The masculine nominative plural ending -(a/e)s of *a*-stem nouns, famously found in the neuter *nestas* in the Rochester Poem, must be regarded as an inherited variant of Low German and Dutch (Marynissen 1995: 221–4, van Loon 2014: 73–7). It happens to survive best in southwestern and northeastern dialects of Dutch, and it has become productive in certain phonological categories, such as monosyllables and
nouns ending in MDu. -ere. The inflected gerund in -ene (Taeldeman’s second Ingvaecionic feature) is also inherited from Old Dutch and can still be found in all of Middle Dutch. The Old Flemish genitive plural ending -a instead of Old Saxon and High German -o, and the nominative singular -a instead of -o in n-stems, must result from a chain of changes in the unstressed vowel systems of the various West Germanic dialects (Nielsen 2000a: 79–83). The basic impetus of this chain, viz. the fronting of short *a to [æ], may have been shared by Old Flemish.

Except for some clear traces of Frisian syntax in North Holland (Hoekstra 2012), it is impossible to identify syntactic features in western Dutch which must certainly stem from Frisian. Taeldeman (1982: 283–4) mentions the absence of inversion after adverbial complements (Gisteren ’t was koud instead of StDu. Gisteren was ’t koud ’It was cold yesterday’), the placement of directional complements outside the predicate (Hij is vandaag gegaan naar Duinkerken rather than Hij is vandaag naar Duinkerken gegaan ’He went to Dunkirk today’), the occurrence of do-support in Flemish, especially in replies, and the absence of the auxiliary worden in fientive (Hij komt ziek for StDu. Hij wordt ziek) and passive usage (Hij is geslagen for StDu. Hij wordt geslagen). None of these features existed for certain in the Old Dutch period, and if they did, we have no clue as to their geographic distribution at the time. For instance, do-support is found in some way or other in most Dutch dialects and in Middle Dutch. Of the features mentioned by Taeldeman, the different placement of complements, do-support, the use of komen for fientives (French devenir) and zijn for passives are all found in Modern and/or Old French. On balance, Gallo-Romance seems to be a more likely, or equally likely, source for these Flemish syntactic features. For general considerations in the study of dialect contact in syntax, see Glaser 2014.

8.2.2 Contrastive historical phonology

In his study British Celtic Influence on English Phonology, Laker 2010 applies contrastive phonological analysis to two historical languages on a larger scale than most of his predecessors (listed in Laker 2010: 55). Concentrating on phonetics, phonemics and phonotactics, Laker systematically compares the reconstructed systems of vowels and consonants of Late Proto-British and Pre-Old English, the two varieties for which language contact in Britain is postulated between 450 and 700 CE.

In this way, he is able to identify the agreements and differences between the two linguistic systems, and hence the elements which were most likely to undergo change during the linguistic transfer of features from L1-British to L2-Pre-Old English which led up to L1-Old English. The result is a list of fifteen Old English items (Laker 2010: 250) which qualify for an explanation due to language contact
with Late British. A similar contrastive analysis will be at the heart of the present study. It will focus on the linguistic development of Frisian and Franconian and will reconstruct different stages in the development of both varieties.

The survey in § 6 suggests that a putative replacement of a (Proto-)Frisian variety by Franconian in the coastal area could have taken as much as five hundred years to reach completion. In Flanders, the process may have started in the eighth century, and it reached parts of North Holland only in the thirteenth century, with Frisian pockets possibly remaining for a few more centuries. These chronological differences have obvious consequences for our reconstruction. For instance, in Flanders the comparison must be based on the linguistic systems of Frisian and Franconian of the eighth century. For South Holland, the relevant system would be that of around the year 1000, and for North Holland that of the thirteenth century. In order to keep the amount of distinctions manageable, I use four reference points (RP) to compare the two systems which influenced each other in the coastal Dutch area, dated at 450, 700, 1000, and 1250 (see Table 4). In the next subsections, the developments leading up to the four reference points will be discussed for the coastal variety and the inland variety separately.

Table 4. Reference points in the comparison between coastal and inland Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RP</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Coastal variety</th>
<th>Inland variety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>Anglo-Frisian</td>
<td>Proto-Franconian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>Early Proto-Frisian</td>
<td>Early Old Low Franconian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Late Proto-Frisian</td>
<td>Late Old Low Franconian, Late Old Flemish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Old West Frisian</td>
<td>Early Middle Dutch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.2.3 From Proto-Germanic to West Germanic

Anglo-Frisian and Franconian formed part of the Continental West Germanic dialect continuum which existed around 400 CE. This continuum had itself developed out of Proto-Germanic through a number of linguistic innovations. The nature of these innovations can be reconstructed by comparing West Germanic with (a) Gothic, which represents a Germanic dialect of people which had moved south at an early stage and thus escaped the innovations of North and West Germanic, and (b) North Germanic, the ancestor of the Scandinavian Germanic languages. Since North and West Germanic share a number of innovations which are absent from Gothic, many scholars assume an intermediate Northwest-Germanic stage, during which innovations could spread across the (later) border of North and West Germanic (Boutkan 1995, Nielsen 2000a). By 400, a number of West Germanic innovations can be distinguished which are absent from North Germanic (Nielsen 2000a: 241–7). At the same
time, West Germanic had already split into a number of separate dialects which did not all share the same innovations anymore. In the northern part of the continuum there was a group of innovatory dialects that we refer to as Anglo-Frisian. They can be defined as the forerunners of the later Frisian, Anglo-Saxon and (northern) Low Saxon dialects. Anglo-Frisian may be contrasted with the remaining West Germanic dialects spoken in the interior of the Low Countries and Germany, which adopted few to none of the Anglo-Frisian innovations; see Table 5.

Although there will usually be no need to retrace our steps to the Proto-Germanic level to explain the difference between inland and coastal Dutch phenomena, it will be useful to provide a survey of my views regarding the reconstruction of Proto-Germanic, as per Table 6. It should be noted that the reconstructed system differs in some respects from the mainstream reconstruction as presented, for instance, in Ringe 2006: 214–33. The following system largely builds on Kortlandt 1996 and 2007 and assumes the presence of glottalized consonants and the implications thereof; cf. also Kroonen 2013: xv–xli.

Table 5. Stages in the development of West Germanic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Latest common innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proto-Germanic</td>
<td>northern Germany / southern Scandinavia</td>
<td>0–200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Germanic</td>
<td>northern Germany, Denmark</td>
<td>200 CE?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Frisian</td>
<td>North Sea coast of Germany and the Low Countries</td>
<td>400 CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental West Germanic</td>
<td>Netherlands and Germany</td>
<td>400 CE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Proto-Germanic I assume a series of voiceless fricatives (*f etc.), voiceless lenis stops (*p) and preglottalized stops (*ʻp), which correspond to the traditional reconstructions *f, *b and *p (< PIE *p, *bʰ, *b), respectively. Apart from geminate *ss, which arose from Proto-Indo-European clusters of dental stops, geminate obstruents arose in Proto-Germanic from Kluge’s Law (*Cn > *CC in pretonic position, Kroonen 2011) and from analogical gemination of single fricatives within Germanic paradigms (see Kroonen 2011: 80–2). Geminate resonants arose through several different assimilations. I furthermore assume that the PIE voiced aspirates stops yielded plain voiced stops in Proto-Germanic (possibly with fricative allophones in intervocalic position at a relatively early date), unlike the majority opinion. The evidence for stop pronunciation is collected in Kortlandt 1988; Kluge’s Law provides comparative support (Kortlandt 1991, Kroonen 2011). It is here assumed that *ei had already developed into *i. PGM. *ia corresponds to the vowel traditionally termed “*e₂”, cf. Kroonen 2013: xxiii–iv and Kortlandt 2006. I do not regard the discussion concerning this vowel as settled but for our purposes it is not especially relevant.
### Consonants and vowels of Proto-Germanic

#### Consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Labialized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>f</em></td>
<td><em>ff</em></td>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td><em>pp</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td><em>pp</em></td>
<td><em>t</em></td>
<td><em>tt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td><em>pp</em></td>
<td><em>t</em></td>
<td><em>tt</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>s</em></td>
<td><em>ss</em></td>
<td><em>z</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>w</em></td>
<td><em>ww</em></td>
<td><em>j</em></td>
<td><em>jj</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>m</em></td>
<td><em>mm</em></td>
<td><em>n</em></td>
<td><em>nn</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>r</em></td>
<td><em>rr</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>l</em></td>
<td><em>ll</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Vowels:

- **short**: *i*, *e*, *u*, *a*
- **long**: *i̯*, *i̯e*, *u̯*, *o̯*
- **diphthong**: *eu*, *ai*, *au*, *ia*

### Consonant changes between Proto-Germanic and West Germanic

1. **Rhotacism of PGm. *z* and merger with original *r*.** Though the result is *r* in nearly all Germanic languages, there is some Runic evidence to the effect that, in the early Runic period, the *r* < *z* (written as ᚫ) was still a different phoneme from *r* < *r* (written as ᚷ), viz. a palatalized and/or voiceless *r* (Laker 2010: 79).

2. **Loss of *-z* after stressed short and long monosyllables in Anglo-Frisian, Low German and most of Dutch (Boutkan 1995: 43–51, van Loon 2014: 68–71), as opposed to its retention and development to *r* in High German and southeastern Dutch: ODu. *he* ‘he’, *gi* ‘you’, *mi* ‘me’ vs. High German *er*, *ihr*, *mir*. Possibly, *-z* > *-r* was originally retained in posttonic syllables. Alternatively, words may have had two variants depending on the status of a word as stressed or unstressed (note OFri. *-er* ‘he’ used as a cliticized pronoun). In historical times, the isoglosses between enclitic *(h)i* and *-er ‘he’, and between enclitic *-gi* and *-iur ‘you’, run roughly between Brabant and Limburg.

3. **Loss of *-z* in pretonic prefixes in Anglo-Frisian, Old Saxon and Dutch: ODu. MDu. *ā* ‘out’, *te* ‘apart’ (ODu. *ābulge* ‘wrath’, MDu. *amechte* ‘exhausted’, te-*brecan* ‘to crush’; van Loon 2014: 71–3) versus OHG *ar* < *uz-* , *zur* < *tuz-. In contrast, the stressed variant of *uz-* retained its *r* and yields MoDu. *oor*- as in *oorlog* ‘war’, *oorlof* ‘permission*. It has been suggested that the Old Dutch gloss
turnichal in the * Lex Salica * represents a prefixed noun *tuz-nih(w)al ‘destruction’, related to MDu. *tenielen ‘to destroy’. In that case, stressed *tuz- would originally have preserved -r in Dutch too, with te- later being generalized from unstressed position.

4. Velarization of *w to g between the high vowels i, u: OFri. *niugun, OS *nigun ‘nine’ < PGm. *newun, OE sugu, OS suga ‘sow’ < acc.sg. *suwun (Kroonen 2011). The change was still productive in Frisian when *v became w, e.g. in si(w)gun ‘seven’ < *sivun < *sebun, Sylt jügel, Helgolandic djigel, Wangerooge jügel ‘gable’ < *gevul < *gebla- (Boutkan 1998b: 80).

5. Loss of word-final *-t after long vowels (Boutkan 1995: 57–9, 385), e.g. in abl. sg. *-ôt > Goth. adverbial -o. After short vowels, the loss is uncertain, but if it was lost in that position, t-loss must be dated before apocope of word-final *-e.

6. J-gemination: *-Cj- > -CC- (with C ≠ *r) if the root was light (that is, if it contained a short vowel plus consonant; Simmler 1981). Among the labial and dental obstruents, there is no clear evidence for a palatalized character of the new geminates, though one may suppose that they were palatalized phonetically or even, with Liberman 2007, phonemically.

7. Vowel epenthesis in word-final resonants. After the loss of short *a in endings, word-final sequences of obstruent plus resonant arose, as in OE segl ‘sail’, botm ‘bottom’, OS apl ‘apple’. The individual languages (Boutkan 1995: 172f.) mostly inserted a (normally in Old Saxon and Old High German) or u, o (before -m in Old Saxon and early Old High German). The same vowel a is found in Old Dutch, e.g. accar ‘acre’, uagar ‘beautiful’, uogal ‘bird’; after the eleventh century, e prevails in unstressed syllables.

In early Old English poems, such as *Beowulf*, metrical evidence shows that postconsonantal resonants are almost never syllabic (Fulk 1992: 87). Nonetheless, several developments in Continental West Germanic are best explained on the basis of inner-paradigmatic alternations between vocalized and non-vocalized word-final resonants. To put it more cautiously, they suggest a different behaviour of *-CR# and *-CR-. Cases in point are the alternations which arose from the West Germanic gemination of stops before liquids, yielding, e.g., akker versus Aker- (see below), and the conditioned metathesis sl > ls. Vowel epenthesis also predated the voicing of intervocalic fricatives (see below).

8. Lenition (voicing) of word-initial lenis *p, *t, *k to b-, d-, g-, and of word-internal, prevocalic *-p-, *-pp-, *-t-, *-tt-, *-k-, *-kk- to -b- (later Dutch v), -bb-, -d-, -dd-, -g- (later Dutch γ) and -gg-: geven ‘to give’, bieden ‘to offer’, drinken ‘to drink’, graven ‘to dig’, liegen ‘to lie’ (Kortlandt 2007). The lenition did not reach all West Germanic dialects.

9. Gemination of WGm. *p, *t, *k before l and r, and of *k before w, in particular after short vowels (Simmler 1974). This is found in all West Germanic languages
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but has been generalized to different degrees. In some cases, languages retain traces of paradigmatic alternations, as in ODu. -akkar, MoDu. akker ‘acre’ versus the toponym Aker-sloot, Du. appel ‘apple’ but Apel-doorn, ODu. quiccafe/kwikka fé/ ‘livestock’ but MoDu. kwiek ‘brisk’. The existence of forms with and without gemination (Dutch appel vs. Apel-) points to alternating paradigms which combined both variants. This, in turn, suggests that vocalization of word-final resonants took place before gemination initiated.

10. Metathesis *sl > *ls in intervocalic position (de Vaan 2012a). This gave rise to alternating paradigms with stems in *-isla-: nom.acc. *-islaz/n > *-isal (or *-isl) with no occasion for metathesis, but intervocalic *-sl- > *-ls- in the other case forms. Metathesis to ls was regular throughout the ja- and n-stems. The metathesis is omnipresent in Old Frisian (which has the extended suffix *-islan-), but is never found in Old High German, which apparently generalized the unmetathesized sequence. Dutch takes up an intermediate position.

Vowel changes between Proto-Germanic and West Germanic


2. a-mutation: lowering of non-nasal *i > *e and *u > *o before *a, *ǣ, *ō in the next syllable, e.g. OE lof, OFri. lof, OS lof, OHG lob ‘praise’ < *luba-. Shared by North Germanic. There are important differences between the dialects in the application of a-mutation (Buccini 1995: 19–43; see § 15.1.3 in this book), and it is disputed whether a-mutation of *i took place at all. Van Loon 2014: 59–60 dismisses such a development, whereas Ringe & Taylor 2014: 34–5 give a more balanced view, arguing for a “modestly extensive lowering of *i to e in the southern part of the W[est] G[er]m[ani]c area, usually before labial and velar obstruents which were in turn followed by nonhigh vowels”: OE cwic, OS quik, OHG quèc ‘cattle’ from *kwikwa-.

3a. i-mutation of *e: raising of *e > *i in the next syllable, e.g. OHG deot vs. diutisk, ODu. werthan vs. wirthit. Shared by North Germanic.

3b. u-mutation of *e: In High German, *e is also raised to i before *u in the next syllable: OHG nimu ‘I take’, hilfu ‘I help’, filu ‘much’, sibun ‘7’, sichur ‘sure’. How far north this mutation reached and how regular it was, is unclear. In the Wachtendock Psalter, we find filo- ‘much’ in the glosses, and uil /vı(:)l/ is also found in thirteenth-century literary texts from the Cleves/Guelders area. In Old Saxon, raising before *u is also found, e.g. gibu ‘I give’, tebriku ‘I break up’, filu ‘much’, Hirutfeld toponym, though there is also a larger number of forms in which raising is absent, possibly for analogical reasons (Gallée 1993: 52–3).
Table 7. Consonants and vowels of West Germanic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*f</td>
<td>*ff</td>
<td>*p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*p/*b</td>
<td>*pp/*bb</td>
<td>*t/*d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*s</td>
<td>*ss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*w</td>
<td>*ww</td>
<td>*j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*mm</td>
<td>*n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stressed vowels:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Rise of *ea from e-infixation in verb stems in -a- and from lowering of *ia to *ea, e.g., in the reduplicated preterite of strong verbs of the 7th class, such as *e-auk ‘increased’, *e-ar ‘ploughed’, in the preterite *e-aj ‘went’, and in *hiaar > *hear ‘here’. Shared by North Germanic. For this hypothesis, see Kortlandt 1994, 2006.

5. Merger of word-final *-az and *-ã in -*a* (Nedoma 2014: 357–60). A few recent Runic finds with final <a> confirm that -*az* yielded -*a* in Proto-West-Germanic, especially the comb from Frienstedt in Thuringia with kaba/kamba/ ‘comb’ (*kamba-*) (ca. 250–300; Schmidt et al. 2011) and the Ichtratzheim spoon with lapela/lapela/ ‘spoon’ (*lapila-*) (6th c.; Fischer et al. 2014). The North German footstool carrying the inscription ksamella/skamella/ ‘footstool’ (*skamella-*), dated to 431 by dendrochronological analysis, may then be reconsidered as a real nominative form. The alternative, viz. that -*a* represents the accusative ending which was used for the nominative (Boutkan 1995), cannot be excluded, but it would not imply that these inscriptive forms functioned as accusatives in their context.
8.2.4 From West Germanic to Old West Frisian and Early Middle Dutch

RP I. Anglo-Frisian vs. Proto-Franconian (450 CE)

a. Anglo-Frisian changes

The migration of the Saxons and Angles to Britain separated their linguistic development from that of Frisian. It appears that, before this migration, the Anglo-Saxon dialects shared a number of common innovations with Frisian (some of which are also found spreading into Old Saxon and parts of Old Franconian). The following list of Anglo-Frisian changes is based mainly on Kortlandt 2008; see Table 8 for the resulting system.

1. Centralization of low vowels before nasals. This often yielded rounded vowels in stressed syllables, probably [å] and [ɔ:]. Examples with *a are OE land, lond ‘land’, OFri. man, mon ‘man’; examples with *æ are OE and OFri. mōna ‘moon’, OFri. kōmen ‘they came’, nōmen ‘they took’, ōne ‘without’, sōn ‘soon’, MoWF spoen, dial. spoan ‘chip, splinter’.

2. Loss of nasal consonants before f, ð, s, plus compensatory lengthening in stressed and unstressed syllables. The combination *an yields /o:/ before a fricative. Examples in stressed position: OE, OFri. tōþ, tōth ‘tooth’, gōs ‘goose’, fif ‘five’, ūs ‘us’. Examples in unstressed position: 3pl.pres. OFri. OS -ath, OE -að < *-ōþ < *-anþ. This development spread to some Saxon and Franconian dialects, e.g. in ‘five’ and ‘us’, maybe also in ‘goose’ (see § 12 and 13 on these words in Dutch).

3. Reduction of unstressed vowels. Shortening affects the long vowels in Old English and Old Saxon *ā > a, *ǣ > æ, *ō > o, *i > i, *ū > u, whereas reduction is reflected by qualitative change in unstressed vowels: *a > OS /œ/, OE /œ/ > /e/, and *o > OS /ɔ/, OE /ɔ/ > /a/.

4. Monophthongization of *ai to *ā, e.g. OE stān ‘stone’, ān ‘one’.

5. Retraction of WGm. *æ to ā before w and before g plus back vowel. Examples: OE sāwon ‘they saw’, lāgon ‘lay’, māgas ‘kinsmen’.

6. Fronting of *a to æ. This fronting was blocked: (a) by a following x; (b) a following l, r, x plus consonant; (c) in open syllables by a back vowel in the following syllable;35 (d) between w and rC; (e) in some unaccented words (Bremmer 2009: 29). Examples: fronting in OE dag ‘day’, fæt ‘vessel’, hwæt ‘what’, OFri. dei ‘day’; no fronting in OE dagas ‘days’, fatu ‘vessels’, OFri. nacht ‘night’, sāl ‘to slay’ (< *slaxan), falla ‘to fell’, hals ‘neck’, half ‘half’, flax ‘flax’, wax ‘wax’, a chan ‘eigh’; fara ‘to go’, draga (but also dregā) ‘carry’; makia ‘to make’ (< *-ōjan); swart ‘black’, warm ‘warm’, was ‘was’.

35. On this development see Versloot 2016, who argues that *æ was retracted before Runic Frisian *-r and *-r, and dates this change after the spread of the F. ő-stem ACC.SG. ending to the NOM.SG. in the 6th or 7th century.
Table 8. The Anglo-Frisian system around 450 AD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>ð</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>ww</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>rr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>ll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stressed vowels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*о</td>
<td>*о</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>*æ</td>
<td>*а</td>
<td>*а</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Palatalization of *k and *g before front vowels and *j, palatalization of *g also after front vowels. Palatalized *g merges with *j (except after n and in gemination: OFri. lendza ‘to lengthen’, MoE hinge). Front vowels at this stage are: *i, *e, *æ, *i, *æ, *e, *eо. Examples include OE céosan ‘choose’, giefan ‘give’, cinn ‘chin’, igil, il ‘hedgehog’, OFri. tsetel ‘kettle’; tziake < *kækōn ‘jaw’, tsiiс ‘cheese’ < *kæsi, dei ‘day’ < *dæg < *dag, jern ‘yarn’ (Bremmer 2009: 31). Although the details of the phonologization of the palatalized velars are different between Old English and Frisian, and also, in some aspects, between the different English dialects and between different branches of Frisian (e.g. Kümmel 2014: 251–7), Laker 2007 argues that the phonetic beginnings of the change must lie in the Anglo-Frisian stage.

8. Monophthongization of *ea to e. Examples: Northumbrian OE fēll, fēng, OFri. mēde ‘present’, fēng ‘caught’. This is found in Frisian and in Anglian, Northumbrian, and Mercian Old English, but not in West Saxon.


b. Continental West Germanic changes

1. Lowering of *æ > *a, dated before the denasalization of nasalized long vowels. The same lowering is also found in North Germanic, e.g. ON vápn ‘weapon’ (Got. pl. wepna), ON kvámu ‘they came’ (Got. gemun), ON ār ‘year’ (Got. jer). It is disputed whether this lowering took place in a common pre-stage of
North and West Germanic (which is the majority view, cf. Ringe 2006: 12–3), or independently in parts of both branches (Kortlandt 2006, 2008).

2. Reduction of unstressed long vowels and diphthongs in High German: *ai > *ē, *au > *ō; shortening of *-ō > -o, *-i > -i, *-ē > -e.

3. Establishment of voicing as a relevant feature of obstruents, hence the rise of /b/ for PGm. *p and, in most dialects, of /p/ for PGm. *’p.

See Table 9 for the resulting system of Proto-Franconian.

Table 9. The Proto-Franconian system around 450 CE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants:</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ww</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stressed vowels:</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*ī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*[o]</td>
<td>*ō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*ā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RP II. Early Proto-Frisian vs. Early Old Low Franconian (700 CE)

a. Early Proto-Frisian changes

1. Fronting of *ā to ā, as in OFri. bēn ‘bone’, hēl ‘whole’, skrēf ‘wrote’. This was blocked by a following *g and *x and by *u, *ō or *wV in the following syllable, for instance, in āch, (h)āgon ‘have’, āthom ‘brother-in-law’, tāna ‘toes’ (de Vaan 2011a).

2. *au > *ā, as in OFri. hāh ‘high’, bām ‘tree’, etc. If Runic Frisian skanomodu contains the etymon *skaun-, this can be dated to the sixth century at the latest (Quak 1990a: 361).

3. i-mutation of low and back vowels:

   *u > *ū, *ū > *ū
   *ō > *ō
   *a > *ā, *ā > *ē


It is clear that these metatheses, and especially the one before dentals, remained productive for quite some time. Van Loon (2003: 145) mentions a possible anchor in the relative chronology in the assimilation of the velars in *bregge, *brids ‘bridge’ ($*bruggjō$), *breke, *bretze ‘breach’ ($*bruki$) and *thretza ‘to push’ ($*þrukkjan$). Since these words do not show metathesis, the consonants were not yet assimilated when metathesis took place. Of course, we do not know at which point in time the palatalized consonants reached the dental place of articulation. The metathesis before $ch$ was previously dated very early because of the variant OFri. *thriuch of *thruch ‘through’ (which presupposed metathesis before $iu$-breaking) but Hoekstra 2000 has shown that *thriuch represents a late and insignificant variant.


8. WGm. $*iu > OFri. iu(ː)$ or *io(ː), $*eo > ia(ː)$. E.g., OFri. *triūwe ‘true’, *biuth (3s.pres.) ‘offers’, *diūpte ‘depth’, *diūre ‘expensive’, *biāda ‘to offer’, *diāp ‘deep’, *diār ‘animal’.


10. Merger of $/æ/ (< WGm. *a, *e, *ā) with /e/ in /e/. The merger can be dated after $i$-mutation and after $iu$-breaking (point 5).

11. Shortening of $*æ > *æ > a$ or e (Hoekstra & Tichelaar 2014: 188), and of $*ē > e$, before obstruent clusters (probably after the merger of $/æ$/ with /e/ for systematic reasons; also after syncope). It can be dated to before the colonization of the North Frisian islands (Versloot 2014b: 53). Examples include OFri. *lēda (*laidjan), pret. latte (*laididē) ‘to lead’, OFri. *stēta (*stautjan), ptc. *estat ‘to thrust’ (*stautj-$)$, etc.

12. Reduction of unstressed /a/ to $*[ə]$, which was written as u in Runic Frisian; this is the interpretation of -u by Nedoma 2014, who interprets the vowel as...
central-raised ("obermittelhohes") [ɔ], viz. in nom.sg. skanomodu (late 6th c.), weladu (ca. 600), aniwulufu (600–650), kabu ‘comb’ (8th c.), adugislu (ca. 700), habuku (ca. 800), acc.sg. kabu ‘comb’ (ca. 800), and medially in nom.sg. adugislu and gisuhldu (ca. 700).


The resulting system is illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10. Early Proto-Frisian system (700 CE), before the emigration of the North Frisians in the eighth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants:</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>þ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>ww</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>jj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>rr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>ll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels:</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*u</td>
<td>*iu(·)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*o</td>
<td>*ê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*æ</td>
<td>*a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Early Old Franconian changes

Contemporary evidence from before 700 is absent, except for a few names in Latin documents. The only texts which have been composed before that date are the Lex Salica and Pactus Legis Salicae. Even though the extant manuscripts of those texts date to the late eighth and the ninth centuries, we can use the vernacular glosses in the texts as indicative of the language of the Merovingian period (see Table 11). A few changes show up:

1. The metathesis of intervocalic *hl > *lp is shown by 1sg.pres. maltho ‘I say’ (Quak in ONW s.v. malthon).
2. WGm. nom.acc.sg. *-ewa had already yielded -eo, as shown by theo ‘servant, slave’ (Quak in ONW s.v. thio).
3. The endings *-az, *-an leave no certain traces in the Merovingian glosses, but the Runic evidence suggests that final unstressed /-a/ was still present in the fifth century. In Alemannic, at least, it was preserved until the sixth century (see above). By the end of the seventh century, it will have been lost in all of non-Frisian Continental West Germanic. Once final -a was lost, *u split into /u/ and /o/.

4. Monophthongization of *ai and *au before r, h, hw and w, viz. in Lex Salica chreo- ‘corpse’ < *hraiwa- (ONW s.v. rēo) and seola- ‘soul’ < *saiwalō- (ONW s.v. siela), and possibly also in the form horogauo, horogaut, if it represents an ACC.SG.M. *chorogan = hōrogan ‘serf’ from WGM. *xaurigan- (MoDu. horige, see Quak in OWN s.v. *hōrigo). We can posit the changes *ai > *ae > */ɛ:/ and *au > *ao > */ɔ:/. The monophthongal stage was reached in Franconian around 700 (Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 § 43) judging by the evidence of personal names.

   It may be useful to add the clearest evidence in the Lex Salica for the absence of certain phonological changes which are well known from the later stages of Old Dutch, but which must apparently be dated after 600:

5. The fricative *x is well represented by the spelling <ch>, as in changisto ‘stallion’ (see Quak in OWN s.v. hengist). Whether it was indeed still pronounced as [x] by the sixth-century Franks, or was lenited to [h] but written as <ch> by the later scribes, remains uncertain.

6. There is as yet no r-metathesis before dentals, e.g. in bructe for *brustV ‘breast’ (see Quak in OWN s.v. *idisbrust).

7. The gloss ortfoca ‘tame bird’ (see Quak in OWN s.v. *ortfogal) might hide a sixth-century form *ort-fokl, with vocalic -l preserved in word-final position. Alternatively, it could be interpreted as a form preserving the NOM. ACC. SG. ending -a found in a few West Germanic Runic inscriptions, such as lapela ‘spoon’. It seems less likely that -focla was a spelling error for *-focal by the Carolingian copyists of the Lex Salica.

8. The form turnichal, tornechallis, plausibly from *tuz-nixwal ‘digging up a body’ (Quak in OWN s.v. *turnialin), shows that the prefix *tuz- still retained the u-vowel, as well as the final -r < *-z.

9. There is no explicit evidence for i-mutation of short *a to *ä = /e/ (so-called primary i-mutation). All probable instances of words with a sequence liable to i-mutation of *a show <a> (Quak 2008a). Very clear examples are chaltia ‘sow, pig’ (OHG gelza ‘piglet’, MDu. gelte ‘sterile pig’; see Quak in OWN s.v. *dregigelta, *fokkigelta, *nerigelta, *rennigelta, *swēnigelta) and changisto ‘stallion’ (MoDu. hengst).

10. There also seems to be no i-mutation of *eu. At least, the frequent words leode ‘weregeld’ (< *leudi-, cf. Quak in OWN s.v. liut) and leodinia ‘fine for killing a woman’ (Quak in OWN s.v. *liudinna) are never spelled with
The diphthongs *ai and *au had probably remained as such, except before r, h(w) and w. Evidence for *ai includes *and-haimi 'abduction' (Quak in ONW s.v. *anthēmi), geisofredo 'wound between the ribs' (*gaisa-, cf. Quak, ONW s.v. *gēsofrit), and cham- 'home' (Quak in ONW s.v. *hēm I); evidence for *au includes ortobaum, orthobano 'fruit tree' (Quak in ONW s.v. *ort-bōm). In reipus and andreipus 'rope (money)' (cf. Quak in ONW s.v. rēp), the original diphthong *ai is preserved as <ei>, though in some passages, all manuscripts agree on <e>: rephus, rephuouano. The same spelling is found in chrenecruda 'loose earth(?)' if this contains *hraini- 'pure', as proposed by Quak, in ONW s.v. *rēnkrūda. The conditioned split of *au into /au/ and /ɔ:/, and of *ai into /ei/ and /ɛ:/ in the central Dutch dialects, is dated between 700 and 800 by van Loon (2014: 118–24).

Pretonic ga- is still <ga-> if the sequence gas ferit in Pactus Legis Salica, ms. A2, represents *ga-ferrit 'removed' (see Quak, ONW s.v. *giferrit). There are several other glosses in <cha-> which are interpreted as having initial ga-.

There was no diphthongization of *ō, or, in any case, it is not reflected in spellings: <o> in atomeo 'I set free' (< uz-tōmjan- to PGm. *tōma- 'empty, free'; cf. Quak in ONW s.v. *ātōmen). There is conflicting evidence for two more changes:

The spelling of ‘five’ in the glosses is intriguing: we find fit mihachunna, vueth chunna and fitme chunna 'five hundred' (see Quak in ONW s.v. fīf ‘five’). The variants fit miha- and fitme might represent *fimf, whereas vueth could go back to *uīufth representing /fiː/.

WGm. *ē is reflected as <e, i> in ledo, lito ‘half-free’ (OHG lāz, OFri. lēt; see Quak in ONW s.v. lāt), where we must allow for influence of the Latin correspondence laetus. The more certain cases have <a>, as in Lex Salica chhratis ‘honeycomb’ (OHG rāza, Du. raat < PGm. *xrēto- ‘honeycomb’), cf. Quak in ONW s.v. rāta.

Finally, for the sake of completeness I mention:

The High German consonant shift: the shift of West Germanic voiceless (preglottalized) stops to voiceless affricates and geminated fricatives, e.g., OHG offan ‘open’, skif ‘ship’, ezzan ‘to eat’, hwaz ‘what’, mahhon ‘to make’, ih ‘I’ as opposed to OS opan, skip, etan, hwat, makon, ik (see Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 § 83–90 for more details). In the traditional formulation, the High German consonant shift also involves the devoicing of voiced stops in Upper German, as in Old Bavarian tohter ‘daughter’, kepan ‘to
give’ for dohter, geban in Old Middle Franconian; in our alternative view of West Germanic, these voiceless stops rather represent an archaism (see I, b, 3 above). Since the High German consonant shift defines the difference between Low and Middle Franconian, it is by definition absent from Low Franconian. Of the modern territories of the Netherlands and Belgium, only the southeastern corner has the shift of *k to /x/ in ich ‘I’, mich ‘me’, dich ‘you’ and ouch ‘also’. Only a few Limburgian towns west of Aachen are affected by the Middle Franconian consonant shift in its entirety. Lexical diffusion has brought about the spread of some words with shifted consonantism into other Limburgian dialects, cf. Goossens 1968.

Table 11. The Early Old Franconian system around 700 CE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants:</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>þ</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td>ll</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stressed vowels:</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*ō</td>
<td>*ea *eo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*ā</td>
<td>*ai *au</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RP III. Late Proto-Frisian vs. Late Old Low Franconian (1000 CE)

a. Late Proto-Frisian changes

For Late Proto-Frisian, we are first of all interested in the western dialects which would have been spoken along the Dutch coast. Some information can be gleaned from onomastic evidence (Gysseling 1960b, 1962, Quak 2003, 2012a, 2012b: 64–9), but most of the features which show that a name was of Frisian stock (Bremmer 2008: 287–8) arose in the period before 700, and hence cannot be used to define the period up to 1000. The Continental Late-Proto-Frisian system is given in Table 12.
1. Unrounding of front rounded vowels. According to Versloot (2001b: 768), we must reckon with two dialect groups at the time of unrounding, viz. Continental Frisian (whence Westerlauwers Frisian, Ems Frisian and Continental North Frisian arose) and Insular North Frisian. In the former group, unrounding of short and long *ü yields a mid vowel <e>, whereas in Insular North Frisian, we must posit the resulting high vowels *i and *į. The separate unroundings can be dated to the eighth century, not very long after the separation of what became Insular North Frisian (Gysseling 1962: 19, Buccini 1995: 41).

*u > *ü > ContF *e (merging with /e/ and *ä), InsNF *i
*ū > *ũ > ContF *ê (merging with *ê from WGm. *ea and *ǣ), InsNF *į
*ō > *ū > *ē (not always merging with /ē/ from other sources)

2. Allophonic voicing of intervocalic *f, *þ, *s (e.g., OFri. fethere ‘feather’, CNFri. fääder, fäär, MoWFri. fear). In addition, voicing of word-initial *þ- in frequent (unstressed?) function words, such as OEFri. thanne > danné, OWFri. thanne > danné ‘then’ (Bremmer 2009: 50).

3. Lenition of intervocalic *b to *v, e.g. -liva, -leva ‘to live’, liāf ‘dead’, drīva ‘to impel’.

4. Reduction of the unstressed vowel system to a triangular system with /i~e/, /u~o/ (the high vowels appear after a light stem or after a high vowel in the stem, the mid vowels elsewhere), and /a/ (Nielsen 2000a: 80–1).

Table 12. The Continental Late Proto-Frisian system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants:</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>tt</td>
<td>cc</td>
<td>kk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f/v</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>h/ð</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>j/j</td>
<td>j/j</td>
<td>xx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/j/</td>
<td>/j/</td>
<td>/j/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s/z</td>
<td>ss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ww</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>rr</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ll</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels:</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*i</td>
<td>*iu(·)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>*e</td>
<td>*ē</td>
<td>*ej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>*a</td>
<td>*æ</td>
<td>*ā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ū > *ũ > ContF *ê (merging with *ê from WGm. *ea and *ǣ), InsNF *į
*ō > *ū > *ē (not always merging with /ē/ from other sources)
b. **Old Franconian changes**

A number of Old Low Franconian texts can be dated to the period between 700 and 1000, either because their original was penned down in that period (the baptismal formulas), or because they were presumably composed in that period, even though the surviving manuscripts date from later centuries (as in the case of the Wachtendonck Psalter). Furthermore, we have personal names from places such as Ghent and Xanten, and toponyms in Latin documents originating from or describing several regions of the Low Countries. The Old Franconian system of ca. 1000 is given in Table 13. Some of the main changes observed are:

1. **Lenition of intervocalic *x*(w) to ODu. /h/,** which is subsequently lost between vowels: ODu. *jehan* ‘to say’, MDu. *giën*. Compare also ODu. *beuellen* ‘to command’, MoDu. *bevelen* (OS *bifelhan*, PGM. *felxanan*). It seems likely, however, that word-final -x was retained longer, as it survives into Middle and Modern Dutch as <-ch>, <-g> in a number of words, especially after vowels. The modern language usually spells <g> here, e.g. Dutch *hoog* ‘high’ (*xauxa-), *zag* pret. ‘saw’ (*saxw*), *sloeg* ‘slew’ (*slōx*), *ruig* ‘rough’ (*räxa-).*^36^  

2. **Loss of initial h-** (Quak 2000). Before liquids, n and w, h is generally dropped in all of Dutch. Only some of the earliest toponyms retain h before liquids, in words attested in (copies of) sources from the eighth, ninth and tenth centuries, as do two glosses (*hlothu*, *hrot*). Among the scarce written traces of the fricative are the toponyms *Hrineshem* in Guelders (855 copy 10th c.), and *Hlithum* next to *Lidum* in North Holland (10th c.). The modern language has several homonyms due to the merger of *xR-* and R-: MoDu. *lid* ‘body part’ < *lípu-* vs. *oog-lid* ‘eye-lid’ < *xlida-*, MoDu. *rijm* ‘hoar-frost’ < *xrīma-* vs. *rijm* ‘rhyme’ from French *rime*, MoDu. *verwelken* ‘to wither’ to *welka-* ‘humid’ vs. *welk* ‘which’ < *x”alika-*. Before a vowel, h-loss is attested in Flanders from the eleventh century onwards, as is the hypercorrect addition of h- to vowel-initial words.

3. **xs > ss**. The assimilation of xs to ss is typical of Dutch and Low German. It probably happened in the west of this continuum first. In the southeastern Dutch Wachtendonck Psalter of ca. 1000, we find *uusso* ‘foxes’ (GEN.PL.) beside *uuahson* ‘to grow’, *uuihsil* ‘change’, *ohsson* ‘oxen’. The earlier date of

---

^36^ The main exception with <-ch> is MoDu. *toch, doch* ‘yet, however’ < *þaux*. A spelling doublet has led to semantic differentiation in the particles *nog* ‘still, yet’ versus *noch* ‘nor’, both from PGM. *nux*. After r, the velar fricative is preserved in the MDu. hapax *dworch* ‘transverse’ (Gouda, ca. 1340; cf. Verdam 1919: 245–6), cf. OS *thwerh*, as opposed to the assimilation in MDu. *dwerree* ‘cross-ditch’ (*dwerch* plus reye ‘ditch’), and dialectally also in MDu. *dorch*, MoDu. *durg* ‘through’, StDu. *door.*
the change in western dialects is shown by that fact that in Ghent, there is no trace left of *x before s by the eleventh century (Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 589). By 1200, ss has become general in Dutch.

4. Voicing of the word-initial and word-internal fricatives *f, *θ, *s to [v], [ð], [z]: Du. vader ‘father’ < *fader, over ‘over’ < *ufar, zee ‘sea’ < *saiwa-, lezen ‘to read’ < *lisan, dat ‘that’ < *pat, broeder < *brōþar. Voicing can be dated to the tenth or eleventh century on the basis of written evidence, such as Old Ghent personal names (Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 580f.), though it may have been present earlier in pronunciation. The voicing must post-date the lenition of intervocalic *x. In spelling, voiceless f-, s-, and th- are retained in anlaut until Late Old Dutch, which may be due to the fact that voiceless allophones managed to survive word-initially in word sandhi, viz. after a preceding voiceless obstruent (van Loon 2014: 193).

5. Lenition of intervocalic -b- to -v- (MDu. gheven ‘give’) and of word-initial and word-internal -g- to -γ- (MDu. goed ‘good’, ooghe ‘eye’). The new /v/ merged with Early Old Franconian intervocalic *f. In Flemish, the fricative character of /g/ is indirectly attested from the eleventh century by the spelling <ch> for a voiceless fricative in auslaut: Isburch ‘Is-burg’, Thietwich ‘Thiet-Wig’ (Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 587).

Old Franconian *g, both as a stop and as a fricative, must have had a palatal allophone next to i, e, and a velar allophone before a, o, u. The existence of the palatal allophone is proven for Dutch by the merger of /γ/- and /j/- before front vowels, as in geden ‘to weed’ < *jetan, gij ‘you’ < *jiz, gest, gist ‘yeast’ < *jesta- (see § 9.4). Also, before dental consonants, WGm. *eg and *ag merged with ODu. ei ( < WGm. *ai), whereas *ig merged with ODu. i. This palatalization can roughly be dated to the tenth century: ei arose after 833 in southwestern Old Saxon (Tiefenbach 1984, 2002: 296), and is attested after ca. 950 in personal names from Ghent (e.g. Eilbertus, Theinardus).

6. Word-final devoicing. The devoicing must post-date the loss of postvocalic *-z and the split from Anglo-Frisian. If one regards the West Germanic obstruent system as originally consisting of voiceless phonemes only (see above), then the word-final voiceless obstruents can also be interpreted as archaisms which escaped word-internal voicing.

7. Devoicing of fricatives in syllable coda before resonants. A number of lexemes with intervocalic voiced fricatives in Dutch (Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 55) and Low German (Lasch 1914: 131f.) have allomorphs with a voiceless fricative before l, m and n. A similar devoicing of b (v) to f is found in Old High German, but on a smaller scale (Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 § 139 Anm. 5). In Dutch, the change involves the fricative pairs s/z, *θ/*θθ, f/v, and g/ch, compare MoDu. bezem/bessem ‘broom’ < *besman, adem/
asem ‘breath’ < *æbma-, gavel/gaffel ‘fork’ < *gablō-, even/effen ‘even’ < *ebna-, logenstreffen ‘to belie’ < *luginō- but loochen ‘to deny’ < *laugnjan. Devoicing of v, z, g was productive before derivational suffixes in l or n in Late Old and Early Middle Dutch: lieflijk ‘lovely’ to the stem lief, lieve- ‘dear’, schuifelen ‘to shuffle’ to schuiven ‘to shove’, begrafenis ‘burial’ to begraven ‘to bury’ (de Vaan 2014a).

8. Raising of the first element of the diphthongs *ai and *au to mid vowels, yielding ei and ou in the course of the ninth century (van Loon 2014: 118–22).

9. Monophthongization of *iu to /y:/ Van Loon (2014: 125) dates this change to around 900 for inland Dutch. The new vowel merges with the result of secondary i-mutation of *ū.

10. Secondary i-mutation of low and back vowels (Goossens 1981, 1989):


The loss of postconsonantal *j as well as the reduction of unstressed vowels to schwa led to phonologization of the i-mutated vowels (Quak 1990b). Of these, *ŷ merged with the product of earlier *iu whereas *ā merged with earlier *e in part of the dialects. The vowels *ū, *o, *ē, *ã and the diphthong *öiū were new to the system.

11. Reduction of *eo via *io (attested as <io> in spelling) to /iə/, spelled as <ie>. This diphthong merges with the result /iə/, spelled <ie>, of *ea. In dialects, MDu. /iə/ in hiatus and word-finally often merged with /iː/, which explains a number of words in ij of the standard language: bij ‘bee’ (MDu. bie, OHG bia < *bi(j) ō-), dij ‘thigh’ (ODu. thio, MDu. die, OE þēoh < WGm. *þeuxa-), lij ‘lee(side)’ (MDu. lie, OS hleo, OFr. hli < *xlewa-; cognate with MoDu. luw ‘protected’ < *xlewja-), betijen ‘to move on’ (MDu. tien, OHG ziohan < *teuxan-).

12. Diphthongization of *ō to *uo <uo> in Brabant and southern Guelders, which may by the eleventh century have become /uə/, at least in part of the southern and eastern dialects of the Low Countries. Possibly, the diphthongization responded to systemic pressure caused by the earlier rise of /ɔ:/ and /ɛ:/ from *au and *ai, and by the presence of the other opening diphthongs *ea, *eo which became ia, io.

In Middle and Modern Dutch there are several areas which preserve a mid monophthong /o(:)/, such as East Limburg and parts of the northeast. In addition, some relic forms with /oː/ are found in western dialects. The same geographic dichotomy holds between central dialects in which *io and *ea became /iə/ > /iː/, spelled ie, and peripheral dialects in which
/e:/ was retained; *ō. This situation has been explained in two different ways (see van Loon 2014: 155). One solution is to argue that in Flanders, Holland, Utrecht, the northeastern dialects, and East Limburg, *ō did not diphthongize to /uo/, or not as early as in Brabant. Alternatively, the eastern dialects did diphthongize *ō to an opening diphthong such as /ōa/, but then monophthongized it to /ō/.

13. Loss of w between a consonant and stressed *uo; that is, -Cwuo- > -Cuo-. This change is found in OHG huosto ‘coughing’ < *hwuosto < *hwōstō, and in suozi from earlier suwozi ‘sweet’ (Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 § 107), but not in Old Saxon or Old English, where ĕ remained a monophthong (OS swōti, OE hwōsan ‘to cough’). In Frisian, OFri. sōn(e) ‘appeasement’ and sēna ‘to appease’ have no w anymore, and a preform *hōsta- ‘cough’ is suggested by WFri. hoast, InsNFri. hoost ‘a cough’. In Dutch, variants without and with w can be found for a number of words, e.g., for zwoel, zoel ‘hot, humid’ (*swōla-; both variants occur in the standard language), zoenen ‘to appease; kiss’ (*swōnjan-), zoet ‘sweet’, hoesten ‘to cough’, hoe ‘how’ (*hwō).

14. Loss of postconsonantal j. Quak 2004 dates the loss of j in Old Dutch to the (early) ninth century, based in particular on names from Ghent.

Table 13. The Old Franconian system ca. 1000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants:</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>tt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>þ</td>
<td>þþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>v</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>ss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ww</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>ji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>nn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>rr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
<td>ll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stressed vowels:</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**RP IV. Old West Frisian vs. Early Middle Dutch (ca. 1250 CE)**

a. **Early Old Frisian changes** (Siebs 1901, Hoekstra 2001, Quak 2003, 2012b):

1. *r*-metathesis in *r* plus short vowel before dentals, from *-rV-* to *-Vr-*, as in OFri. *ferst, first* ‘period’, *fersk* ‘fresh’. It is dated to the eleventh century by van Loon (2003: 151), cf. the toponym *Burnuurð* (11th c., Werden), which contains *brunna(n)*.-

2. Raising of *e > i* before *rC* and *lC*, as in the toponym *Berghem* (1st half 11th c.) > *Birghem* (end 11th c., Groningen).

3. The diphthongs /iu/, /iu:/ and /ia:/ develop consonantal /j/, as shown by subsequent developments. They can henceforth be interpreted as biphonemic sequences of /j/ plus *u, *ū, *ā*.

4. The occasional absorption of *j* in *ja, ju* after liquids: OFri. *biast > brast* ‘breast’, *flucht/flucht* ‘he flees’ (Bremmer 2009: 42–3). This can be dated after the eleventh century, cf. unchanged *ia* in *Ottarfliaton, Oterflletun* (10th and 11th c., Werden), *Marsflita* (10th–11th c., Werden), *Hriadi* (10th c.), *Hriade* (11th–12th c.). Note also the absence of metathesis in Old East Frisian *biast, brast*, which means that the rise of *brast* post-dates *r*-metathesis.

5. Loss of *w* between two *i’s*: OFri. *ni* ‘new’ < *niwja-, knī, OWFri. *knē* ‘knee’ < *kniwa-*.

6. The palatal stops probably remain for a long time. The change from palatal stops or affricates to dental affricates can be dated after *r*-metathesis before dentals in the eleventh century (see nr. 1 above), as shown by OFri. *brits* ‘bridge’ < *bruggjō, bretze* ‘breach’ < *bruki, thretza* ‘press’ < *prukkjan* (van Loon 2003: 145).

### Table 14. The Early Old West Frisian system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants:</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>pp</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ts</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>ff</td>
<td>ň</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>bb</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dz</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>ww</td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td>jj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>mm</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>mn</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>rr</td>
<td></td>
<td>ll</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. (continued)

Vowels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>ε</td>
<td>ɔ</td>
<td>έ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ɛ</td>
<td>ɣ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This yields the Early Old West Frisian system of Table 14, before the workings of open syllable lengthening (Hoekstra 2001: 722, Versloot 2001b), and immediately before the raising and fronting of /ā/ which happened in Old West Frisian. The latter was not shared by the dialects of Hindeloopen and Schiermonnikoog, nor, probably, by the dialects spoken in North Holland (de Vaan 2011a: 311).

b. Late Old Dutch and Early Middle Dutch changes

The developments of this period are more diversified as regards their dialectal spread. The following changes can be seen in all dialects:


2. In the early twelfth century, *þþ regularly yields voiceless ss, which was spelled <s> after long vowels and <ss> after short ones (de Vaan 2014a). It merges with geminate /s:/ from WGm. *ss and *xs. The evidence includes bessen ‘to dab a wound’ (< *baþjan), smisse ‘smithy’ (*smiþjo-), and klis ‘tangle, burdock’ (*kliþþan-). The rise of a sibilant reflex may be due to the voicing and occlusion of single *þ to d, after which *þþ remained isolated as a dental fricative.

   In the sequence *þm, *þ remained voiceless and merged with /s(:)/ in Late Old Dutch. Paradigmatic alternations explain the existence of variants with dem versus sm: central and eastern adem versus western Dutch asem ‘breath’ (nom.acc.*âpam, obl. *âpm-), Dutch vadem ‘fathom’ (< *fâma-) versus vessem ‘to fathom’ (< *fâmjan-); for details, see de Vaan 2014a.

3. Syncope of short vowels in open, word-internal syllable. This takes place at various times between the common West Germanic period and Modern Dutch. Of the different processes described below, the first two date from a period when unstressed vowels still had distinct qualities, whereas the third and fourth took place after the reduction of unstressed (short) vowels to schwa. Large-scale syncope of schwa takes off somewhere during the twelfth century, but the exact chronology, speed and conditions depended on the total number of syllables per word, on its rhythmic structure, on its morphology, and on the dialect. Furthermore, intra- and extraparadigmatic
analogy played a major role in stimulating syncope or, conversely, restoring the elided vowel. Whether the phonetics of the intervening consonants also mattered, is unknown. The issue has not been researched exhaustively.

3.1 There was an early syncope of short vowels after a heavy syllable and after disyllabic first members already in West Germanic compound nouns, as shown by names such as OHG Adalberth (*a̞ala-berxta-), Eburnand (*ebura-nan̂pa-), Mahthild (*maxti-hil̃pi-), etc.; OHG kuon-keit ‘bravery’ (*köni-hai̞ipi-), miltherzi ‘merciful’ (*meldja-hert̃ja-). If the first syllable was light, the second vowel was usually retained: OHG kuonheit (*kōni-hai̞i), miltherzi (*meldja-hert̃i). There is variation in names with a heavy first member: Ruodigēr beside Ruodgēr, Karleman beside Karlman, etc. (Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 § 62 Anm.4).

3.2 Syncope of internal vowels in simplexes only regularly affects the suffix vowel *i of the weak preterite in Old High German after a heavy syllable: hōrta ‘heard’ (*haurida) but nerita ‘saved’ (*narida). Here it is possible that syncope took place on the model of verbs which lacked a suffix vowel all along, such as *sōxta ‘sought’ and *āxta ‘thought’ (Ringe 2006: 252; pace van Loon 2014: 85).

3.3 In Early Middle Dutch trisyllabic words of the structure CVCeCe(C), in which V2 is a full vowel, that is, before a secondarily stressed suffix such as -kijn (diminutives), in original compounds, such as in -dom, -schap, and in synchronic compounds of all kinds, syncope of schwa probably regularly applied. Of course, a polysyllabic stem could be restored on many occasions. For instance, beside ODu. haribergi (loc., ca. 1000), later hereberga (ca. 1100), Early Middle Dutch usually has herberghe ‘inn’, but hereberghe is also sporadically found. Similarly Early MDu. bodescap becomes boedscap ‘errand, message’. Note that the second syllable of here- was apparently syncopated before open syllable lengthening took place, as we have no evidence for *heerberghe, whereas the reverse chronology holds for boodschap. In the latter case, one might invoke analogy with the simplex bode ‘messenger’ which acquired a lengthened vowel throughout.

3.4 In Late Old Dutch words of the structure CVCeCe(C), with e representing schwa, either the second or the third syllable could be syncopated. Most likely, syncope of the first schwa was the norm, whereas retention of the first schwa and syncope of the second one could result from analogical restoration of the first schwa if it belonged to
the stem (van Loon 2014: 182–3). In the thirteenth century, syncope can be observed, among other forms, in:

- isolated nouns such as ODu. *bilithe ‘image’ > *bilet > Early MDu. *beelde (Fle.), *belde (Brab.), *bilde (Lim.) > MoDu. *beeld;
- comparatives in -ere and superlatives in -est: scoonre ‘more beautiful’, coenste ‘most valiant’ (MoDu. -er and -st);
- feminine abstract nouns in *-ipō > MDu. -ede > -de/-te: MDu. lievede > MoDu. liefde, MDu. samede > scaemte = MoDu. schaamte ‘shame’;
- adjectives in -isch > -sch > MoDu. -s: MDu. juedesche > Joodsche > Joods ‘Jewish’;
- the weak preterite: Early MDu. makede > maecte, MoDu. maakte ‘made’;
- words ending in Early MDu. -eRe(C): lettere > lettre ‘letter’ (next to apocopated letter as in Standard Dutch), segele(n) > sgele(n), in oblique cases of segel ‘seal’, MoDu. zegel (syncope particularly in western Early Middle Dutch); brodre gen.pl. of broeder ‘brother’; etc.

In disyllabic words of the structure CVCeC, unstressed e can be apocopated especially if the syllable -eC was not a recognizable morpheme. Thus ODu. *mānoth ‘month’ > *māneth > Early MDu. *maent, dat.pl. maenden, MoDu. maand; ODu. thienest > MDu. dienst ‘service’; ODu. *twālif > Early MDu. twelife, twelve > MoDu. twaalf ‘twelve’; ODu. hovid > Early MDu. hovet, hoeft > MoDu. hoofd; ODu. nachot > Early MDu. *naket > naect > MoDu. naakt ‘naked’; ODu. *sagit > Early MDu. seghet ‘says’ but seidi ‘says he’ < *seget-hī.

Yet the alternation found in some of these words (seghet but seidi, *naket singular but *naeecte plural) shows that we are really dealing with syncope in trisyllabic forms: *nākede > nākte, segedi > *segdi > seidi. In some paradigms, the loss of the second syllable was generalized to the disyllabic members of the paradigm. This is confirmed by the existence of words which retain posttonic schwa both in the disyllabic forms and in trisyllabic ones: ODu. havek > MDu. havek ‘hawk’, gen. haveks, acc.pl. haveke. The medial syllable of haveke must be due to analogical restoration.

3.5 Variation in the number of syllables and in the syllable boundaries led to differences in the application of word-internal syncope within paradigms, and hence to paradigmatic alternation (Marynissen 1995, van Loon 1996 passim). For instance, the word kegel ‘cone, skittle’ has a genitive kegeles which could undergo syncope to *kegles, which ultimately led to keiles. Both variants were lexified in Dutch as different
words, kegel ‘cone’ and keilen ‘to fling’. Since word-final -e was subject to apocope around 1300, with the exact chronology differing per region, the order of apocope and syncope determined the outcome. For instance, a dative segele of segel ‘seal, stamp’ could be syncopated to segle (which apparently happened more often in western dialects, see Marynissen 1995: 100), it could be apocopated to seghel, or it could remain trisyllabic as seghele.

4. Metathesis of rV to Vr before the dental consonants t, d, s, n if V was a short vowel. Examples are MDu. sport (G. Sprosse) ‘rung’, berd (Brett) ‘board’, vorsch (Frosch) ‘frog’, borst (Brust) ‘breast’, ors (Ross) ‘horse’, borne (Brunnen) ‘well, bourne’. Goossens 1998 shows that the number of lexemes affected by this particular r-metathesis in modern dialects decreases as one goes from west (Flanders) via Brabant and Limburg to east (Ripuarian, Moselle Franconian). Also, whereas the metathesis is restricted to original rV in closed syllables in most dialects, Flemish has a few cases of metathesis in open syllables: terden ‘to tread’, verde ‘peace’ (Du. vrede). Such forms show that the metathesis predates open syllable lengthening. Van Loon (2003) dates the metathesis between 1050 and 1150, the oldest attestation possibly being the toponym Firsnere (West Flanders) for earlier Fresnere, now ‘Varsenare’.

Whereas Old Dutch short vowels before r plus a voiced dental are nearly always lengthened in Middle and Modern Dutch, e.g., MDu. eerde ‘earth’, doern ‘thorn’ (van Loon 2014: 225–7, de Vaan 2011b), the vowels of metathesized sequences usually remain short (see the examples above). One could postulate that phonetic lengthening of *VrD had taken place before 1050 and thus predated the rise of metathesized sequences. Alternatively, with van Loon (2014: 227), one might assume that r-metathesis was followed by lowering or centralization of the vowels in question, which created new sequences of the type VrD which acted as a push factor for the lengthening of the vowel in the old VrD-sequences.

5. Metathesis of Vr to rV before xt. In Old Dutch, this metathesis is absent from the available evidence, with the exception of toponyms containing personal names in -berht < *Berxta- in the twelfth century, e.g. UUoubrechtengem (1122) < *Waldberxinga-haim. In Early Middle Dutch, the metathesis is present in most dialects except Limburgian: MDu. vrucht ‘fear’, vruchten ‘to fear’ (< *furxti-), (-)wracht ‘made’ (pret. and ptc. to werken), and personal names in brecht beside bert.

6. ft > xt. Standard Dutch shares with Low and Middle German the change of ft to /xt/. Whereas cht first appears in Middle Franconian in the eighth century and in Old Saxon in the tenth, the first certain attestations in Dutch
date from the twelfth century: Lichtervelde < \textit{*luftar-feld-} (1127), \textit{achttinghe} ‘confiscation’ < \textit{*haft-} (Ghent, 1176–1200). This geographic distribution suggests that \textit{xt} spread from central Germany to the north and reached Dutch relatively late. Holland preserved \textit{ft} in the thirteenth century, and traditional dialects of Holland in the twentieth century still did so.

7. Vocalization of *\textit{al}, *\textit{ol} and *\textit{ul} to \textit{ou} before \textit{t} and \textit{d}. The vocalization is preceded by the three vowels merging in \textit{o}, which can be dated to the tenth century in Flanders. The \textit{l-}vocalization itself is attested after 1050 in Flanders, and after 1100 in Holland (Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 72). A number of southeastern dialects preserve \textit{l}, whereas some others have vocalized \textit{l} but preserve distinct reflexes of *\textit{al} and *\textit{ol}. The northeastern dialects of Dutch have not proceeded beyond the merger in \textit{ol}; see the map in Goossens 2008: 93. Spiradically, \textit{l} is palatalized to \textit{j}, e.g. Early MDu. \textit{(Ar)noid} ‘Arnout’ in Zealand, and once \textit{gewoyt} for \textit{ghewout} ‘power’. The vowel /\textit{i}:/ in the next syllable is the likely cause of the vocalization of *\textit{ol} to \textit{oi} in the Middle Dutch names \textit{Boydin}, \textit{Boidi(j)n} as opposed to \textit{Bouden} ‘Baldwin’ and \textit{Woytin} versus \textit{Walter}; see Mooijaart 1992: 154.

8. Fronting of ODu. /\textit{u}/ to /\textit{y}/, MoDu. <\textit{uu}>, in Flanders in the twelfth century, and, before the end of the thirteenth century, also in West Brabant and Holland (see § 16.1). The fronting may have been caused by the rise of the diphthong /\textit{uo}/ > /\textit{uə}/, according to van Loon (2014: 217–8). The new front rounded vowel merged with /\textit{y}/: from *\textit{iu} in Brabant, but represented a new phoneme /\textit{y}/: in coastal Dutch.

9. Lowering of ODu. tense and short /\textit{i}/, /\textit{y}/, /\textit{u}/ in western and central Dutch to the Early Middle Dutch lax vowels /\textit{ɪ}/, /\textit{ʌ}/, /\textit{ʊ}/, compare MoDu. \textit{vis}, \textit{put}, \textit{vos} with MoHG \textit{Fisch}, \textit{Pfütze}, \textit{Fuchs}. The lowering of *\textit{i} caused some confusion with *\textit{e} > /\textit{e}/, which is seen by the large number of words in *\textit{i} reflected with modern /\textit{e}/ and by the words in *\textit{e} that now have /\textit{i}/ (van Loon 2014: 204). The lowering of *\textit{u} probably caused the merger with *\textit{o} in a large number of dialects, though it is uncertain whether this originally affected all of Dutch (see § 15.1.3).

10. Lengthening of short vowels in open syllable, ca. twelfth century on the basis of place-names (Quak 1995, van Loon 2014: 210). In the east, the short vowels *\textit{i}, *\textit{ü}, *\textit{u}, *\textit{e}, *\textit{o}, *\textit{ä}, *\textit{a} yielded the corresponding long vowels. Whereas in western Dutch the lengthened products of the three front vowels *\textit{i}, *\textit{e}, *\textit{ä} and the back vowels *\textit{u} and *\textit{o} merged in /\textit{e}/ and /\textit{o}/; these five new long vowels have remained distinct from each other in many eastern dialects, because the short high vowels had not been lowered to lax vowels as in western Dutch. In western Dutch, open syllable lengthening created a new phoneme /\textit{e}/: from WGm. *\textit{i}, *\textit{e}, *\textit{ä} (e.g., WGm. *\textit{himil}-, *\textit{geban}-,
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*skapin- > MDu. hēmel, gēven, schēpen), a new /o:/ from *u, *o (e.g. WGm. *þuruh-, *loban- > MDu. dōre, löven), and a new phoneme /o:/ from *y. The new /a:/ from *a in open syllable merged with the product of *ǣ in most of western Dutch, except North Holland, but not in many eastern dialects (for instance, WGm. *naman- ‘name’, *mēnan- ‘moon’ yield MDu. nāme, mâne > MoDu. maan, naam, but Limburgian /na:m/ vs. /mɔ:n/).

11. Shortening of long vowels and diphthongs before consonant clusters. This occurred up to a certain degree in forms of the standard language (mainly in isolated lexemes) but the phenomenon was and is much more regular in many dialects. A West Germanic long vowel or diphthong has yielded a Middle Dutch short vowel in the following categories: (1) Before cht: MDu. brachte ‘brought’ (OS brāhta), MDu. dachte ‘thought’ (OS thāhta), MDu. sochte ‘sought’ (OS sōhta), MDu. verkochte ‘sold’ (*kōfta), ODu. lioht > *liht > MDu. licht ‘light’, MDu. zachte ‘soft’ (OS sāfo), MoDu. ochtend ‘morning’ (OS ūhta); (2) Before nT: MDu. twintich ‘twenty’ (OS twēntig), ODu. vriend > MDu. vrint, vrunt (but MoDu. vriend), ODu. stuont > MDu. stont, MoDu. stond ‘stood’, ODu. gieng > MDu. ginc > MoDu. ging ‘went’; (3) Before geminates: ODu. feitin > MDu. vet ‘fat’ (WGm. *fātita-), ODu. Bruocsella ‘Brussels’ (< *brōk-sali-) > Early MDu. brussele beside bruesele, brusele.

12. Degemination. There is some confusion over the date of degemination. Whereas Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 58) consider a date in or after the tenth century, van Bree (1987: 155) holds that geminate consonants must still have been present in Early Middle Dutch, and van Loon (2014: 212) also dates their simplification to the thirteenth century. Clearly, degemination must post-date the rise of *xs > ss and *þþ > s(s), which takes us into the early twelfth century. Degemination also post-dates lengthening in open syllables (or, at the very least, it must have been contemporary with the lengthening), since vowels before geminates remain short. It is difficult to decide on the basis of graphic evidence when degemination first started in Dutch, but a rough date in the thirteenth century seems plausible. Through degemination of /g:/, the phoneme /g/ was reintroduced into the language (e.g. in Early MDu. secghen ‘to say’), though this, too, soon changed into /γ/ in western dialects.

13. Resonant assimilations in intervocalic position: (1) mb > mm: ODu. heimer (ca. 1170), Early MDu. eemer, MoDu. emmer ‘bucket’ < *ain-bar-; ODu. umbe, EMDu. omme ‘around, about’, dom(p), -me ‘dumb’, lam(p), -me ‘lamb’, Lambrecht/Lammerecht ‘Lambert’, tombe/tomme ‘tomb’. (2) ng > ñ: vinger > MoDu. /vnɔŋ/; koning ‘king’ with /-1ŋ/ from the oblique case forms, but /k/ in the surname De Koninck and the adjective koninklijk ‘royal’. (3) nl >
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ll: ellef, elleven ‘eleven’ < *ainlif(an), spille ‘spindle’ < *spenn(i)-lō-, Linlo (1157) > Lille (1181) ‘Lille’ (prov. Antwerp); Early MDu. manlic, mallic, mallec ‘each’ < *man-līka-; probably also in elk ‘each’, MDu. also ellic (MLG elk, ellik; OE ælk) if from *aina-līka-, although the stage *-nl- is not attested in any document. There is little evidence for these changes before 1200 but their dialectal appearance in the thirteenth century suggests that they did develop somewhat earlier. (4) other resonant assimilations: pm > m in Early MDu. coepman > coeman ‘merchant’ (MoDu. koopman), ammpman > amman ‘official’, tn > n in vontnesse > vonnesse ‘judgement’ (MoDu. vonnis), dn > n in woensdag ‘Wednesday’ < *Wōdensdag, dl > ll in Zellik (974 Sethleca, 1108 Selleca), Qualburg (1050–1100 Quadalburg, 1143 Qualburg), dr > r in Adriaen > Ariaen, laerse ‘boot’ (1240), MoDu. laars < *leder-hose.

14. The loss of intervocalic d, g, v. Loss of d is generally dated to the late thirteenth and fourteenth century (van Loon 2014: 245–6), and seems to have spread from west to east. Van Loey 1976: 113 assumes d-syncope in Flanders from the twelfth century, in Brabant, from the thirteenth, and in Limburg, from the fourteenth: zilinghe beside sidelinghe (West Flanders, late thirteenth century) ‘small stream, dike’, alsoengher for also-denigher ‘suchlike’ (Maaseik, Limburg, 1343).

Syncope of intervocalic v can sporadically be found in Middle Dutch, e.g. in heet ‘has’ (< hevet), hoot ‘head’ (MoDu. hoofd) < hovet, two forms which survive as such in dialects, and in toponyms, such as Haastrecht (< Havekes-dreht, South Holland), ter zen ‘by the testimony of seven (witnesses)’ (from *zeven ‘seven’; North Holland, 16th c.), Urmond (< *Euver-mont ‘Over-mount’, Limburg). In Standard Dutch, v-syncope is found in the words proost ‘dean’ < MDu. provest < Old French provost ‘inspector’, heus ‘real’ < heuvesch ‘courteous’, and oozie ‘overhanging part of a sloping roof, eaves’ < MDu. *oves (< OHG obasa, Goth. ubizwa).

Examples of intervocalic g-loss are MDu. lede ‘lay’ < legede, geseet ‘said’ < geseget, swijt ‘is silent’ < swiget. Words which survive in Modern Dutch are altoos ‘always’ from *al-toges (altos already in 1200, Limburg), and veredigen ‘to defend’ from Early MDu. ver-dege-dingen ‘to claim in court’.

Loss has proceeded much further with d than with v and g, possibly for structural reasons (van Loon 2014: 248): after open syllable lengthening, short vowels plus geminate obstruent correlated regularly with long vowels plus single obstruents. But whereas ff/v, ch/g and ss/z formed fixed pairs of geminate versus single fricatives, single d (or its predecessor ð) was lacking a geminate counterpart, since geminate *þþ had become ODu. ss around 1100.
15. Dissimilatory loss of the velar nasal in \(/\text{ŋ}g/ > /g/\) when preceded by another nasal in the same word: *coninghinne > conighinne ‘queen’, *maninghe > manighe ‘admonition’, *penninghe > peneghe ‘penny’ (inflected forms), honech beside honing (here, the nasal is absent already in the Wachtendonck Psalter honog), winninghe > wonighe ‘dwelling’, etc.

This yields the phonological system of Table 15 in the southeastern dialects. I furthermore assume for Flanders the raising of */e:/ (WGm. *eo, *ea) to */i\text{ə}/ (whence MoFle. */iː/) and of ODu. */ɛ:/ to */e\text{ə}/ (as still in West Flemish; the vowel did not merge with the product of open syllable lengthening of */e/). Also, similar changes applied to the back vowels. Table 16 provides the long-vowel system for the Flemish dialects and those of Brabant around ca. 1300, after the application of open syllable lengthening.

Table 15. The Early Middle Dutch system (southeastern dialects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants:</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels:</th>
<th>Short</th>
<th>Long</th>
<th>Diphthongs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>õ</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ø̄</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>æ</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. The Early Middle Dutch long vowels and diphthongs (Flanders and Brabant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flanders (trad.)</th>
<th>Brabant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*/iː/</td>
<td>/iː/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/iə/</td>
<td>/iə/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/eː/</td>
<td>/ɛː/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/eə/</td>
<td>/oə/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/aː/</td>
<td>/æː/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*/eɪː/</td>
<td>/əuː/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


West Germanic *k and *g have been preserved as velar obstruents in Modern Dutch and in most of Old and Middle Dutch. Usually, we find a voiceless stop [k] for *k. The reflex of *g can have different phonetic realizations in modern dialects: in the west, it is mostly a voiceless velar or uvular, [x] or [χ], whereas in the central south and in the southeast it is pronounced as a voiced palatal [ʝ], but as voiceless [c] in word-final position.

In several sets of Dutch words, in particular in the coastal dialects but not only there, *k and *g display or seem to display palatal or sibilant reflexes, such as j, tj, or s. Some scholars have implied that all or many of these palatalizations of *k and *g are interconnected. For instance, Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: xxxiv discuss under the header of “Ingvaeeoonse bestanddelen van en ingvaeeonismen in het Nederlands” the shift of *k to tj (in diminutives and in some place names) or to s (in smetse, ceen, Butsejem), the alleged shift of ng to nz (see § 9.5), and the shift of g to j in various contexts.

Some scholars cast the net even more widely, suggesting that the palatalizations of velars in Dutch are manifestations of a more general West Germanic phenomenon. Such is the take of Krogh 1996: 203–4 and van der Hoek 2010b: 88–100, 203–6. As is well known, West Germanc *k(k) and *g(g) regularly became dental affricates or fricatives and palatal glides in Old English and Old Frisian in the neighbourhood of front vowels or j (for details of the changes, see Campbell 1959: 174ff. and Bremmer 2009: 23–35). Following Liberman 2007, van der Hoek 2010a, b explicitly regards the English and Frisian palatalizations as the outcome of palatal phonemes which were present in West Germanic. Dutch would have generalized the unpalatalized phonemes to a large degree, with the exception of the occasional palatalized reflexes of k and g.

Common to all previous discussions is their eclectic treatment of the available evidence. The following subsections aim to discuss the relevant topics in an exhaustive way: 1. Palatalization in clusters of dental plus velar obstruent; 2. Palatalization of word-internal *g; 3. Palatalization in the prefix *ga-; 4. Initial j- > g- before front vowels; 5. Loanwords and other irrelevant evidence. Note that the development of Dutch je and jij ‘you’ (ultimately reflecting Early Middle Dutch *tg) and the rise of gij ‘you’ are both discussed in § 9.4.

37. “Ingvaeeonic elements of and Ingvaeeonisms in Dutch”.
9.1 The cluster T+K

Several different palatalizations concern a cluster of a dental obstruent plus k or g. The combination TK\(^{38}\) was infrequent in Early Germanic. All instances of TK discussed in this section have arisen in the course of Old or Middle Dutch due to syncope of a vowel which stood between T and K. The resulting clusters have developed into a palatalized combination written as Tj. The first three subsections below deal with clusters of the type Tg, the next four with the type Tk.

9.1.1 Personal names in Gard(is), Roetjar

The earliest instances of /j/ from *g are found in personal names ending in gard(is) in sources from Flanders, Zealand, and Holland.\(^{39}\) The second element (Latinized with a NOM.SG. -gardis) contains the feminine *gardjō(n)- to *garda- ‘fence, courtyard’ or the noun *gazdjō(n)- ‘goad, stick’ (Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 § 210 Anm.5). In Flanders, the palatalized variants are frequently found after 1100, but Idisiardis already dates from 948 (Idisiardis) and there is another attestation from the eleventh century. Here is the Flemish evidence until 1253:

a. Names attested (also) with palatalized variants:

| Adalgard: | Aliarden (gen.; 12th c., Ghent). |
| Boefgard: | Boviardis (11th c., Ghent). |
| Boudgard: | Boltiarda (11th c., SWFla.), Boudiardis (12th c., Fla.). |
| Edelgard: | Hetheliardis (12th c., Ghent). With g: Ethelgard(a). |
| Idisgard: | Idisiardis (948, Fla.). With g: Idasgarda (840). |
| Lutgard: | Lieiardis (1221, Ghent; next to Lugardis), Luiardis (1234–35, Asper), Lujarde (gen.; 1208–12, Ghent). With g: Lutgardis, Lugardis. |
| = Lietgart: | Litiardis (1234–35 copy from 11th c.), Lieiardis (idem), Leitiart (1201–50, Ghent), Liardis (12th c., Ghent), Liejardis (1230), Liejardis (1236), Lieart (1228). With g: Lietgardis, Ligardis. |
| Ravengard: | Ravaniardis (1234–35, Fla.). |

\(^{38}\) Meaning *dg, *dk, *tg, and *tk. In the first subsection, 9.1.1, palatalization of *g is also found after other consonants than *d and *t, which may have been a secondary development.

\(^{39}\) The attestations are taken from Mansion 1924: 148 (for Flanders before 1000), Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 29–32 (Flanders 1000–1253), Schoonheim 2004: 96–100 (Holland and Zealand before 1300), and VMNW (Flanders 1200–1300).
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**Sijegard:** Siardis (12th c., Ghent), Ziardis (1227, ibidem), Syardis (1241, Temse), Ziarde (gen.; 1234, Assenede).

**Thietgart:** Thitiarden (gen.; 1151–1200, Ghent). With g: Thietgarda/is.

**Wolfgard:** Wlfiardis (11th c., SWFla.), Wlfiardis (12th c., SWFla.), Wlfiardis (1125, Evergem), Wulviardis (1180, Oostburg).

b. Names without attested palatalized variants:

- **Alfgard:** Alfgard(a) (1234–35).
- **Belegard:** Belegardis (11th c.).
- **Bergard:** Bergard (1234–35).
- **Ermengard:** Ermengardis/-a, Hermengarda (from 840–77 to 13th c.).
- **Folgard:** Folgarda (840–77).
- **Frethegard:** Frethegard (11th c.).
- **Hruodgard:** (H)r(u)odgarda (from 822 to 11th c.).
- **Landgarda:** Landgarda (840–77).
- **Lifgarda:** Lifgard, -a (12th c., copy 1234–35).
- **Osgarda:** Osgarda (840–77).
- **Ragingard:** Reingart, -dis (981, 11th c., 12th c., 1130).
- **Wildgard:** Wildgarth (1230, 1234–35).

In Holland and Zealand, no palatalization is found in the period until 1200, witness Bertgarda ‘Brechtgard’ (1x), Ermegardis (1x), Ethergarda (1x) ‘Edelgard’, Friesgart (2x), Hildegarda (17x), Lietgardis, Liutgarda (14x), Ratgart (1x), Reingerd (1x 918–48, copy end 11th c.).

After 1200 in Holland and Zealand, and after 1253 in Flanders, the following forms show palatalization of the velar:

**Edelgard:** Eliaerden (gen.; 1293, Dordrecht).

**Evergard:** Euerjard (1300, Bruges), Evriarden (gen.; Bruges, 1274), Eueriarden (gen.; 1279, Bruges), Euriarden (dat.; 1273, Aardenburg; 1279, Bruges), Euriarde (dat.; 1301–10, Bruges). 40

**Lietgard:** Lieiart (1279, Bruges), Liejard (1281, 1295, Bruges), Lieiaert (1288, Bruges), Luiart (1279, Ghent), verliejaerden (gen.; 1285, Bruges); unpalatalized variants are more frequent, e.g. Liegart (Oudenaerde), Lutgart, Lugar (Brabant, Limburg), Luitgart (Holland). 41

**Saxgard:** Saxiarius (2x; 1264 copy end of 13th c., Egmond, see Gumbert 2008: 53).

**Sijegard:** Ziardis (1256 Zealand 4x).

**Wolfgard:** Woluiardis (2x; 1273, Prémontré).

---

40. Strikingly, this name is not attested in the Old Flemish sources up to 1253 studied by Tavernier-Vereecken.

41. VMNW has no less than six entries for this single name: Lietgart, Ligardis, Lutene, Lutgardis, Lutgart, Luyart.
In summary, palatalization of -gardis to -jardis is attested from 948 in Flanders and from the thirteenth century in Holland. The absence of Hollandish j-forms before 1200 may be due to the small number of texts from Holland in that period. The first member of names with palatalization is found to end in d or t (Boudgard, Dietgart, Frodogard, Lietgart/Liutgart, Ratgart), f (Wolfgard), l (Adalgard, Edelgard, Elgard), n (Ravengard), r (Evergard), s (Idisgard, Saksgard), and v (Boviards). Except for f and v these are all dental consonants, but, in fact, dentals make up nearly all the consonants that can occur in this position, since a preceding k and g would assimilate completely to -gardis, whereas h would disappear. Thus, we can say that g > j in these names was conditioned by the contact between -C and g-. The compromise solution, viz. that palatalization started after first members in dental obstruents and then spread to other names, is conceivable, but is not explicitly supported by the earliest attestations.

The best illustration of the stages by which the phonetic process took place is given by the name Lietgard = Lutgard, which went from -tg-/tg- (the initial stage) to -ti/-tj- (palatalization) and ended as -i/-j- (loss of the dental stop).\footnote{The forms with intervocalic g (Ligardis etc.) can be explained from the Old Flemish tendency to delete the initial dental of a cluster of d > t plus a consonant (Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 582), the oldest example of which dates to the 11th century, viz. Ogerus for Odgerus. Hence, *Lietgardis could apparently become either Lietjardis or Liegardis.} The palatalization in Siardis for Sigardis or Sigegardis must be connected with the general development of *sigi- to sī- in names, and is discussed in § 9.2.1 s.v. zege.

The Old Dutch name *(h)ruodgēr from *xrōþi-gaiza-, German Rüdiger, is attested in Early Middle Dutch as Rutg(h)er mainly in and around Maastricht. In a document from Bruges dated to 1263, we find palatalization in Roetjar van Ghistelle ‘Roetjar from Gistel’. There is no need to regard -jar as a reflex of Frisian gār ‘spear’ (pace de Vries 1942b: 134) since unstressed e is spelled as a in various Early Middle Flemish forms, in particular before r. An example is vlaemscar penninghe ‘of Flemish pennies’, cf. van Loey 1976: 82. Thus, roetjar shows the same change of dg > dj as the compounds in gardis. The second element *gaiza- is also found with /j/ in the name Boudiaer < *bald-gēr in the accounts from Amstelland in North Holland (in 1343; van der Schaar 1953: 176)

Earlier scholarship assumed that g > j in these names was a Romance development. Förstemann (1900: 599, 608) compares West Frankish names in iardis for gardis, and supposes that g- became i- in West Frankish from the ninth century on. Mansion (1924: 19, 270) classifies Idisiardis as a French name due to its change of g to j before a. Yet he also admits that nothing points to the said Idisiardis being a person of Romance descent. Indeed, Romanists now hold a different view. The Old French
names of Germanic origin have been collected by Morlet 1968. Examples of names in -gardis include Adalgardis (seven times with g, once as Adaliardis), Hildigardis (10x g, 11x i), Leutgardis (usually with g, but also 1x Ledeardis and 1x Leyarda), and Ragnegardis (7x g, once Rainiardis). The spelling with g is still found in a majority of cases, and Morlet (I: 16) writes that in the forms in iardis, the syncope of g can be explained by the fricative pronunciation of the Germanic g. In other words, she regards g > j in these names as the result of the (occasional) incorporation of the fricative pronunciation of West Frankish /g/ as /j/ by speakers of French.

There are also internal objections against ascribing the Old Dutch names in iardis to Romance influence. Firstly, one would expect to find French influence also in other (elements of) Dutch names, but that is not the case. Secondly, Old French influence may be contemplated for Flanders, but is less likely for the names in iardis from Zealand and Holland, which are further removed from the French area.  

9.1.2 The prepositions tegen ‘against’ and jegens ‘towards’

Proto-Germanic *gagn(i)- (EWAhd IV: 7–9) ‘toward, against’ yields OHG gagan, gegin, MoHG gegen, OS gegin, OFri. jēn, jōn, OE gegn-, gēan-, MoE a-gain, gain-say. The combination *gn has regularly been palatalized to *jn in English and Frisian; in addition, initial *ge- has become je- in Old Frisian. In Old Dutch, the Leiden Willeram shows one attestation with palatalization (iegen) against another one without (gegen), whereas the text preserves g- in ingegen (5x), ingegan (1x), and angenegen (1x). The Wachtendonck Psalter always preserves g-, viz. in the preposition angegin (4x), anegeginnne (1x) and in the nouns geginloup ‘occursus’ and geginuirdi ‘presence’. In Middle Dutch, initial g- is sporadically preserved, viz. in ghegen (Axel, East Flanders, 1251–75), geghen (Breda, 1269), gheghen (Ghent, 1372; CRM14), and in the adjective gheghenwordighen ‘present’ (Deventer, 1300).

In Modern Dutch, the earlier preposition is continued by tegen ‘against’ and jegens ‘towards’.  

43. Förstemann (1900: 606) also compares West Frankish names in iaud from WGm. * gaudus (the element is not explained for certain, but it could be a lenited form of *gauτu-). In Old Dutch, I found only one palatalized instance in Odiodus (in a source from 923; Mansion 1924: 20), as against a larger number of forms with retained g (Adelgot, Adhelgodus, Hilgot, Radgot in Mansion 1924: 42, Odgaudus, Otgotus and others in Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 132f., 136f.). The interpretation of Odiodus therefore requires a new analysis of the document in which it occurs.

44. Jegens arose as a variant of Early MDu. jegen. In the thirteenth century, -s is only found in Holland, Utrecht and Zealand (and twice in Ghent). The exact source of -s is uncertain since, in the thirteenth century, adverbial -s was not yet productive; cf. EWN.
etymological dictionaries of Dutch claim that tegen arose from te plus jegen, whereas jegen(s) itself is explained by EWN as the North Sea Germanic outcome of gegen with palatalization of *g- to j-, as in Dutch jij ’you’ beside gij ’ye’. Close scrutiny of the Early Middle Dutch evidence reveals that this explanation of tegen is imprecise, while that of jegen(s) is uncertain at best. The chronology and dialect geography of the various attestations (see Mooijaart 1992 and VMNW) rather suggest that tegen and all its variants with other dental obstruents (tsj-, ts-, s-, etc.) developed from the combination of te ‘to, at’ plus gegen. In Dutch, te-gegen almost completely replaced gegen. This possibility was hinted at by Mooijaart (1992: 201): “Misschien ook zijn de vormen met (palatale) s in tsjegen e.d. rechtstreeks uit te + gegen ontstaan”.

She finds no concrete evidence to prove this, but southeastern Dutch does provide hints in this direction, as I will show, and other dialects are not incompatible with such a scenario.

The combination te + gegen (MHG zugegen, zegegen) preserves initial g- in a few literary manuscripts from the Cleves/Guelders area. The Aiol fragments (1220–40) have twice te gegen versus once thiegen. Contemporary with these fragments is tjegen in the Glossarium Bernense (1240) from Limburg. There is also once tgegen versus usual tegen (6x) and tegens (33x) in the Moraalboek (1270–90) from the same Lower Rhine area. The internal evidence of the latter text thus confirms that tegegen belonged to a more archaic register. The data under review suggest the following chronological order of developments: original te gégen (with the main stress on the first syllable of gegen) became tgegen (with the main stress on the first syllable of gegen) became tgeegen (loss of pretonic shwa) whence tjegen (palatalization) and finally tegen (cluster simplification).

Regional distribution between 1200 and 1300

The totality of the dialects shows an enormous spelling variation in the thirteenth century, but many variants are restricted to a specific region or set of regions.

a. Initial t(e)geg-:

The retention of the first g is a rare phenomenon altogether. We find sporadic cases in the Cleves/Guelders area (te gegen 2x in the Aiol fragments, 1220–40, tgegen 1x in Moraalboek, 1270–90) and in Flanders (once tgeghen in Bruges in 1279, once also in a charter from Sluis, 1320). Two documents from Monster in western Holland from 1299 have tgeghenwordeghen ’present’.

b. Initial i- or j-:

ieghen, jeg(h)en is the numerically dominant form, especially in West and East Flanders (ca. 1600 times in a variety of locations; sometimes rounded to jog(h)en,

45. “Maybe the forms with (palatal) s in tsjegen etc. arose directly from te + gegen.”
joeghen in Bruges), Zealand and Southwest Brabant. It is also found in Northwest
Brabant, in Holland and Utrecht, and in Alden Biesen in Limburg. In East
Brabant it is rare (only 3x). Ieghens is mainly found in Holland and Zealand.
c. Initial tie-, thie-:
The combination <t(h)i->, which probably indicates biphonemic /tj-/ (though
an attempt to spell an affricate /tf/- cannot be excluded), is most characteristic
of Holland (64x t(h)ieghen or tieg(h)ens in Chancellery documents), and, to
some extent, of West Flanders (60x t(h)ieghen, of which 49x in Bruges). Isolated
occurrences are found in East Flanders, Zealand, Antwerp, West Brabant, and
Cleves/Guelders.
d. Initial te-:
Numerically, t- is most frequent in the Cleves/Guelders area (74x tegens, 9x
tegen) and in Holland (42x teghen(s)), less so in Utrecht (9x) and Bruges (23x).
e. Initial ts(-) and tse-:
These minor variants are found in Flanders, Antwerp and South Holland: tseghen
once each in Antwerp, Ghent and Bruges, and twice in Assenede (EFla.), tseighe
once in Bruges and twice on the island of Putten (SHol.).
f. Initial sc(h)-, ch-:
The variants sceg(h)en and scheg(h)en are nearly only found in East Brabant
(48x), but sceghen also once in Ghent. The variant cheg(h)en occurs in East
Flanders (5x in Ghent, 3x in Velzke 3x), in West Brabant (11x in Willebroek,
one in Tervuren), and in Limburg (10x in Maastricht).
g. Initial s-, si-, sci-:
These are rare variants, all occurring in southern Dutch. Scieg(h)en is found
in East Flanders (9x), sieghen twice in Bruges, and once in Ghent and East
Brabant. Southwest Brabant has five times seghen and once zeghen.
h. Initial zero:
Eghen (Sinaai, EFla., 1298) and eghenwerdeghe ’present’ (Dilbeek near Brussels,
1296).

Spelling the palatalization
The development of tj- to tsj-, ts-, s-, and t- recalls the spelling ts- (maybe for [tf-]) in
combinations of a word-initial dental stop plus etymological j-, such as tsare ‘in this
year’ from te jaere, tsaers ‘yearly’ from des jaers, and tsarmeer ‘in future’ from te jare
meer (Franck 1910: 110). A similar treatment affects the initial affricate in French
loanwords which had [tʃ] in Old French, such as ‘census’ and ‘charter’ (Pijnenburg

46. Compare also iege\\n
worde ‘presence’ in Gl.Bern. (1240).
et al. 1997: 94–5, 144), which were eventually adopted into the Dutch phonological system with initial /s/ or /ʃ/. Compare Early MDu. czins, tsens, chens, cens, sens, tsijns, etc., ‘census’, leading up to MDu. chijns, sijs, MoDu. chijis, cijis. For ‘charter’, we find the Early MDu. spellings chaertre, tsaertre, tsiaertre, saertre, Early MoDu. certer (MoDu. charter has been borrowed from English in the nineteenth century). These variants perfectly match the different combinations with which the initial sound of ‘against’ was written in the thirteenth century. Just like *tgegen has become teg(h)en in Holland (beside tieghen), Utrecht, and Cleves/Guelders, ‘census’ has initial t- in thiens, thiins in Holland and Utrecht in the thirteenth century, and tins, tiins in eastern dialects in CRM14. The joint evidence of tegen and tijns makes the hypothesis of Van Reenen (2014: 92, 103–4), viz. that northern Dutch tijns is a loanword from Low German tins that was independent of southern Dutch tsijns, less compelling (though not impossible).

Explaining jegen(s)
We must still explain jegen(s), which rapidly became the most frequent form of the word in Early Middle Dutch. Since there is no general palatalization of g- before stressed e in this period in any dialect, the j- of jegen(s) has been ascribed to Ingvaeonic palatalization, which would in this case have entered the mainstream dialects. A clear case of such a development appears in the form iegin in the Leiden Willeram (ca. 1100), which may belong to the Frisian characteristics of the manuscript (cf. Sanders 1974: 308–12). The only reliable instance of such a general palatalization of g- in Dutch is found in the prefix ge- of participles and collectives. But here it occurs in a pretonic syllable which may have been subject to a specific phonetic reduction, and the palatalization in the prefix -ge- is restricted to the coastal provinces whereas initial j- in jegen is also found in Brabant and Limburg. Hence, the dialect geography speaks against a coastal Dutch development.

Franck (1910: 93) ascribes jegen < gegen to dissimilation of the first g- in order to avoid two consecutive fricative g’s. This explanation cannot be excluded, but it is not the most convincing one. Firstly, we have no other example of such a dissimilation. Secondly, and more importantly, the sporadic preservation of gegen across the different dialects in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, versus the attestation of jegen also in all dialects, would be difficult to explain under this scenario.

I therefore favour an alternative solution. Jegen(s) probably represents another outcome of the palatalization of tegegen to t(s)jegen, but not by way of direct phonetic change. After all, loanwords like cijns, tijns ‘census’ and saertre ‘charter’ never acquired initial j-. Jegen may therefore be due to metanalysis of tjegen as *te+jegen, that is, the preposition te was analogically restored. The model for this restoration would have been provided by native forms such as tsaers ‘yearly’ and tsare ‘in this
year’, which probably remained transparent combinations of des and te plus jaar ‘year’. As a result, the primary form of the preposition was felt to be jegen.

It does not seem possible to provide definite proof for this scenario on the basis of the attestations. The earliest Middle Dutch text from Ghent, the bylaws of the leprosarium, written in 1236, has a single instance of chegen. In the next document, likewise from Ghent (CG nr. 0004), from 1237, we find chegen and iegen side by side: eleven times iegen (and thrice iegenwordech) against four times chegen in exactly the same semantic and syntactic usage. Whereas iegen is found mainly on folios 30 to 35 of this text, chegen occurs only on folios 36 and 37, together with iegen.47 Note the co-occurrence of both variants in the following sentence: So wie so yemene meshandelt of mesuort. ende uan hem bedregen wert; hi sal er betren iegen den ghenen dar hi af bedregen es; dane chegen den graue (fol. 36.15)48. The simultaneous use of both forms would be easier to explain if iegen came directly from *gegen and chegen from *te+jegen, but that would still leave unexplained the concrete evidence from southeastern Dutch dialects for the change *tgegen > tje-gen, and their contemporaneous use of iegen, jeghen from 1265 onward. Unless we explain the latter forms from lexical diffusion of the Flemish and Hollandish preposition in the middle of the thirteenth century (which hardly seems likely), the southeastern j-forms must be due to the metanalysis of tjegen as te+jegen in any case. Thus, we can either assume a separate rise of jegen in Flanders (via dissimilation gegen > jegen) and further east (metanalysis of tjegen), or we accept that the same metanalysis took place several times in different regions, viz. some time before 1237 in Flanders but not before 1240 in the southeast. The full, analytical combination te ieg(h)en is only attested once in 1285 in West Flemish (Rijmbijbel) beside more usual tjeghen and teghen.

In the form eghen (under point h above) there is no initial consonant at all. Since prevocalic j- does not normally drop, I see no other option but to ascribe eghen to a reanalysis of tegen as *te+egen. If this is correct, it increases the likelihood of the scenario sketched above for jegen.

---


48. ‘Whoever maltreats or assaults someone and is accused by him: he must rather compensate the person by whom he was accused than [compensate] the count’. 
Distribution between 1300 and 1400
The eastern dialects preserved initial te-g- and tg- longer than the western ones, as can be seen from the data of the fourteenth century. The full sequence te-g- occurs only once in tegegeworge 'present' (for *te-gegen-wordige) in Susteren in East Limburg in 1354 (CRM14). Initial tg- is also represented in fourteenth-century documents from Utrecht (once), Drente, Overijssel, Guelders, East Brabant, and Limburg. Attestations include tgeschewordich (Utrecht 1341), tgehgen and tgehgenwordighen (De Wijk, Drente, 1367), tgeghen (Zwolle 1344), tgeghen (Zutphen 1351), tghihens (Kampen 1375), tgehenwerdighen (Doesburg 1366), tgegenwordighen (Laag-Keppel 1364), tgegenwordigen (Gemert 1394), tgegenwordgh(en (Maaseik 1343, 1349), tgegenwordicheit (Pietersem 1367), tgeghen (Zoutleeuw 1373), tgeh(h)en (Sint-Truiden 1375, 1379), tgegenwordigen (Brustem 1386), and tgegenwerdeghen (Lummen 1392). A late instance of tgehen occurs in a charter by Gerart of Cleves from 1417 (Roks 2011: 37). Still, in the same documents from the same eastern regions in this same period, the predominant initial spelling in these words is <ti->. Therefore, <tg-> is probably an archaism which may already have been pronounced as tj-.

9.1.3 Yerseke
This toponym from Zealand is a compound of *gêr ‘pointed piece of land’ and *sikô- ‘stream’ (van Berkel & Samplonius 2006: 513). In Old Dutch, we only find unpalatalized forms: Gersake (966 copy 15th c.), Gersicha (980 copy 15th c.), Gerseca (1186), Gerseca (1219). After 1219, all forms have a palatalized initial consonant, which could have arisen in the prepositional phrase *te Gerseke ‘in G.’. This would become t’Gerseke by elision of the schwa, yielding the input tg- for palatalization to tj. The second syllable has unstressed <i> in iersike, jiersike,yersike (West Holland, 1299), <e> in jerzeke, jerseke, and zero in yerske, jerske, jeerske (Antwerpen, 1248–71).

9.1.4 The diminutive suffix -eken > -(e)tje
The diminutive suffix of Modern Dutch has five different allomorphs, viz. -je (e.g., pot-je 'little jar', hoej-je 'little hoof'), -tje (zaal-tje 'little hall', been-tje 'little leg'), -etje (kamm-etje 'little comb', pinn-etje 'little pin'), -pje (bloem-pje 'little flower'), and -kje (koninkje to koning 'king'), cf. ANS s.v. ‘Verkleinwoord’. The exact distribution is complex, and some nouns have two different diminutives (kipje vs. kippetje to kip ‘chicken’). The spelling tj suggests a biphonemic combination of t plus j, but phonetically (and, some have argued, also phonemically) we are dealing with a palatal
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stop [c]. In the dialects, additional allomorphs occur which, moreover, often have a different distribution from their standard counterparts; see Pée 1936. For instance, a typical distribution in the southern dialects of Brabant and Limburg would be the following: the allomorph -(c)ə after t, d, n (t and d merging with the palatal stop); -kə after r, l, s, vowels, and labials; and -skə after velars.49 Dialects in which i-mutation is a productive morphological process show i-mutation of back vowels in the stem of diminutives.

The oldest form of this suffix (which, in Old and Early Middle Dutch, competed with other diminutive suffixes such as -lijn, -sijn, -elkijn) in Middle Dutch is -ekin, -ekiin/-əkin/ from PGM. * -kina-. It is clear, therefore, that the modern dialects and the standard language show either the preservation of *k (in dialectal -ke, -ske), or its palatalization to /c/ or /j/. Scholarly discussion has centred around the phonetic path and the geographic spread of the palatalization.

According to an older theory proposed in the 1920s by Kloeke (1923, 1925), and adopted among others by Schönfeld & van Loey, it was the front vowel character of the following Old Dutch *i which caused the palatalization of k; a preceding t would have been an additional factor in this process. The change would have started in (North) Holland, as this is where the oldest written attestations of a change from k to ki and then tg or tj are found, from the fourteenth century onwards. The resultant palatal stop /c/ then spread from Holland to the east and south due to the economic and political dominance of Holland after 1600.

Kloeke’s theory was immediately called into question by de Vries (1925, 1927, 1928) and by Kern (1929: 54, 68–74), who drew attention to dialectal data from other areas than Holland, which also show a relatively early palatalization. Early enough, that is, to render their origin from lexical diffusion from Holland doubtful. De Vries and Kern argue that palatalization was due to the contact of k with a preceding t or d. For instance, *hōdekīn ‘little hat’ > hoetken > hoetgen > hoetje.

There are two reasons why the objections against Kloeke’s theory are cogent. Firstly, long /i:/ does not cause palatalization of k or g in any other Dutch word. Secondly, the distribution of diminutive allomorphs in the Dutch dialects shows that k was not palatalized under all circumstances (as one would expect if a following /i:/ was the cause). Rather, it is only after t, d, n that we find palatalization in most dialects. This points in the direction of stem-final dentals as the locus for the palatalization. In Kloeke’s defense, one may note that the full scale of the dialect distribution was not widely known before Pée’s monograph of 1936.

49. After a stem-final velar, an extra s was apparently added to keep the k-suffix distinguishable (Marynissen 1974).
Van der Hoek 2009 follows Kloekè’s explanation of the palatalization being caused by *i, but at the same time, he acknowledges a multi-regional origin of the change. He thinks that “at one time the language had an extensive system of palatalized consonants” (p. 71). The restriction of palatalization to the diminutives would be due to the concomitant vowel shortening, but van der Hoek does not explain what the causal link would be. In fact, the historical record shows that vowel shortening lags behind the first stages of palatalization by some centuries. Although it is quite likely that Dutch had allophonically palatalized velars before front vowels (the data on *g point in this direction), this does not help to explain the attested distribution of the diminutive suffix. Palatalization of k before *i or *i is not otherwise found in Dutch, whereas there are several good indications that dental-velar clusters were prone to yield palatalized outcomes.

In her 1998 article on the history of the diminutive suffixes in southern Dutch dialects after 1200, Marynissen definitely proves the correctness of de Vries’ theory. The palatalization of -t/d-ke > -tje must be regarded as a polygenetic change, which had (at least) four different centres of innovation in Dutch. Marynissen bases her investigation on the two toponyms ‘street’ and ‘field’, which end in dental stops and are widely attested in local records of all periods. This allows her to follow in detail the path of palatalization of the final consonant of these two nouns from 1200 to the present. The evidence shows that the palatalization can be regarded as an independent development in each region, which happened (or surfaced in the sources) at different moments in different regions in Late Middle or Early Modern Dutch. Taking into account Marynissen’s results, we must distinguish at least four different core areas of palatalization:

1. (North) Holland. Here, palatalizing spellings are found from the end of the thirteenth century, particularly in personal names. The evidence is discussed in some detail by van der Schaar 1953: 189–202, who distinguishes four groups of spellings (besides original -kijn, -kin, -ken). I cite them in their probable chronological order:
   a. kiaen, found particularly in South Holland in the fourteenth century: Drutekiaen (Leiden 1319), Gosekiaens (Leiden 1335), Boudekiaens (Leiden 1344), Rogghekiaens (Leiden 1358), Foykiaen (Leiden 1370), een eruekiaen ‘a small property’ (Leiden 1380), Hertekiaen (Delfport), Claes Ossenkiaensoon

50. Van der Hoek has misunderstood Kern 1929, to whom he ascribes the claim that “the single consonant */k/ changes into a consonant cluster */tx/”. Yet Kern explains his view at length on p. 68, concluding: “Dat een groep /tk/ of /t’k’/ zich haast onvermijdelijk weldra tot /t’x’/ > /t’/ moest ontwikkelen, behoeft geen betoog.” [“It goes without saying that a group /tk/ or /t’k’/ soon almost inevitably had to develop into /t’x’/ > /t’/.”]
(1323 Zealand). The actual pronunciation is uncertain. If we assume that k still represents [k], i indicates palatality, and if ae renders a lower vowel than e or schwa, we may conjecture -[kæ(:)n] or -[cæ(:)n].

b. kajen (with anaptyxis of a from *-kjen?): Ludikajen, Clais Dumikajen, Romikaïen uyt Oesterland, Diddikajen, Bonikaïen, Heynikajes (gen.), all in a count’s document from 1319 with names from West-Friesland; Ghizikaïen (‘Gijsken’, 1322, probably from Westland in South Holland). Since this variant occurs only in two documents from 1319 and 1322, both from the administration of the Count of Holland, it seems likely that -kajen is a personal variant from a single scribe.

c. tiaen and iaen, in which <ae> may indicate a low front vowel /æ:/, These are found particularly in North Holland. Most words are spelt with a dental obstruent, as in the names Calletiaen (13th c.), Wittetiaen, Heynetiaen, Doedetiaen, Coppeiaens (Haarlem 1347), Foeytiaen (Haarlem 1361), and in appellatives such as lappetiaen ‘little piece’, vennetiaen ‘little lake’, endetiaen ‘little end’, sticketiaen ‘little piece’. Spellings with only <j> are Abbejaen and Dirckiaen.

d. tgi(i)n, particularly in sources from southeastern North Holland after 1340: keteltgin ‘small kettle’, stiertgin ‘little bull’, broedertgiin ‘little brother’, and many names: Hughetgin (Weesp), Lammetgin (Edam), Ghisetgiin (Amsterdam), etc. In South Holland, we find -tgen after 1380, as the chronological successor of -kiaen: Ghijstgens (Delft 1382), Soytgens (Leiden 1399), Snoeytgen, Doedetgen (Den Haag 1397). The palatal pronunciation of ig as [tʃ] or [c] is secured by the spelling of sinte ponstgens dach ‘Sint Pontian’s day’ (Haarlem 1399, and others), since Pontian is usually spelled Pontiaen or Ponciaen. In the sixteenth and seventeenth century, -tgen becomes very frequent in documents from Holland, later followed up by tje (after 1600) and ie (by vocalization).

2. Northeastern Dutch. Groningen shows the development of -kijn, -ken in the fourteenth century to -gijn, -gin, -gen in first part of sixteenth century, e.g. in ffantghen ‘little banner’. In Drente we find Reyntyen ‘Reineke’ (1447), cf. de Vries 1925.

3. Southern Flemish. One of the earliest attestations is straettijn ‘little street’ (Wervik 1414), with tt indicating palatalization (Marynissen 1998: 256). From the sixteenth century onwards the palatalization seems to have become established in southern West Flanders and southwestern Brabant, and it soon spreads beyond. The oldest forms in East Flanders are 1530 stretiën, 1540 straetjien.

4. Limburg and southeastern Brabant. Palatalization is first attested in the fifteenth century: 1436 straetghen ‘little street’ (Vechmaal), 1447 straetgen (Maaseik), 1479 straethen (Diest). Its northward spread can be followed in the documents
if we look at personal names with a diminutive suffix, which can occur both as a first name (Liesbetken) and as a surname (Steynkens). In towns such as Neeroeteren in 1461 (Segers 2003) and Sittard until 1450 (Wethlij 2004), -ken is still the only attested suffix after names ending in t or d. In North Limburg, -ken changes into written -gen fairly abruptly in the first half of the sixteenth century, as in Kessel-Eik (1516),51 Sevenum (by 1530), Oirlo (1550) and Venray (1570), cf. de Vaan 2012c. The precise pronunciation of the combination tg is not known: it may have been an affricate [tʃ], but we also find the spellings ti and ty in the same period (e.g., in Oirlo Geritye 1551, Baertien 1562). There is reason to believe that tg(h) was a standardized spelling for the affricate or sibilant in diminutives in the sixteenth and seventeenth century.

We may conclude that the diminutive suffix provides abundant evidence for palatalization in the cluster tk in Middle and Early Modern Dutch.52 Since the oldest form of the suffix was -ekīn, later also -eken, syncope of the schwa which stood between the dental consonant of the base and the k of the suffix was a preliminary condition for the palatalization. The regional differences in the chronology of this syncope must be part of the explanation for the regional differences in the date of the rise of palatalization.

9.1.5 Kortgene

This town on the island of North Beveland is a compound of kort ‘short’ and kene ‘small stream’ < PGm. *kinan-. The oldest attestations are from the thirteenth century: Cortkeen (1247), Kortekine (1271), kortekene, kortekiene (WHol. 1299), Coirtkene (1333); cf. van Berkel & Samplonius 2006: 245 and VMNW. In 1347 we first find Cortgene with g, and in 1605 Coirthiene with the first explicit spelling which indicates /j/. The name is presently pronounced as [kərtˈxeːn]. The development of tg after the syncope of word-internal schwa shows that it was the contact between t and k which caused the palatalization of the velar stop.

51. Lietgen van Eijck, see http://www.loegiesen.nl.

52. As Jarich Hoekstra reminds me, there is independent evidence for the same development in North Frisian (Fering-Öömrang), where tk and dk have also become tj, e.g., fōtj ‘little foot’ (*fōtik), hōntji ‘little dog’ (*hundikīn), eetj ‘vinegar’ (*etik), pretji ‘preach’ (*predikia), letj ‘little’ (*litik) (Hofmann 1961: 8).
9.1.6  

edik ‘vinegar’

Besides modern azijn, which was borrowed from French, Dutch has edik ‘vinegar’, which corresponds by and large with MoHG Essig, OHG ezzīh, MLG et(t)ik, etek, atik, ODu. etige (dat.sg. Wachtendonck Psalter). This word was borrowed at an early date from Latin acētum (EWAhd I: 1190–1). OS ecid and OE ecced retain the original order of k and t as in the Latin word, but other West Germanic dialects acquired the word with metathesis of k and t as a masculine a-stem *atika- (whence OHG, MoHG Essig) or, with Romance lenition t > d, as *adika-. In Early Middle Dutch, the noun is found as edek (in the west) or etek (in Cleves/Guelders), dat. edeke, gen. eteks. Loss of intervocalic d explains the subsequent form eek at the end of the Middle Dutch period. After the seventeenth century, edik/eek disappear from the written language.

In some southern dialects, the word has remained alive until the present day. Map 58 in Roukens 1937 II (and the comment in 1937 I: 302–4) and the relevant maps in van de Kerckhove 1949, Weijnen 1965b, WLD, and WBD show monosyllabic eek /e:k/, aek /e:k/ in large parts of Limburg and in northeastern Brabant. Disyllabic forms with a palatal affricate or stop aetje /ɛːtʃə/ or aetsje /ɛːtsə/ occur in some towns in the east of Belgian Limburg and the south of Dutch Limburg. 53 Goossens 1968: 15 compares the geography of the preforms *adika- in northern Ripuarian and Cleves/Guelders as against *atika- in Ripuarian proper. He proposes that northern Limburgian eek goes back to earlier edek, whereas southern Limburgian aet(s)je represents *etek. Although the parallelism between northern *d and southern *t would support this solution, it leaves the second syllable of aet(s)je unexplained. This form can be explained from *edeke or *eteke, that is, as the result of syncope from earlier *edeke or *eteke. These must represent the originally trisyllabic forms of the oblique cases, which apparently became dissociated from the nominative and accusative singular. This speaks in favour of an original paradigm *edek, *edeke > aek, aetje, in which the variants aek and aetje became so dissimilar that the generalization of one of these two forms as the single form for ‘vinegar’ is trivial. If South Limburg had had *etek, *eteke, we would expect strong aet(s)ek (as in Ripuarian) and weak aet(s)je, and aet(s)ek would have had more chances to survive.

---

53. Due to their ending, they could be interpreted as diminutives, as for instance in Bree (Dupont 1922: 44).
9.2 Palatalization of word-internal \(*g\) to \((*)j\)

In about fifty different Dutch lexemes, the combination of a short vowel plus \(g\) has yielded a diphthong \(ei\) (MDu. MoDu. /ei/) or \(ij\) (MDu. /i:/ > MoDu. /ei/). Sometimes the whole Dutch area has palatalization, sometimes all dialects preserve \(g\). In many other lexemes, some dialects keep \(g\) and some palatalize it. The handbooks offer different generalizations for these changes. Schönfeld & van Loey 1970 § 64 propose two rules: 1. \(*agi\) and \(*egi > *egi > eg’i\) (= palatalized \(g\)) \(> *eje > ei; 2. *igi > ĕge\). A third change of \(*egC > ei\) is regarded as a more sporadic development. Van Bree (1987: 87f.) adopts the same changes 1 and 3 for \(*agi\) and \(*eg(i)\), but cautions that not all dialects behave in the same way. Unlike Schönfeld & van Loey, van Bree claims that \(*igi\) also becomes \(ei\), adducing MDu. \(leit\)’lies’ < \(*ligiþ\) as an example.

Franck (1910: 107) surmises that “Germ. \(eg\) is vielleicht nur vor Konsonant zu \(ei\) geworden” and “Beim Umlaut scheint dagegen \(egi\) zu \(ei\) geworden zu sein. Aber wann \(egi\) \(ei\) wird und wann es erhalten bleibt, erheilt nicht (\(ei\) nur in Silben auf die unbetonte Silbe und dann Nebenton folgte?)”. Van Loon (2014: 187–8) separates the development of Old Dutch \(-egi-\), \(-igi- > -ei-, which is also found in Middle High German (where \(-igi-\) becomes \(-i-\) and \(-egi-\) becomes \(-ei-, cf. Paul, Klein, Solms & Wegera 2007: 137), from the vocalisation of \(g\) to \(j\) after a palatal vowel and before a consonant, found in Anglo-Frisian and western Dutch.

Most scholars thus distinguish between two separate developments with different geographic scope, but the precise conditions governing these changes remain unclear, as does the place of these changes in the relative chronology of Dutch sound changes. Some other changes are also relevant to this topic, including (1) fricativization of \(g\), (2) Old Dutch fortition, i.e., the alternation of voiced and voiceless fricatives before \(l\), \(n\), \(r\), as in Dutch \(tegel\) vs. \(tichel\) ‘tile’, \(gavel\) vs. \(gaffel\) ‘fork’, (3) lengthening of short vowels in open syllable, (4) syncope of word-internal unstressed vowels. All of these changes took place at different moments in different parts of the Dutch linguistic area. Finally, inner-paradigmatic alternations must be taken into account. For instance, WGm. *regna- would give Old Dutch nom.acc. *regan but gen.dat. *regn-, yielding different conditions for many of the changes just listed.

In the scholarly literature on Old Saxon and Middle Low German, the issue is treated in a somewhat different fashion. Gallée (1993: 50) notes the occurrence of forms such as Meginrickesdorf and Egilbertus (Westphalia, 980), with preserved \(g\), next to palatalization in Meynburghun (Corvey), and of Regin- next to Rein- in

---

54. A similar rule of only preconsonantal palatalization was tentatively formulated by Mansion (1924: 270) but rejected immediately by himself on the grounds that the intervocalic spelling \(<g>\) could sometimes indicate \(/j/. Our MDu. and MoDu. evidence proves the reality of \(/g/ for most of the relevant forms.
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other personal names. Gallée also remarks that \( \text{ei} \), \( \text{ai} \) are more frequent in the eleventh century than in the tenth. On p. 74 and 170–2, he considers a development \( \text{agi} > \text{egi} > \text{eji} > \text{ei} \). In the personal names of the Werden charters (between 793 and 848; Blok 1960, Bohn 1931, Tiefenbach 1997: 195f.), we can see the changes of \( \text{egi} > \text{ei} \) and \( \text{igi} > \text{ii} \) happening before our eyes. Since other names with a disyllabic first member ending in a consonant do not generally show syncope of the second vowel in this period (compare names in Beren-, Irmin-, Idis-, Mathal-, Wandil-, Warin-), nor do names with an \( \text{u-} \) or \( \text{jō-} \) stem as their first member (Frithu-, Hathu-, Hildi-), the shift \( \text{egi} > \text{ei} \) cannot be due to a general vowel syncope. We must rather assume that \( \text{egi} \) was pronounced as \([\text{e} \text{j} \text{i}]\), in which the consonant further developed into \( \text{j} \); apparently, there was hardly any audible difference between, e.g., \( \text{Rejin-} \) and \( \text{Rein-} \). Tiefenbach (1984: 329) shows that \( \text{egi} > \text{ei} \) is almost regular in the ninth to eleventh-century names from Essen (1984: 144, 170), whereas in Xanten (1984: 64, 94) and Cologne (1984: 236, 262) the palatalization of \( \text{g} \) is only starting in this period. The relevant names from Tiefenbach’s material have as their first member \( \text{Egil-/Eil-} \) (\( \text{agila-} \)), \( \text{Megin-/Mein-} \) (\( \text{magina-} \)), \( \text{Regin-/Rein-/Rem-} \) (\( \text{ragina-} \)) and \( \text{Sigi-/Si-} \) (\( \text{sigi-} \)), which are all discussed below. Thus, Essen and Werden both show an early, ninth-century date of the palatalization, which then spread westwards. Note that word-initial \( *\text{Agi-C-} \) shows early syncope without palatalization: \( \text{Egibertus, Egburg, Ecdagus} \) in Xanten, \( \text{Ekbertus, Ekbrand, ekhild} \) in Essen, \( \text{egbertus} \), \( \text{Ecuuinus} \) in Cologne. Possibly, these names were influenced by the first member \( \text{Eggi-}, \text{Ek-} \) from \( *\text{agjō-} \) (thus Tiefenbach 1984: 340). The second member \(-\text{dag}\) is never found as \(-\text{dei}\) in Essen, but the number of relevant tokens is small.

For Middle Low German, Lasch (1914: 83f.) posits a development of \( \text{egi} + \text{dental} \) via \( \text{eg} + \text{dental} \) to \( \text{ey} + \text{dental} \), in which syncope precedes palatalization. When syncope did not occur, she continues, \( \text{egi} \) underwent lengthening to \( \text{ēge} \) and \( \text{g} \) remained: modern Soest dialect \( \text{ižo} (< *\text{egedo}) \) versus Ostphalian \( \text{eyde} (< *\text{egde}) \) ‘harrow’.

9.2.1 The evidence

The relevant evidence from all periods of Dutch is presented in alphabetical order according to the Modern Dutch entry. The focus will be on the etymology and the extent to which palatalization is attested chronologically and geographically.

1. \( \text{breidel} \) ‘bridle’ < *\( \text{bregdila-} \). Attested with \( \text{ei} \) in all dialects from 1200 onwards, both in the noun and in the verb ‘to bridle’. Modern dialects have \( \text{breidel, breyl, breil} \), Modern Low German \( \text{breidel} \). Derived from *\( \text{bregdan} \), see the next entry.
2. \( \text{breien} \) ‘to knit’ < *\( \text{bregdan-} \). MDu. \( \text{breyden, breyen} \) (Fla. Hol. 15th c.), in modern dialects of Groningen \( \text{bra(a)iden} \) ‘to knit’ (Molema 1895).
3. *brein* ‘brain’ < *bragna- (MLG bregen, bragen n.). Late MDu. *brein* (Fla., 1517–18), *bragen* (Hol., 1450–70, NE-Dutch, 16th c.), *braghenpanne* ‘brain-pan’ (Groningen, ca. 1440), *breguen* ‘brains’ (*Teuthonista*, 1477). The Early Modern Dutch form is *breyne, brijne* (Hollandish, according to Kiliaan 1599). In the seventeenth century, *brein* is found especially in Hollandish sources. Thus, we roughly find the retention of *a* and *g* in the east as against the development to *ei* in Holland and Flanders, although *ag* is also attested in Holland. This points to an alternating paradigm with nom.acc. *bragen* < *bragn* but oblique *brein- from *bragnV-. The form *bregen* is explained by EWN as due to a North Sea Germanic fronting of *a* to *e*, but its eastern location in Cleves/Guelders contradicts this. The vowel *e* may have been analogically introduced into the strong case forms from oblique gen. *bregnes, dat. *bregne.*

4. *degel, diggel* ‘platen, shard’ (MLG *degel, deygel* ‘cauldron’, OHG *tegel*, MHG tegel, tigel, MoHG Tiegel). In literary Early Modern Dutch, there is variation between *deghel* ‘platen’ (1567), ‘cauldron, meltingpot’ (“Saxon and Sicambrian” according to Kiliaan) and *diggel* ‘pottery, shard’ (attested from 1614). No forms in *ei* are attested. The variation between *degel* and *diggel* goes back to Old Dutch: the former results from open syllable lengthening of *dig- or *deg-, whereas the latter has preserved the short vowel in a closed syllable.

   There is no agreement on whether *degel* reflects a Latin loanword or an inherited formation. Since Latin *tegula* was borrowed into West Germanic as *tigula- m./n., as shown by Dutch *tegel* ‘tile’ (see below) and German Ziegel, and since Dutch *degel* means the same, I favour the view that all of these words reflect Latin *tegula*. The failure of *degel* to adopt the female gender of the Latin word may point to a somewhat later date of borrowing than in the case of *tegel*. Seebold (2011: 917) explains *d- in MLG *degel* as resulting from “Umsetzung hochdeutscher Formen in niederdeutsche”, but that does not explain the *i-vocalism nor the geminate *gg* of Dutch. A possible solution is that, either in the donor language (Romance) or in the recipient dialects, Latin *tegula* had a variant *degula* or *digula*. There is no evidence for voicing in Gallo-Romance, but the difference in aspiration of obstruents (unaspirated in Gallo-Romance, often aspirated in Germanic) might have caused the incorporation of *t- as Germanic *d-*. Alternatively, the Latin word may have been connected folk-etymologically with the Germanic verb *digan* ‘to knead’ (Go. *digan* ‘to model from clay’), since tiles were made of clay. Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the verb survived in Germanic languages other than Gothic.

5. *degen* ‘hero, thane’ < *pegna-. Palatalization is first attested in the Old Ghent personal names from around 1000: *Thegenlandus* (829), *Theinardus* (996–1029), *Tegehere, Tegenbertus, Teingerus* (996–1029). Later we also find *Theinbertus* (12th c.), *Thegenbold* beside *Theinboldus* (12th c.), *Theinardus, Deinard* (1120, 13th
c.), Deinilth (12th c.), Theinothus (12th c.) > Deynoot, and Thegenwalus (12th c.); see Mansion 1924: 169 and Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 74f. In the thirteenth century, we find the West Flemish name Deynen (gen.sg.; 1283) versus South Hollandish Deghen (Dordrecht, 1286). The Middle Dutch appellative deg(h)en 'thane', plural degene, is found from West Flanders to Cleves/Guelders. It appears that degen was the usual form for the appellative in all dialects, whereas dein- is restricted to Flemish personal names after 1000. The same distinction appears in Low German, where Thein- is first attested in the eleventh century. Whereas the appellative is OS thegan, MLG degen 'thane', the names include Theganradus (Werden, 799), Thegenhard (Corvey, 1130), Thegenhard (Neuenheerse, 1163), Thegenhardus (count of Altena, 1183/96), Thegenradus (Halberstadt, 1193), Theinrad (Helmstedt, 11th c.), see Schlaug 1955: 82.

6. MDu. deger ‘thick’ < *digra-. It occurs in tiegere ‘entirely’ in Cleves/Guelders (1201–25) and as deg(h)er ‘completely’ in Hollandish and in eastern Dutch dialects from the fifteenth century onwards. The last Dutch attestations of deger are from the seventeenth century but in Low German it survives into the modern dialects. Modern Dutch degelijk ‘solid, sound’ is derived from deger, as shown by the oldest form degelrec ‘entirely’ (WBrab., 1291–1300). The word soon lost its r, probably by analogy with the noun deghe > deeg ‘growth, health’. The suggestion in EWN s.v. degelijk, viz. that degerlijk with r goes back to the feminine genitive of the noun, must be refuted. The southeastern variant tiegere points to lengthening of an original *i, not *e, and this matches the evidence of the other Germanic languages: ON digr adj. ‘thick’, OFri. adv. digere, diger, deger ‘precisely, exactly’, Gothic digrei ‘fullness’, from PGm. *digra- (Kroonen 2013: 95).

7. -Dei in personal names < *daga- ‘day’. The element -dei occurs as a second member in personal names from Zealand and adjacent coastal provinces. The most frequent is Everdei(us) with ca. 125 attestations from 1085 onwards, especially from Zealand and Zeeuws Flanders, though it is also sporadically attested in Holland (a late instance is Jan Everdey, Hoorn, 1475). Other names containing -dei are MDu. Dockedey (Ghent, 1315); ODu. Fikerdey (1130–61, Benningfort, NH?), MDu. Fekerdei, Vekeldei (12x, between 1285 and 1512 in Dordrecht and Amstelrand; in 1524 Henricus Fijkerdoy in Abcoude); MDu. and Early MoDu. Fockedey (WFla.), Foukedei (Calais, 1298); Laverdei (EFla., 15th c.); ODu. Liefdei (Ghent, 12th c.); ODu. Osdei ‘Ansdag’ (Fla., 11th–12th c.).

55. Since <ou> can stand for /o./ (the dot indicating a half-long vowel) in the Calais documents of the late 13th century, maybe Foukedei can be explained from rounding of *Feke(r)dei (compare Calais van den Woughe to weg ‘road’) rather than from *Folkdag as proposed by Gysseling & Bougard 1963: 38.
The same second member is also found with vowel fronting in Low German: Old Saxon *dagus, -dac, beside *-deg, -dech (Schlaug 1962 passim, Schlaug 1955 passim, Gallée 1993: 45). In fact, the personal names in *dag seem to have been more widely spread in Low German than in Old Dutch.

8. dweil 'towel' < PGm. *þwagilō- (EWAhd II: 909–11; OIC. þvegill m.). Apart from this preform in *g there also existed a variant *þwaxilō-, which had probably introduced voiceless *x from the strong verb *þwaxan (thus Schaffner 2001: 413), yielding OHG dwehila, MoHG Zwehle, MLG dwèle, dweile. Whereas Low German dwèle must contain *x, the form dweile could also go back to *g (see Schaffner 2001: 412). In Middle Dutch, only forms which continue PGm. *x are attested. In western dialects it is dwale, in eastern dialects mostly dwèle (f.), see MNW s.v. dwale.56 Dwaal remains in use in the written language until the seventeenth century. Forms containing *g are only attested after 1500, viz. dweyl (Junius, 1567), MoDu. dweil. Kiliaan (1599) still views dweyl as a Flemish word. Thus, dweil is a typical coastal form. The modern West Flemish variant dwele retains, or has restored, g (MDu. ptc. ghedweghen) and has masculine gender (de Bo 1892: 285). A masculine preform *þwagila- could explain the retention of g (viz. from the Old Dutch disyllabic nom.acc.sg.), and would be an exact cognate of OIC. þvegill.

9. MDu. egede, eeghde 'harrow' < *agifō- (EWAhd II: 958). Early MDu. egede (Limburg, 1240), egheden (WBrab., 1275, 1292), edemakere ‘harrowmaker’ (EFla., 1276–1300), toponym Egt-bampt (Limburg), Late MDu. pl. eeghden (Antwerp, 1330), dat.sg. eyde (Zealand). Kiliaan (1599) has eeghde = egge ‘harrow’, the latter word being the precursor of MoDu. eg. Modern dialectal eid(e) and the derived verb eiden are found in Flanders, Zeeland, North Holland and Groningen.

Thus, palatalization surfaces relatively late in the sources and is restricted to coastal dialects, including Groningen. East Flemish ede-makere is ambiguous: it could reflect *egede with intervocalic syncope of g, but it might also go back to *eide and show the Flemish monophthongization of *ei as in leden ‘to lead’ < leiden. Since egede was trisyllabic, regional differences in the preference for syncope (to *egde) or apocope (to *eged), for which see Marynissen 1995, may lie behind the presence or absence of ei.

56. The entries dwale for 'gausape' and 'manutergium' in the Limburgian Glossarium Bernense from 1240 are difficult to derive from *þwahlō- because of the apparent lack of i-mutation which would be expected to yield e in these dialects. Therefore, this dwale either goes back to a variant *þwahlō- (cf. Got. þwahl n. ‘bath, baptism’, OHG dwahal ‘bath’) or it has introduced /a:/ from the verb dwan /dwaːn/.
10. echel 'leech' < *egalō(n)- (OS egela, MLG egel(e), eyle, ile, OHG egala, MoHG Egel, OFri. ile). The noun occurs in Old Dutch in the toponym Deccelpule, Dekelpole 'The Leech Pool'. With gemination of the voiced velar we find Early MDu. eggele, eggle 'leech' (Limburg, 1240), the surname Eggel (Bruges, 1295), and the personal name Egghelin (WFla., 1297). Late Middle Dutch sources have the plural echelen (Hol., 1477) and the compound watereg(h)el (Teuthonista, 1477). The first forms with palatalization are found in Hollandish ylen (1450–70, 1485) and bloetijl 'blood-leech' (1465–85). Early Modern Dutch has a voiceless fricative in echel (in Dodonaeus and other, Hollandish sources), echel, acchel (Kil.) 'leech', echel (Kil.) 'liver disease with sheep', but palatalization to /i:/ in iile 'leech' (attributed to Guelders by Kiliaan), yle (Cats, 1618), yl (Hexham). Modern dialect forms with palatalization are found in North Holland (iil(e)) and South Holland (il on Goeree).

The gemination in eggel, echel arose after syncope of the medial vowel in egele. The monophthong /i:/ of Low German and of western Dutch dialects points to a preform *igle < *iglō < *igilō(n)-, with suffixal *-il- instead of *-al-. The suffix change might be due to analogical influence of *egila- ‘hedge-hog’ on *egalō(n)- ‘leech’.

11. egedis 'lizard' < *agw-i-bahs(j)ōn- or *agw-i-behsōn- (EWAhd II: 959–61; OHG egidelha, once ei- already in the ninth century; MHG egedehse, eidehse, OS egithassa, MLG egedisse, eygdisse, OE āðexe). Relevant variants in Dutch include Early MDu. egedisse (Limburg 1240), Late MDu. egetisse (Hol. 1450–70), aftisse (Gl. Haarl., 1440–50), haghetissen pl. (Fla. 1351–1400), *hectissen pl. (Brab., 1514). Early Modern Dutch are haechdisse (Vorstermanbijbel, 1528) and egdisse, eechdisse (Plantin, 1573). Kiliaan (1599) gives several variants for ‘lizard’, of which he calls aketisse Flemish, which agrees with later evidence (de Bo 1892 has snaketisse). He guesses that heydisse may be called that way ‘because it lives in uncultivated and arid places’, which is an obvious folk etymology on heide ‘heath’. Other variants in Early Modern Dutch are echdissen (Oudaan, 1661), egghediss’ (de Brune, 1657), echtissen (Middelburg, 1623), egdisse (Statenbijbel, 1688). A modern dialect form with palatalization is South Hollandish eidas, also eindas.

The coastal Dutch forms in (h)a- must be due to folk etymology with haag ‘hedge’, and those in he- with heg(ge) ‘hedge’. The form aftisse looks like a hypercorrect Hollandish form of *agtisse, since Hollandish often retained ft which changed to cht further east and south. Where the High German instances of ei- can easily be explained from g-palatalization, the late appearance of heydisse and Hol. eidas (which has folk etymology with das ‘badger’) makes the same assumption uncertain for Dutch. We have to assume that the forms in (h)e- were pronounced but unwritten for several centuries until 1599, or that the change egC- > eiC- could still happen in the Early Modern Dutch period.
12. *egel* ‘hedgehog’ < *egila-*. Early MDu. *igel* (Limburg 1240, 1270–90), *ygel* (EBrab., 1276–1300), *egel*, gen. *eghels* (WFla., 1287), and the toponym *Eghelsveken* (WBrab.). The usual form in Modern Dutch is *egel*, though Vondel once has *echel* (1617). For the modern dialects, see TNZN 1.10: as far as no heteronyms apply, most dialects have *egel* but Limburgian presupposes *igel*.

The fricative *g* is preserved everywhere. The raising of the stressed vowel to /i:/ in southeastern dialects corresponds to the vowel of the Old Germanic languages and suggests *i* in the second syllable, as in Limburgian *hiemel* ‘heaven’ < *ximila-*, etc. (see Goossens 1988: 70–1, FAND II: 60–1). Unlike in *egel* ‘leech’, there are hardly forms with gemination from *egl-. The absence of gemination and the absence of *g*-palatalization both suggest that *g* and *l* were not in contact in the relevant period for palatalization, contrary to the case of *egilō(n)-* ‘leech’. Hence, for ‘hedgehog’ we may assume that the disyllabic West Germanic nom. acc. *egil* determined the outcome.

13. *-ei* versus – *egge*, *-igge* < *-igjōn-*. A suffix to derive feminine agent nouns from masculine persons and from verbs. All lexemes with this suffix which occur in the thirteenth century are Flemish, mainly from Bruges and Calais, but also from Ghent and from Maerlant’s *Rijmbijbel*. They have the form -igghe with short *i* and geminate /g:/.

Examples are *cammighen* ‘female combers’, *kelre wardigghen* ‘cellar keepsters’, *meesterigghe* ‘mistress’, *viscoighhighe* ‘female fishmonger’. The form -igge remains typical of Flemish throughout the Middle Dutch period. In the few formations attested outside Flemish, the suffix also takes the shapes -egge (in *diefegge* ‘female thief’ and *dwaesegge* ‘female fool’, attested mainly in Holland but also in Groningen and Fryslân) and -ege (in *dieveghe*, *dwaeseghe* ‘female fool’, and *lopereghe* ‘girl on heat’). Suffixal -ege is indistinguishable from (inflected forms of) the productive adjectival suffix -ig, viz. -ige or -ege. In the modern standard language, *dievegge* ‘female thief’ is the only surviving noun with this suffix. It ceased to be productive after the sixteenth century outside West Flemish.

The most likely etymology of the suffix is WGm. *-agjōn-* or *-igjōn-*, but it is only reflected in Dutch and Old English (e.g., OE *scernicge* ‘actress’, *sealticge* ‘dancer’). It seems likely that it was used to build substantivized feminines to the productive adjectival suffix of appurtenance *-ixa-, *-iga-* (Krahe & Meid 1969: 197). The original formation may therefore have been an *i/jō*-stem, with nom.sg. *-agi*, oblique *-agjō-. This means that -ege, with single *g*, could

---

57. A few forms spell -ighe but they alternate with -igghe in texts from the same place.

58. Nowadays the suffix is stressed (similar to other feminine formations in *-in*, *-es*), but until Early Modern Dutch the stress resided on the stem.
continue original *-igō-, the feminine of *-iga-. This actually what MNW assumes for dievegge, which it explains as original *dievige 'the female thievish one'. In contrast, -igge and Old English -icge could represent *-ig-jō-. For -egge, Schönfeld & van Loey (1970 § 178) suggest that it is a contamination of -ege (which they explain from Vulgar Latin -iga) with -igge. This is possible, but, alternatively, -egge might be due to local lowering of unstressed short i to e.

Now we come to the forms with palatalization. Van Loon (2014: 187) explains -ei as the result of palatalization of *-eg in absolute auslaut, as in the personal names in -Dei. Yet in view of Flemish clappeghe beside general trisyllabic klappeye in the sixteenth century, the change of g > j seems to have been intervocalic. The evidence is restricted to three lexemes. The highest number of tokens with -ei (and -ay) is found for Early MoDu. clappeye, MoDu. klappei 'garrulous woman': it is a current word in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and in literary works in Holland until the eighteenth century. Forms with -g- are found in (West) Flemish, viz. Everaert clappeghe (1523), modern dialects klappege, klappeie (de Bo 1892). An adjective klappig, klappich 'garrulous' is attested in Plantin (1573) and in some seventeenth-century authors from Flanders and Holland. This may have been the source of klappei in Holland.

The second word is MoDu. labbei 'garrulous woman'. It is attested in northern Dutch from the middle of the seventeenth century (labbay in Baardt in 1645, labeyen in Van Effen in 1732) and is derived from labben 'to talk, chatter'. Since labbei means the same as klappei but its attestation is much more restricted and starts more than half a century later, it can be argued that labbei was modeled on klappei.

The third noun is kladdei 'filthy woman' (after 1800), which is attested so late that it could easily be a recent formation on the model of klappei. Still, since the adjective kladdig 'filthy' is attested from 1600 onward, and only in Hollandish sources, it is conceivable that kladdei represents a local development of kladdig.

If we are indeed witnessing a change of -ege to -eie in Flemish (and Hollandish?), the conditioning remains to be explained. After all, the suffix -ig is very frequent, and does not normally palatalize its g. Maybe the velar fricative was lenited more strongly in suffixal -ege, between two unstressed vowels, than elsewhere. The development would then be comparable to prefixal ge- > je- in Flemish (§ 9.3). It may not be a coincidence that the palatalization has only surfaced in these pejorative, probably low-register, female nouns.

14. Eiericus (Ghent, 12th c., early 13th c.) = Egericus (Ghent, 12th c.) and (H)eggerik. The first member contains PGm. *agjō- 'edge of a sword' (OS eggia, OE eeg, MDu. (h)egge, ecke, MoHG Ecke). Whereas the name (H)eggerik shows the j-gemination of the simplex egge < *agjō-, Egericus and Eiericus presuppose a
first member *agi- which continues the original Proto-Germanic nominative singular in -i of the i/jō-stems. For Eiericus, Tavernier-Vereecken (1968: 587) assumes that i represents a palatal spirant, not a palatal glide.

15. Eil- < *agila- in names from East Flanders: ODu. Eilbertus, Eilboldus, Eilbodo, Eilfridus, Eiolfus (all from Ghent, 11th c.). The adjective *agila- does not survive as a simplex in Dutch. In Old Saxon, Eilbold first appears in the Werden documents in 816/817 (Blok 1960, nr. 34 = xxxviii), also in Essen, and later in Xanten. The Old Germanic names suggest a preform *agila-, cf. Förstemann 1900: 27–36, but the etymology is uncertain. Proto-Germanic *agla- ‘painful’ or *aglu- ‘difficult’ (Kroonen 2013: 4–5) are no good semantic matches, and would not normally have yielded a first member Agil- but *Agal-. Possibly, *agila- was derived from *agan- ‘to fear’, in the sense of ‘fearful’.

16. eisen, ijzen ‘to be afraid’ < *agisōn-. In Old Dutch, the verb is not attested but the noun (*agis-an-) and adjective (*agis-lik-) are. The Wachtendonck Psalter (10th c.) retains g in all cases except one: nom. egisso ‘fear’, gen. egesin, adv. egisliko ‘terrible’ (all in glosses to the WPs.), gen.sg. egislikes (WPs. 65.05), but so eiselika thing (WPs. 65.03). In the Middle Franconian Rhyming Bible (1150–1200), one form retains egis- and another one has palatalization to eis:- nom.pl. égisliche but nom.sg.m. eislich. Finally, the Leiden Willeram has nom. sg.f. egeslich (3x). In Early Middle Dutch, the noun has disappeared. The verb is always found with palatalization: eisen ‘to be afraid’ (Limburg, 1240), eysen (EBrab., 1276–1300), eysde (WFla., 1285). Similarly ei- in eyselike and other derivatives. After 1500, the verb is mostly spelled as ijs/zen. There are no traces of g in Middle or Modern Dutch.

17. ekster ‘magpie’ < *agistrjōn- f. (see van Wijk 1914: 214–5 for the reconstruction). The closest cognates are OS agastria, agistra, MLG egester, OHG agistra, agestra, MHG ageraster, agrest, egerst. In High German dialects, these forms are continued in Alemannic ägerst(e), cf. EWAhd I: 85f. The basic noun was OHG aga, OE agu < *agō- ‘magpie’. Many of the German forms with an l-suffix also display palatalization of g: OHG agalstra, MHG ailster, egelstere, MLG elster (< *eilster < *agil-), MoHG Elster < *aglistrjōn- (EWAhd I: 72f., 79f., Eickmans 1986: 171–3).

Dutch has no forms with a palatalized reflex of *g. Early MDu. egestre (Limburg 1240) reflects *agi-. Hicstre ‘jay’ in the same vocabulary has taken analogical h- from putative *heher (OE higora, MHG heher, MoHG Hāher ‘jay,

---

magpie’), and its i may be due to analogy with another word (hicken ‘to peck’?); cf. Westphalian hikster (Sarauw 1921: 391), MLG hegester. The western forms with /a:/, such as aecstren gen.sg. (WFla., 1287), aestre (Flanders, 1390–1400), aexter (Holland, 14th c.), have no i-mutation. They go back to a preform with *a in the second syllable or are based on the simplex *agō-. The forms from Late Middle Dutch and Modern Dutch generally confirm the distinction between western a(a) and eastern e(e), with this stipulation that the e-form was also native to Brabant. As ekster, it has become the literary standard. In modern dialects, aakster and variants are frequent in West Flanders and northern East Flanders, ekster in southern East Flanders and Zeeuws Flanders (WVD III.126). Other dialect forms are èèster in eastern Limburgian, egerst in central Limburgian, and aster in Groningen.

18. Fegernodus (Ghent, 948, 11th c., 12th c.); Vegericus (Ghent, 11th c.), Vegericus (1098), Veieric (1306–07), Feyerick (modern family name, Ghent). The first member contains the adjective *fagra- (OHG fagar, OS fagar, MoE fair ‘beautiful’). The raised reflex e from *a in the first syllable is irregular in Dutch, and might point to Ingvaeonic speech according Mansion (1924: 116). The rare change of intervocalic g to (still intervocalic) j in Veieric, Feyerick may be linked to this coastal Dutch phenomenon.

19. Frigelingehem (966), later Frilingim (Ghent, 11th c.), see Mansion 1924: 28, 269. The toponym is possibly identical to the first element in modern Vrijlegem-hoek in West Flanders. Fri- /fri:-/ would then show a change of *igi/e to i in the eleventh century.

20. heinen ‘to fence’ < *hegenen < *xaginōn- and hegen ‘to fence’ < *xagōn-. The reflexes of the latter verb always have g in Dutch. MDu. heghen ‘to fence’ and derivatives are found in northeastern Dutch. In the Early Modern period, heghen ‘to protect, guard’ also turns up in Flanders, Holland, and Zealand, while Kiliaan (1599) has verhegen ‘to improve’, as do modern eastern dialects of Twente and Achterhoek. Compare MLG heghen, the usual form, but heynen ‘to defend’ in a charter from 1345 from Oldenburg.

The reflexes of *xaginōn- fall into two categories. Brabant and Flanders favour g, witness heghenen ‘to furnish, clean, decorate’ (Kiliaan; de Brune), vereghenen ‘to tidy up’ (Bruges), beheghenen ‘to harm’ (Eversaert, Bruges), on-theghenen (van Ghistele, Antwerp). Guide Gezelle (WFla., 19th c.) has afhe-genen ‘to stake out’. The meaning ‘tidy up’ is related to ‘fence off’. Holland and Zealand show palatalized reflexes of the verb in the meaning ‘to fence’, compare MDu. heinen (Delft, 1299), beheijnen (Gouda, ca. 1340; Goudriaan et al. 2000: 25), heyninge ‘fence’ (various places), Kiliaan heyninck ‘fence’. In the seventeenth century we find the verbs omheinen and beheynen in texts from the same region.
The difference between Flemish *hegenen* and Hollandish *heinen* is conspicuous. It could be due to different patterns of syncope, but it goes against the usual geographic relationship as seen in Hollandish *regen* vs. Flemish *rein* ‘rain’. Possibly, *g* in *hegenen* could be restored on the model of *hegen*, where the context for palatalization was not given.

21. *jegen(s)* ‘against’ < *gagin, *gagna/i*. See § 9.1.2 above for the attestations and the reflexes of initial *g*-. In Old Dutch, the word-internal *g* is retained throughout. The same goes for all appellatives in thirteenth-century Dutch. An exception occurs among the Flemish names attested in French documents from Calais from 1296 and 1298, where three persons have the family name *Ghei(n)mar* (Gysseling & Bougard 1963: 39). The editors explain the name as *Gagin-mār*, with the element *gagin-* as also found in some other Old Germanic names ( Förstemann 1900: 564f.). If this etymology is correct, we might explain the palatalization as a case of *gn > jn* in a polysyllabic word (cf. the names in *Mein- and Rein-* discussed below), whereas *g* stayed in disyllabic gegen and in *jegen*.

In the Wachtendonck Psalter, ODu. *geginwirdi* ‘conspectus’ is usually attested as *geginuuirdi* or *genuuirdi*. The deviant forms *gaienuuerde* and *gainuueierde* in glosses to Psalms 5.9 and 9.26 are interpreted by de Grauwe 1979–82 I: 171–3 as Middle Franconian forms left from the Vorlage of the text. In view of the frequent absence of *i*-mutation in the OHG forms of this noun (*gagenwerti, gaginwurti*, etc., see the attestations in de Grauwe, loc.cit.), this seems the most likely solution.

22. *kegel* ‘cone, skittle’ < *kagila-. This noun is always attested with preserved *g*. In Old Dutch, there are five instances of a personal name *Kegel, Keghel* (EFla., 12th c.), while in the thirteenth century, *keghel* is attested in South Holland, East Flanders and West Brabant. Kiliaan (1599) mentions *keghel* as ‘cone, post, etc.’, and another word *keghel* as an antiquated Hollandish word for ‘boulder’ and as a Flemish variant for ‘icicle’. We find *kegel* in all of Modern Dutch. See nr. 24 *keilen* for the derived verb.

23. *kei* ‘stone, boulder’ < *kagi*. The presence of *g* in West Germanic is established by the cognate noun *kegge* ‘wedge’ (Early MDu. nom.sg. *kigghe, gen. sg. [s]ceggen) from *kagjō-, and by the fact that *kegel < *kagila- means both ‘cone’ and ‘boulder’ and can formally be a derivative of *kagi. Kei and kegge can go back to a Proto-Germanic *i/jō*-stem with nom. *kagī, gen. *kagjōs. In Dutch, all forms of *kagi* have palatalized *g* to *j*, probably yielding *kegi or *kege and then keie. The oldest form is the toponym *Keidyc* (Fla., 1153). Next, it occurs in the names *Paulus Keyacker* ‘stone-field’ (1272), *Hanninus Keie* (1281; Debrabandere 2003), and in the appellative *keyen* pl. (Brab., 14th c.). Early Modern Dutch has *keye*, Modern Dutch *kei(e).*
24. *keilen* ‘throw’ < *kagilōn-. The oldest meaning is ‘to play a game (of skittles)’, which shows that the verb was derived from *kegel* ‘cone, skittle’: MDu. *keylen* ‘a certain game’ and *keylbane* ‘skittle alley, bowling alley’ in the Statutes of Leiden, *keegelen of keylen* ‘to bowl’ (Utrecht, 1640). The more general meaning ‘to throw’ surfaces in the seventeenth century. Most or all Early Modern attestations of this verb are from the coastal provinces, and nearly all show palatalization.

25. *kregel* ‘touchy, prickly’ < *krigila- ‘stubborn’ (see Kroonen 2013: 304 for the original meaning of the verb *krīgan* ‘to be stubborn’), cognate with MLG *crighel*, *kregel* ‘alert, mobile’. Early MDu. *kriegel* (WBrab., 1265) with /i/ or /iː/, Late MDu. *eincregel* (Teuthonista, 1477), Early MoDu. *krijghel* ‘touchy’ (Kiliaan, 1599; with introduction of the vowel of the verb *krijgen*), *kregel* (Coster, 1619). Modern *kregel* is mainly found in northern Dutch sources but also in Flemish and Brabantish. No palatalization is ever attested in this adjective in Dutch.

26. *leger* ‘lair, army’ < *legjan-. The noun may be hidden in the Old Dutch toponym *Legurlo* (Veluwe, 855 copy 891–910). Middle Dutch *legher* can mean ‘position’ (e.g., *te lants leghere* ‘as long as the land lies’), and then ‘lair, army camp, army’, which is the meaning of MoDu. *leger*. No palatalization attested.

27. *leggen* ‘to lay’ < WGM. *lagjan-. Due to j-gemination, *gg* arose in the infinitive, the 1SG, 1PL. and 3PL. present indicative, and in the present subjunctive. Thus, in order to determine the extent of *g*-palatalization in this verb we must study the 2SG., 3SG. and 2PL. present, the preterite, and the past participle. The survey will be restricted to the Old and Early Middle Dutch periods, since paradigmatic leveling renders the original situation opaque in later centuries. In Old Dutch, the present is only attested in the 2PL. imperative *umbeleged* ‘put around’ and *underleged* ‘put below’ in the Leiden Willeram. The preterite occurs as 3SG. *legede*, 3PL. *lege* in the Middle Franconian Rhyming Bible, and the participle as *geleget* in the LW. Thus, *g* is preserved everywhere, and in all these forms it is in intervocalic position.

There is more variation in the Early Middle Dutch period. Table 17 provides a survey of the attested forms. It shows that *g* is preserved in the two forms which occur of the 2SG. pres., and in all 3SG. and 2PL. pres. forms, with the exception of once *leit* ‘lays’ and once *leidi* ‘lays he’ in the works of Van Maerlant, who wrote in West Flemish. In the preterite, however, all dialects show *ei* except for the southeastern area, which has *leged(e) and belachten*, found in literary sources (*Tristant* and *Moraalboek; belachten* once in the Aiol fragments). In the participle, there is more variation: *g* is generally preserved Holland and Brabant, and partly in Cleves/Guelders and in West Flanders, but palatalization to *ei* is found in most of the Flemish forms, including one from Zealand, and in Cleves/Guelders.
This distribution gives the impression that \( g \) was generally retained when it was followed by a vowel in Old Dutch, viz. in the present inflection and in (many forms of) the participle. The nearly exceptionless palatalization in the preterite would seem to contradict this assumption, since the Cleves/Guelders forms show a vowel after \( g \). Yet a different treatment of the preterite from the present and the participle would correspond with a similar split in the data for Old Saxon *leggian*. In Old Saxon, we find a suffixless preterite *lagda, lagdun*, once *legda*, in ms. C of the Heliand, and *legda*, once *ledda*, in ms. M; the participle is generally *gilegid* (Gallée 1993: 263). We can hypothesize that *lei-* in the Dutch preterite matches the absence of a suffix vowel in the Old Saxon preterite (ending -*da*, not -*ida*), whereas the retention of *\( g \)* in the Early Middle Dutch participle (partly) and the 3SG.PRES. (generally) would correspond with the presence of a vowel between *\( g \)* and *\( t/d \)* in Old Saxon. In the past participle, the variation between *eg* and *ei* may be explained by the existence of paradigmatic alternations which depended on the exact form of the ending, that is, preservation of *\( g \)* in *\( ga-lagid \)* but palatalization in *\( ga-lagd- \)* (cf. Gallée 1993: 251). In short, the variation in Early Middle Dutch could be the result of paradigmatic alternation between unsyncopated (> *geleged*) and syncopated (> *geleid*) preforms. As we will see below, a comparable situation pertains to *zeggen* ‘to say’.

The West Flemish forms *leit* ‘he lays’ from the late thirteenth century might foreshadow the levelling taking place in the following centuries (van Bree 1969). But since one of the three attested forms is *leidi* ‘lays he’, with the enclitic personal pronoun attached to the verb, one could also explain *leit* as having arisen in trisyllabic combinations of verb plus enclitic pronoun, with syncope of the middle vowel followed by palatalization of *\( g \)*: *\( liget \)* *\( hī \)* ‘lies-he’ > *\( leget-ī \)* > *\( leg’ti \)* > *\( leiti \)*. In that case, the development to *\( leit/d-i \)* would be comparable with that of the participle *geleit*.

28. *liggen* ‘to lie’ < WGm. *legjan-* << PGm. *leg-i-* (Kortlandt 1990: 8). In view of the strong preterite and participle, only the present sg. forms *ligis* and *ligip* (OS *ligid* ‘lies’) and 2PL. *ligip* are relevant for our investigation. Since the verbs *leggen* and *liggen* have often influenced each other or even merged, it seems advisable to restrict the initial investigation to the same period as with *liggen*, that is, to Old and Early Middle Dutch. Unfortunately, the 2SG. and 2PL. are not attested before 1300, which leaves only the 3SG. Mooijaart (1992: 188) discusses the forms ‘lays’ and ‘lies’ together, because in principle they have the same etymological form: *\( du \) leges, \( hi \) leget*. But although her decision can be defended on graphemic grounds, the present paradigms of both verbs did not completely overlap in all dialects (the stem vowel was different, *\( ā \)* vs. *\( e \)*) and their preterite and past participle remained completely distinct. Therefore, the inner-paradigmatic analogies affecting *leggen* and *liggen* may have been quite different, which justifies a separate discussion of both verbs.
In Old Dutch, the Leiden Willeram has the forms ligad, lighet, liget (all once) ‘lies’ and analigat ‘concerns’. Table 18 shows the distribution of forms in Early Middle Dutch. The oldest form in Flanders, Brabant, Zealand and Holland is clearly leg(h)et with an open syllable; syncope leads to leeght, leecht and other variants. As Mooijaart notes, syncope is more frequent in East Flanders and Brabant, though it is also found elsewhere. In Limburg, the stressed vowel is usually i rather than e, and the form <ligt> can in principle have a long vowel or a short one (in the latter case, it could have adopted it from the infinitive and 1sg., 1pl., 3pl., or it escaped open syllable lengthening). In some forms, e.g. leet in West Brabant, g may have been syncopated (van Loey 1976: 105). Forms with a short vowel (legghet) show the influence of the 1sg. and 13pl. forms with gemination.

### Table 17. The 13th-century forms of leggen (incl. compound verbs) as per CG. The numbers refer to the tokens attested in the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2sg.pres.</th>
<th>3sg.present</th>
<th>2pl.pres., ipt.</th>
<th>preterite</th>
<th>participle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFla.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>leget 5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>leide, -leiden</td>
<td>g(h)eleghet et 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leghet 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>passim</td>
<td>yleghet 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leeght 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>leedde 1</td>
<td>ghelecht 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>legt 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>lede 2</td>
<td>gheleit/d 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leec- 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>leden 1</td>
<td>beleit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leit 2, leidi ‘lays he’ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ghelet 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFla.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>leghet 1</td>
<td>leegt 1</td>
<td>leide 5</td>
<td>gheleit 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leeght 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>leiden 2</td>
<td>geleid 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leght 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>leedde 1</td>
<td>gheleed 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBrab.</td>
<td>legs 1</td>
<td>leget 1</td>
<td>leeght 2</td>
<td>leide</td>
<td>geget 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oplegnt 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>leiden</td>
<td>g(h)elegnt 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leeght 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>passim</td>
<td>gheleit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBrab.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>leide passim</td>
<td>gelegt 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBrab.</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>gheleghet 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleves/</td>
<td>leges 1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>lechet 1</td>
<td>belachten 1</td>
<td>gelagt 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oplegede 1</td>
<td>geleit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>legede 2</td>
<td>geleit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leged ic 1</td>
<td>geleit/d 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>leghet 1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>leide 2</td>
<td>gheleghet 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>leeght 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>leyden 1</td>
<td>vte ghileghet 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zealand</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>vte beleit 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Old Dutch, the Leiden Willeram has the forms ligad, lighet, liget (all once) ‘lies’ and analigat ‘concerns’. Table 18 shows the distribution of forms in Early Middle Dutch. The oldest form in Flanders, Brabant, Zealand and Holland is clearly leg(h)et with an open syllable; syncope leads to leeght, leecht and other variants. As Mooijaart notes, syncope is more frequent in East Flanders and Brabant, though it is also found elsewhere. In Limburg, the stressed vowel is usually i rather than e, and the form <ligt> can in principle have a long vowel or a short one (in the latter case, it could have adopted it from the infinitive and 1sg., 1pl., 3pl., or it escaped open syllable lengthening). In some forms, e.g. leet in West Brabant, g may have been syncopated (van Loey 1976: 105). Forms with a short vowel (legghet) show the influence of the 1sg. and 13pl. forms with gemination.
Table 18. The 13th-century forms of ligt ‘lies’ as per CG. The numbers refer to the tokens attested in the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3SG. PRES. with g or ch</th>
<th>3SG. PRES. without g or ch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFla.</td>
<td>leget 14, leghet 445, gheleghet 1</td>
<td>leit 23, leet 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leeght 3, leecht 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>legghet 1, lecg(h)et 1, legt 21, leght 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leghet 1, leicht 2, leight 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>licht 2, lich 2, lig 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFla.</td>
<td>leget 17, leghet 249</td>
<td>leid 5 (Oudenaerde), leit 97 (67 in Oudenaerde, 19 in Petegem, 1 in Geraardsbergen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leeght 8, leecht 10, leegd 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leghet 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leg(h)t 25, leght 2, lecht 5, lecgd 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBrab.</td>
<td>geleget 12</td>
<td>leiet (Dilbeek 1296)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leeght 4, leecht 8</td>
<td>leit 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>legt 16, leg(h)t 5, gelegt 2</td>
<td>leet 3 (St-Genesius-Rode)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBrab.</td>
<td>leg(h)t 5, geleghet 1</td>
<td>leit 2 (Leefdaal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBrab.</td>
<td>legt 4</td>
<td>leit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limburg</td>
<td>leget 1, legt 1, liget 4</td>
<td>leit 1, leid 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ligt 398, light 1, liech 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleves/Guelders</td>
<td>legit 1, ligit 1, leig 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>leeght 1, lecg(h)et 1, leght 1</td>
<td>leit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zealand</td>
<td>leghet 3, leghd 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form *leit* is a (small) minority form everywhere, except for the East Flemish town of Oudenaerde. Here, *leit* is much more frequent than *leghet, leecht*. Nearly all these verb forms occur in the document CG nr. 1040 which collects the rents of the hospital of Oudenaerde. It is dated to 1291 but not all entries are from the same date or hand. The forms occurring in CG 1040 are *leit* (several dozens), *leid* (5x in one document) *leget 2x, leghet 2x, leecht 4x, leeght 1x*. The last two forms are in entries actually belonging to the fourteenth century. Thus, *leit* may belong to the dialect of one or more specific scribes.

Van Loey (1980: 58) assumes that the forms in -ei- have resulted from a development of *ege* > *ei*, but this is contradicted by the outcome *ege > ēge* > *leget, leecht*; note that both forms (with *ei* and with *g/ch*) can be found in the same places. In CRM14, 3s. *leit* ‘lies’ gains in relative frequency and is found in all regions of Dutch (beside *leghet*, which is found, e.g., in Groningen, Holland, Utrecht, Brabant, Zealand, Flanders and Limburg, and *leeg(h)t* in Brabant). The fact that 13th-century *leit* is found in all major dialects, but everywhere as a minority form, could suggest the following solution. Regular ODu. *liget*
became early western and central MDu. leget > leegt. With inverted word order, and with a pronoun attached in enclitic position, syncope in a trisyllabic form would apply, hence *liget ‘hi > leget-ī > leg’ti ‘he lies’. In the latter form, the development to leit-i in Late Old Dutch would be comparable with the participle of ‘to lay’. The variant leit would then have been generalized in the fourteenth century from inverted clauses.

29. Leie ‘Lys’, river name in Flanders. The oldest attested form is Legia (694 copy 941 to 11th c.), which is followed up by Leia (821 copy 941 to 1223), Leie (838 copy 941) and by the Romance outcome Lis, Lisia, Lisa (11th c.) which confirms an original sequence *gj. Early MDu. Leie is attested as leye or leie, twice as locye, in West and East Flemish.

Usually, PGM. *gj develops into a geminate *ggj and then becomes Dutch gg, as in MDu. brugge < *brugjō- ‘bridge’. This suggests that Legia > Leia did not contain consonantal *j but vocalic [i], due to a date of borrowing of this hydronym after the rise of PGM. *gj or possibly to the influence of a paradigmatic variant *legi in an original i/jō-stem.

30. meid ‘young woman, maiden, maid’ < *magafj-. Old Dutch magath, magathe (DAT.SG., LW) and maget ( NOM. and DAT.SG., MRB) retain g. The same is true for thirteenth-century Dutch, where the southeastern dialects show i-mutation of the stressed vowel to e(e), viz. in DAT.PL. meeghden, meghden (EBrab.), whereas all other dialects retain unmutated a(a), viz. in maghet, maghede, magt, mae-ght, PL. magheden, in magit (Cleves/Guelders), and in the diminutives magediin, magedine (WBrab.), magheden (WFla.). The few Early Middle Dutch attestations from Holland and Zealand also have no i-mutation: magheden (PL.; 2x Kloosterzande in Zealand, 6x Hol.), maghet (2x EHoll.), maghen (2x Dordrecht). The evidence from CG also shows that syncope of the second vowel was spreading in the thirteenth century. Similarly, *maga/id-dōm ‘maidenhood’ results in magitum (Cleves/Guelders, 1201–25), magedum (Limburg, 1240), and with syncope in maeghdomlēc ‘maidlenly’ (EBrab.).

In Late Middle Dutch, forms with ei surface in northern coastal Dutch dialects: meyt (Delft, 1488), eenen cleenen meytken (DAT.; Holl.). In 1599, Kiliaan attributes meyd to Friesland, Guelders and Holland; meyt is further found in Utrechts Placaatboek (1571), and in the Hollandsch literature of the seventeenth century (even as mayt in Hooft). The time and regions where maghet and meid first appear imply that, in spite of the form magit in the southeastern romance Floyris ende Blantseflur (1201–25), Dutch meid does not reflect *agi- > *-egi- > *-eji- > -ei- as held by Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 77 and EWN. In fact, the second syllable contained a in western Old Dutch. Rather, meid developed in or around Holland from *magd- which had arisen in polysyllabic forms such
as the oblique singular and the plural paradigm. The rise of *ei presupposes syncope of schwa in such forms. It is striking that *ei only appears at the very end of the Middle Dutch period. In contrast, *ei appears much earlier and geographically more widespread in *meisen and *meisje, to which we turn now.

31. *meisen 'young girl'. The diphthong is found from the earliest attestations onwards, and the spellings with <c> in 1236 and with occasional <ss> in later texts point to voiceless /s/: *meicin, *meisin (Ghent, 1236), *meisijn (EFla., 1290), een maysen kint (1315). Early MoDu. *meyssen is found quite generally in Holland, Zealand and Flanders, but also in Brabant (Lindemans 1954: 265); Kiliaan has *meydsen, *meyssen. Voiceless s suggests a preform *meid-sin > *meissin. All early forms stem from coastal Dutch, where we also first find g-palatalization in the simplex *meid in the fifteenth century (see nr. 30 above). Thus, *meissin goes back to *meidsin < *magdsin- < *magad-sīn- (Lindemans 1954: 264, Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 228). The length of the derivative explains why syncope and hence g-palatalization affected this word a few centuries before the simplex *meid.

The diphthong *ei develops via *ai into *aa in several modern dialects. An early example is *maasen, pl. *maasens (Biestkens, De Klucht van Claas Kloet, 1619) in Amsterdam. In South Brabant, the diminutive *masken (first attestation: *maesken 1766, Brussels) is widespread in the twentieth century. According to Lindemans 1954: 265f., *meisen > *masen arose in Brussels, at the earliest around 1600, and *masken is its local diminutive. From there it spread to the surrounding area.

32. *meiskin, *meisje 'little girl'. Early MDu. *meiskin and *meisken in West Flemish, and *meiskijn also occurs in other Hollandish and Flemish sources before 1500. The complete absence of forms in *d makes the etymology *magid-s-kin- (Lindemans 1954: 264) unlikely, even though it cannot be completely excluded. Since suffixation of -kijn is regular after words ending in s, *meis-kijn could be a conscious remake on the basis of *meisin, after *meidsin > *meissin had become morphologically opaque in Middle Dutch when -sin died out as a diminutive suffix.

The form *meisken is still quite general in all of southern Early Modern Dutch; later it was replaced by *meisje on the basis of Hollandish. In Holland, *meisje makes its first appearance in 1600. It may be due to a replacement of the suffix -ke by the productive diminutive -je, or it may have arisen as a backformation to *meissen, *maassen, which looked like plural forms to a singular *meis, *maas. The presence of *d in Kiliaan’s *meyd-sken is problematic in that -sken is normally only added to velar-final stems; from *meid, the regular southern Dutch diminutive would be *meidje. Hence, *meydsken looks like a remake of earlier MDu. *meisken.

34. *peil* ‘level’ < *pagila-. From this noun was derived a verb *peilen* ‘to measure’. In Middle and Early Modern Dutch, there is a clear geographic distinction between palatalization in coastal dialects and the retention of *g* in Brabant and eastern dialects. For instance, we find MDu. *peil*, *ghepeilen* ‘to measure’, *wijnpeylder* ‘who measures the wine’ in Holland, Early MoDu. *peylen* ‘to measure’, *peyl* ‘measure, level’ in Holland, and *peyl* ‘task’, *peylen* ‘to give a task’ in Flanders. We have *peil(en) passim* in Hollandish sources from the seventeenth century on, but MDu. *pegel*, Kiliaan *peghel* ‘measure, level’, also ‘pint’ in Saxon and Guerlrish, as well as *peghelen* ‘to measure’ and *pegheler* ‘who measures’. In the modern standard, *peil* ‘level’ and *pegel* ‘level mark’ coexist with semantic differentiation.


The first member may be identical with MLG and eastern MDu. *page* ‘horse’, an *n*-stem (van Berkel & Samplonius 2006: 361), in which case this is the most westerly attestation of that noun. The twelfth-century attestations suggest original *Pagin-dreht* which developed into *Paindreht* (assuming *h* in *Pahindrecht* to be a hiatus) and unattested *Peindrecht*. The name then either lost or did not spell the nasal (*Peydreth*) or monophthongized the diphthong and shortened it before the consonant cluster (*Peendrecht > Pendrecht*).

36a. *regel* f. ‘rule, line’ < *regulō- from Lat. régula (OHG regula, regile, MoHG Regel, OE regol). Early MDu. *regle* (Limburg, 1240), *reghele* ‘ruler; regimen, canon’, in Late Middle Dutch usually *regel(e) but also regule.*

36b. Late MDu. *reggele* ‘row’.

36c. Late MDu. *righelen* (Ghent, 1380) ‘cross-bars’, *rigelen* (northeastern Dutch) ‘shelves’. Early MoDu. *rijghel, rijghel*, variant *richel* (Kiliaan, 1573, 1599), *rychelen* (pl.; 1688), StDu. *richel* ‘ledge’; also *verrigelen* ‘to tax’ (16th c., North Holland).
The three variants a, b and c are given according to the different stressed vowels in Middle Dutch, viz. /e/, /ɛ/ and /i/. There is some uncertainty in the dictionaries about whether all these words go back to Latin *regula* ‘rule’, and by which path. Some variants have been claimed to reflect a separate Proto-Germanic word *rigala-*, which partly merged with *regula*. I follow the reasoning of Franck & van Wijk (1912 s.v. *regel*) and of EWN, viz. that all the attested meanings can be derived from Latin *regula* and that there is no need to assume two different etyma. The semantic differentiation between ‘rule’, ‘row’, ‘shelves’, etc. can be understood on the basis of the explanation put forward by Franck & van Wijk.

Thus, 36a *regel* probably shows the effect of the learned word *regula* which caused the restoration of g at several moments in history. The form 36b *reggele* must have arisen from *regle* by means of fortition of g before l, and thus stands very close to the form of 36a. In 36c, the long i of *righel* can be explained from Latin *ē* having been adopted as i by the Germanic vowel system. This adoption is typical of the earliest layer of Latin loanwords with ē, such as Dutch *krijt* ‘chalk’ and *ijken* ‘to check’: at that period, there was no other long vowel phoneme corresponding to Latin ē. Syncope in trisyllabic forms would have yielded *riglen* in Late Old Dutch, whence with fricative fortition *rijchel* and, with concomitant vowel shortening before the cluster /xl/, the variant *richel* /ˈrikɛl/. One could alternatively explain *richel* from an original short *i* in *rigulō-*, as in the case of *tichel* ‘tile’ < Lat. *tegula*, but contrary to what is found for ‘tile’, there are no early Eastern Dutch attestations of /i/ in the first syllable (though compare OHG *rigil*, MoHG *Riegel* < *rigila-*). The western location of the attestations of *richel*, and the fact that they do not appear before Kiliaan, suggest that they go back to earlier *rīgl-*. 

No forms in *reil(-)* are attested; WFle. *reile* ‘lath’ is regarded as a loanword from French *reille* by WNT.

37. *regen*, *rein* ‘rain’ < *regn-*, *regenen* ‘to rain’ < *regnōn* or *regnjan*-. Old Dutch has *regan* (nom.sg., WPs. and LW) and *regin* (acc.sg., WPs.). In Early Middle Dutch, g is retained in southern and eastern dialects: *reg(h)en* (Limburg, Cleves/Guelders, Brabant, EFla.), *regenwater* (Limburg, 1240), and in the verb *regenen/reggenen* (from Limburg to East Flanders). West Flemish sources from the thirteenth century vacillate between eg and ei. In the verb, *rein*- (12x) is the only attested form. In the noun, *rein-* occurs in the genitive and dative singular (*reins, reine*) and also in fifty percent of the nom.acc. forms (*rein* 8x) and in the compound *reinwater* (3x), as against *reghen* (7x), *reghene* (1x), and *reghenboghen* ‘rainbow’. A possible interpretation of this variation is that the disyllabic form *regen* remained unchanged, whereas polysyllabic forms such as gen.sg. *regenes*, 3sg.pres. *regenet*, pret. *regenede* underwent syncope and egn became ein. We also find *rein, reen* in Late Middle Flemish, and Kiliaan (1599) ascribes *reyn* and the verb *reynen* to Flanders and Guelders.
38. Reinhard, Reinaert < *ragin-hard-. The noun *ragin- ‘counsel, decision; fate’ occurs very frequently as the first element of personal names. Whereas g is always found palatalized in Reinhard, some of the other Old Dutch names preserve g in old attestations, for instance Regenbaldus (12th c.) beside Reinboldus (1034–58; 12th c.), Reiboldi (1201–50); Regenfridus (838) beside Reinfridus (996–1029), Reynfridus (1124), Reinfridus (1162), etc. (from the 11th c.); Regemarus (12th c.) beside Reimarus (12th c.), cf. Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 58–61. By comparison, in Old Saxon, Reinbrat first appears in an 833 document (copy 901–55) from Werden (Blok 1960: 202, nr. 46), although the same name is spelled as Reginberti in the list of witnesses at the end of the document. Rein- and Rayn- are also frequently found in the personal names from the ninth century of the Traditiones Corbeienses, which are preserved in an eleventh-century copy (Schlaug 1962: 144–7). Thus, the change of Regin- > Rein- can be dated contemporaneously with that of Megin- > Mein-.

39. ODu. sigil in the Latin text porcos tempore glandinis quod sigil uocant pascendos introducant ‘they let the pigs in to let them eat in the time of the acorns, which they call sigil’. This is an unedited fragment from the Gysseling collection, dated to around 1131 and without known provenance (ONW s.v. sigil1). The gloss sigil seems to refer to the acorn harvest, and accordingly a connection with ODu. sigan, MoD zijgen ‘to collapse, fall down, descend’ has been proposed. The word could represent a deverbal l-adjective *sig-ila- or *sīg-ila-. If this etymology is correct, it would show that g was retained between i-vowels at this stage of Old Dutch. Since we know nothing about the history of the text fragment, it is possible that sigil was copied from an earlier source; hence 1131 is only a terminus post quem non.

40. steil ‘steep’ < *staig-la- (Seebold 1970: 466) or *staigula- (Heidermanns 1993: 541f.). The adjective is derived from the verb stijgen < *stīgan-, cognate forms being OHG steigal, MHG steigel, and OE *stēgle. The g is lost in all Dutch descendants (Middle and Modern Dutch steil) and in most of Low German (usually MLG steil but also stegel). The Germanic reconstruction is not completely clear: as noted by Heidermanns, adjectives in * -la- suffixed to the root in the PGM. a-grade are rare. The more usual form of the suffix is *-ula-, but then the root usually takes the zero grade. Hence, Heidermanns suggests that *staigla- might be a contamination of *staigra- ‘steep’ with *stikla- ‘reaching up’. The existence of an adjective *staigra- is shown indirectly in Dutch by its derived noun, MoDu. steiger, ODu. stēger, Early MDu. steigher, stegher ‘ladder, stairs’ < *staig-rō-. Hence, for steil a preform *staigla- seems more likely than *staigula-.

41. tegel, tichel ‘tile’ < *tigulō- < Lat. tegula and MDu. tigele, tiechle < *tēgulō- < Lat. tēgula. The various reflexes show that two different Latin words were borrowed, viz. the older variant tēgula and a more recent variant tegula. The latter probably introduced the short root vowel of the verb tegere ‘to cover’. The long
è is reflected in the OHG diphthongs ia, ie (OHG ziegala, zagal), in OS tēgala, and in Middle Dutch spelings with ie (and probably also those with tig-). The short vowel appears in OE tigele, ON tigl, and is continued in Middle Dutch as /e:/ (from lengthening and lowering in open syllable), southeastern /i:/, and before ch as short /ɪ/. In Old Dutch, the noun is only attested in two toponyms, viz. Tiegel (1100), de Tigele (1195) ‘Tegelen’ in Limburg, and Tigelrode (866 copy 18th c.), Tigelrotha (868 copy 18th c.), Tithelrode (1036 copy 1051–1100), Tilroda (1187), Tirolde (1206) ‘Tielrode’ in East Flanders. The latter name seems to lose its intervocalic g between 1036 and 1187; this is reminiscent of other sequences in *-igV-, especially ijl ‘leech’.

For the Middle Dutch period it is difficult to get a reliable geographic picture of the different variants with e/ie/i and g/ch. The fortition before l in tichel is not attested before 1350, and may be due to syncope in forms which in the thirteenth century still had g. Kiliaan (1599) seems to regard tichel(steen) ‘tile’ as the normal (that is, Brabantish) word, whereas he ascribes teghel(steen) to Saxon, Sicambrian (= Guelrish), Hollandish and Flemish. Compare the Middle Low German variants teg(h)el, teigel, western MLG tichel. No variant *teil is attested.

42. teil ‘trough’ f. < *tigulō- < Lat. tegula. One Old Dutch form is attested in thelen (acc.pl., 1199). Next comes the surname Teil (1284–95, WFla.) and Late Middle Dutch teelen (pl., 1441, Sluis in Flanders), teele in Flanders, Brabant, Zealand next to teilen. Kiliaan (1599) has teyle as his normal form, and teele as Flemish variant. In modern dialects, according to WNT, Zealand, Flanders and Twente have teel(e), elsewhere we find teil(e) ‘trough, bowl’.

This noun presents palatalization of g in all dialects, and a further change of ei to ee in Flanders and Twente. No forms preserving g are attested. The close connection with degel, diggel, originally ‘pan, cauldron’ obliges us to assume that teil, too, was borrowed from Latin tegula. Franck & van Wijk 1912 suggest that the general shift to ei in teil as opposed to the retention of g in tegel ‘tile’ was due to the semantic isolation of the meaning ‘trough’ of teil, whereas tegel retained the meaning of tegula and may have been reborrowed several times. In any case, the general loss of g in teil throughout Dutch and Low German renders an earlier stage *tegl- very likely. The difference in vocalism with degel, diggel (see nr. 4 above) can be due to the same cause: fem. *tigulō- would have become ODu. *tigl- by syncope in most of its forms, unlike degel < *digl < *digla-.

43. teil ‘tail’ < *tagla- (Got. tagl, OE tagl, OHG zagal, NHG Zagel ‘tail’). In Early Modern Dutch we find teil with Frisian authors (Spranhuisen 1634, Hilarides 1695) and with Jacob Westerbaen from Holland (ca. 1650). In modern dialects of West Flanders (de Bo 1892, though unmentioned in WVD) and Zealand
(teil, têêle ‘tail’ in WZD), teil is only attested in fixed, alliterating expressions, such as van top tot teyl ‘from tip to toe’, over top en teil ‘top over tail’, met top en teil ‘completely’, teil noch top ‘not at all’. In Groningen, the plural tails refers to a panicle of oats, and in North Holland, teil means the long, dried-out stalk of certain grasses.

It is striking that *tagla- has palatalized reflexes in all coastal dialects, unlike nagel ‘nail’ < *nagla-, where palatalization of g is only found in Frisian. Possibly, the appurtenance of nagel to the core vocabulary led to its introduction from the high-prestige, non-palatalizing varieties (Brabant, East Flanders) into all coastal dialects. The word tagel, however, was already replaced by staart in the inland dialects at the start of the Middle Dutch period, which would explain why teil could survive in specialized meanings in the coastal dialects.

44. Teylingen a toponym in South Holland. Found in Old Dutch as Taglingi (9th c. copy 11th c.) and Teilinc (end 12th c.). Between 1200 and 1300, there are 69 attestations of the place-name, 29 of which have initial T(h)ei/yl- against 40 with T(h)el-. As there is no evidence for an original vowel between *g and *, we may assume that Teil- directly reflects *Taglingia-, a derivative of *tagla- ‘tail’.

45. vleel ‘flail’ < *flagila-. The form vlegel with preserved g is at home in the inland dialects of Dutch but also occurs in Flemish and Hollandish. The earliest Middle Dutch forms are vleghel (Fla., 1380–1425), vlegel (Fla., 1351), and dative vleigele (Hol./Fla./Brab., 1390–1410). In Early Modern Dutch, the eastern and Brabantish vocabularies all have vlegel, but vlegel also occurs in texts from Holland. The palatalized form vlei is found especially in Flanders and Zealand, thus in Middle Dutch plurals vleyle (Zealand), vleylen (Bruges), and in modern West Flemish vle(e)l, vlei.

46. Weinebrugge, a West Flemish toponym and the former name of St.-Michiels (near Bruges). The earliest attestations are UUeinebrugge (962 copy ca. 1050, 1038), UUai[ne]brucge (964), UUanebrugge (966), UUeinabriga (1089), Weinabrigga (1089). The name has been interpreted as containing *wagna- ‘cart, wagon’, see Leys 1961, who points to the toponym Weynbritse, Wymbritse (a regular reflex of *wagna-brugjō in Frisian) in southwestern Fryslân, which was Dutchified to Waghenbrugghe in the fourteenth century. The disadvantage of this explanation is that ‘wagon’ normally retains its g in all periods and dialects of Dutch: ODu. Uuaganuuega (838, kop. 1091–1100; unlocalized place on the Veluwe), Early MDu. wag(h)en, etc. Also the connecting vowel in Wein-e-brugge, Wan-e-brugge is difficult to explain from a masculine first member *wagna-.

ONW interprets Weinebrugge together with West Flemish Weinenduna ‘Wenduinen’, Weineuelt ‘Winneveld’, and Uuainau ‘Weginooi’ as containing *wēgina- ‘slanted’. The semantics of the latter three toponyms clearly seems in
favour of a first member meaning ‘slanted’ rather than ‘wagon’. Though ‘bridge of wagons’ seems a possible meaning for *Weinebrugge, ‘slanted bridge’ seems possible too. No final decision can be made.

47. *zege ‘victory’ < *sigi-or *sigu-. After the loss of final *-z, the PGm. s-stem *segz- (Kroonen 2013: 430) went over to the i-stems or, less often, to the u-stems (as in OHG sigu), suggesting an original suffix alternation *-iz/-az/-uz-, cf. Casaretto 2004: 555–6. In compound names most of the evidence points to *sigi- (OS Sigi-) but OHG also shows *sigu- (Sigobold), see Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 § 220c. The appellative ‘victory’ is never found with palatalization of g: Early MDu. *sige (Limburg 1240), *seghe (WFla., WBrab.), MDu. *seghe, MoDu. *zege.

In compound names in Old and Early Middle Dutch the g has often disappeared. The Old Ghent documents show names in *Sige- alternating with Si-: *Sigeburgis beside *Siborch (11th c.+), *Sigefridus beside *Sifridus (11th c.+), *Sigebertus beside *Sibertus (11th c.), and *Sigardus, *Segardus (10th c.) ‘Sigegard’, female *Sigarde (1234–35, Fla.), *Siardis (12th c.), *Ziardis (1227), gen. *Ziarde (1234), nom. *Siardis (1241), cf. Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 31, 83. In Egmond in North Holland, the male witnesses *Sibold and *Sifridus and female *Sigerda ‘Sige-Garda’ (Oppermann 1933: 77, 79) have no g; maybe the names *Sibod- and *Siwird- attested in toponyms (12th c.) belong here too. Of course, in Egmond we may be dealing with Frisian names, compare Quak 2012a: 92. In the thirteenth century, we find *sigi-brand- as *Sibrando, *Sybrand with /ī/, as shown by MoDu. *Sijbrand. The chronological co-occurrence of variants in *Sige- and Si- suggests that g became j, followed by contraction of *Sije- to Si-. This may be supported by the Old Saxon data, which are more numerous in the ninth and tenth centuries than Old Dutch. For instance, document nr. 39 from Blok 1960 (a Werden charter from 819, copy 901–950) contains the first attestation with palatalization: signum Siiard ‘the signature of Sigihard’. At the same time, in the main text of this document, the Latinized form ego Sigihard tradidi is found. See Schlaug 1962: 150–2 for other Old Saxon attestations in Si- with loss of g from the ninth century.

The name *Seger from *sigi-harja- represents a somewhat different case, as it is the only name in *sigi- to retain its g throughout Dutch; compare Old Ghent *Sigerus (1098+), *Segere (13th c.), etc. Apparently, h was lost in this compound, and the second and third syllable contracted before g could merge with j: *Sigi-harja- > *Sigi-erja = *Sigerja > *Sigere. In Xanten, the names *Sigere and *Siger are attested before 1045 (Tiefenbach 1984: 380).

48. *zegel ‘stamp’ < *sigila- n. < Lat. sigillum. Intervocalic -ig- is retained in Old Dutch, as shown by the Leiden Willeram: *insighela ‘in-stamp’ (DAT.SG.), *besigelad, -t (ADJ. NOM.SG.M.), *besigailaden (DAT.SG.M.) ‘sealed’. Similarly, g is preserved after 1200: Early MDu. *sigel (Limburg, with regular lengthened /i:/ in this dialect),
elsewhere zegel, zeigel (with lengthening to /e:/), cf. Berteloot 1984a, Map 87. No variants of the type *seil- are found in Middle or Modern Dutch.

49. *zeugen 'to bless' < *segnōn, borrowed from Lat. signāre. Old Dutch gesegonot 'blessed' (Middle Franconian Rhyming Bible) retains g. After 1200, palatalization to ei is found in Flanders, as opposed to the retention of eg (and fortition to sech-) in the other dialects: Early MDu. preterite seinde (10x WFla., 2x EFla.), present seine, seinen, seint (all 2x WFla.), as against ptc. sechhende, segghende ‘blessing’ (both 2x WBrab.), inf. segghenes (EBrab.), noun seghhennynghen (EBrab.). Later Middle Dutch texts also show seinen in Flanders but seghenen, sechenen elsewhere. This opposition is explicitly recognized by Kiliaan (1599) and can be found in modern dialects: zeinen in Flanders, zechenen in Brabant and Limburg. The pervasive reflexes ei and ech in Early Middle Dutch confirm that we must base our reconstruction on the contact between g and n (as in OS segnon, OE segnian), the o of ODu. gesegonot and the a of OHG seganon being anaptyctic vowels. The expansion of modern zegenen may be due to the support of the noun zegen (which is first attested in the sixteenth century).

50. *zeggen 'to say' < *sagian-. The g is preserved in all Old Dutch forms: sagen and sagon, ptc. gesaget, gesagot, pret. sagete, sagode, etc. Early Middle Dutch normally has the variant seide in all preterite forms, with the exception of seg(h)ede in sources from Limburg and Holland. In the fourteenth century, according to CRM14, seg(h)ede is typically found in northeastern Dutch, further only wi seghed (Utrecht, 1333), hi seghede (Alkmaar, 1348), sij zegeden (Den Bosch, 1382).

In the past participle, -ei- is the rule in the thirteenth century in West and East Flanders, in adjacent Mechelen and Duffel, and in the Cleves/Guelders region, and -ei- is also found in Utrecht and Holland. South and East Brabant and Limburg usually have gheseg(e)t. This picture is confirmed by CRM14: the participle is ghesive ‘said’, vor(e)seit ‘aforementioned’ in all regions except for northeastern ghesive. More sporadic traces of g are clustered in North Brabant (e.g., vorghesegde Helmond 1316, voreghesegeth Waalwijk 1304, ghesegh Den Bosch 1338, onweders/zeghet Breda 1354, 1380), and southwest of Antwerp (voarseght Rupelmonde 1335, 1359, onverzeghet Dendermonde 1328). West Limburg often has (gh)e)set with intervocalic g-loss. An isolated relic form is voersegheden ‘aforementioned’ in Egmond (North Holland) in 1336.

The 3sg.pres. normally retains g in Early Middle Dutch seg(h)et, segt, segghet. Sporadically, ei occurs in Flemish, viz. in onseit-si ‘she refuses’ (Rijmbijbel, 1285), wederseit ‘contradicts’ (2x in Ghent, 1237, versus 1x weder seghet in the same text), wederseit (Bruges, 1281; WFla., 1287). In the 2sg.pres., where seges, segs are the usual forms, we find once du seits (Wisselau, WBrab., 1291–1300) and thrice du seids (Rijmbijbel, WFla., 1285). In CRM14 the 3sg. present is not very frequent. Retention of g appears to have been the rule in East Flanders,
Brabant and Limburg, whereas South Holland shows *seit* ‘says’, a form that is sporadically also found in Brabant (Tongerlo 1311, Sint-Pieters-Leeuw 1313, 1325, Zoutleeuw 1393). There are only two disyllabic forms in the whole corpus, in West Brabant (*zeghet* in Dendermonde 1328 and Merchtem 1343). More usually we find *seg(h)et*, or, with syncope of *g*, *seet* in Limburg (Hasselt, Diepenbeek).

For the modern dialects, van Bree (1969, 1971) has investigated the distribution of variants for the past participle, which concur to a large degree with the Middle Dutch data. In Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, and Flanders, the vowel matches that of the reflex of WGm. *ai*, which means that we can equate the forms *zeit*, -*zait*, -*zoit*, -*zaet* in those dialects with MDu. *gheseit*. There is a clear isogloss (van Bree 1971: 351) between this western area with *ei* and the inland dialects of Brabant and southern Guelders where the vowel of the participle matches the reflex of WGm. *e* in open syllable, continuing MDu. *geseget*.

A synoptic look at the three verbs *leggen*, *liggen* and *zeggen* may be useful, see Table 19. The distribution of Early MDu. *sei*- and *seg*- is pretty much the same as with *lei*- and *leg*- in ‘to lay’: *ei* occurs in most dialects in the preterite, and in the coastal dialects and the Cleves/Guelders area also in the participle. In contrast, *ei* only appears sporadically in the 3sg. of the present. In his analysis, van Bree (1971: 347) does not decide between preforms *gisagid* or *gisegd* << *gisagd* for the coastal form in *ei*, but the Old Saxon data show that the match between grammatical form and phonetic development is much the same as for *leggen* ‘to lay’. In Old Saxon, the preterite participle is *gesagda* in Heliand ms. M, *gisagda* in C, V 1327, and the preterite 1+3 sg. is *sagda* (CVP), *sagde* (in M, but also *sagda*), 2sg. *sagdas*, plural *sagdun*, optative *sagdi*, -n (Gallée 1993: 267). If we assume that Old Dutch had similar verb forms as Old Saxon and Ripuarian, the prevailing *ei* in the Dutch preterite and the western *ei* in the past participle can be explained from suffixless forms where *g* and *d* were in contact (similarly Frings 1967: 336). We may assume that the preterite had become *segda* in Old Dutch on analogy of the present stem; compare the existence of *legda* in ms. M of the Old Saxon Heliand.

In Old Saxon, the 3sg.pres. is *sagit* in Heliand C, *sagid* in the Prudence glosses, *sagad* in Heliand M, and *sagat* in Genesis. This suggests that MDu. *seg(h)et* is the regular phonetic reflex of *sagit*; the rare variant *seit* must be due to a special cause. We cannot explain attested 3sg. *seits*, *seit* as analogical to the preterite, since the forms are (nearly) homonymous with the preterite 2sg. and 3sg. *seid(e)s*, *seid(e)*. Thus, the solution may be the same as we have proposed for 3sg. *leit* ‘lies’ next to *leghet*, *legt*. Whereas the regular development of *sagit* led to *seghet*, it may have become *seit* in combination with a following enclitic pronoun: *sagit* *hī* > *sag‘tī* > *seidi*. This would fit the earliest Flemish
attestations of *seit* ‘says’, and the alternation between *weder seghet* and *wederseit* in Ghent 1237 and the forms *wederseitse* and *ontseitsi* in van Maerlant’s West Flemish, very well.

Table 19. *g*-forms of *liggen*, *leggen* and *zeggen*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Middle Dutch</th>
<th>Old Dutch</th>
<th>Old Saxon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to lay’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.PRES.</td>
<td>leget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.PRET.</td>
<td>leide</td>
<td>legede</td>
<td>lagda, legda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC.</td>
<td>ghelegt / gheleit</td>
<td>geleget (LW)</td>
<td>gilegid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to lie’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.PRES.</td>
<td>leghet, more rarely leit</td>
<td>lighet (LW)</td>
<td>ligit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to say’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.PRES.</td>
<td>seget, rarely seit</td>
<td>saget (MRB)</td>
<td>sagit, sagad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.PRET.</td>
<td>seide</td>
<td>sagode (LW)</td>
<td>sagda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC.</td>
<td>gheiseit (W, Center), gheseg(e)t (E)</td>
<td>gesagot (LW)</td>
<td>gesagda, gisagda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. *zeil* ‘sail’ < *segl*-*. The *g* is preserved in the Old Dutch gloss *segilgerden* ‘sail-rods’ and in the plural *segle* ‘sails’ in the *Glossarium Bernense* (Limburg, 1240). The other thirteenth-century tokens are all from the western dialects and all have palatalization: *seil* (12x Hol. and WFla.), *seilsteen* (WFla.), and the verb *seilen* ‘to sail’ (1x WBrab., 6x WFla.). The dictionary *Teuthonista* (1477) mentions both *segel* and *seil*. To Kiliaan (1599), *seyl* ‘cloth, sail’, *seylen* ‘to sail’ is the accepted variant, whilst he terms *seghel* an antiquated word for *seyl*. The noun is a neuter noun from the thirteenth century onwards in Dutch, as is MLG *segel*, *seil*. However, High German *segel* is masculine right up to the seventeenth century, when it becomes neuter under the influence of Low German (thus Grimm, *Deutsches Wörterbuch*). Possibly, the gender difference between High and Low German was originally semantically motivated, the masculine indicating an individual sail whereas the neuter referred to canvas as a the material (cf. Leiss 1997, Froschauer 2003). In Old English, *segl* is attested as a masculine in the singular, but both as a masculine and a neuter in the plural.

52. *zeine* ‘fishing net’ < Latin *sagēna*. In Middle and Modern Dutch, *g* is generally retained in most dialects except for Flemish and Hollandish: Early MDu. *see-gene* (Limburg 1240), DAT.SG. *seeghen, segenen* and NOM.PL. *seghene* (WBrab., 1291–1300), DAT.PL. *seghen* (NBrab., 1286), Late Middle Dutch has *seghen* in most sources. With palatalization we find PL. *seinen* (Ghent, 1433), dative ter *zeyn* ‘with a fishing net’ (Hol., 1514). Kiliaan (1599) has *seghene, sahgene, seyne* “holl. fris.”, and *seyn, seyn-net, seygene* ‘fishing net’. Modern western dialects
have *sain in Groningen (Molema 1895; this may be a Frisian loan), and West Flemish *seine, *senne (de Bo). Frisian also show palatalization: OWFri. *seine, *sein, MoWFri. *seine.

53. *zeis 'scythe' < *sagisnó-. The change to *ei can be observed in (nearly) all dialects, and forms with retained *g are unknown. The noun displays a lot of variation in Dutch dialects, but most of it is due to a limited number of phonetic and morphological changes. The attested forms in Late Middle Dutch are *seysene (Fla., 1350), *een seysene, seysine, dimin. *seyksen, *seysels (pl.; WFla.); *seyssen (Teuthonista, 1477); seysen (northeastern Dutch, 1410–30), zeynnen (pl.; Hol.), seynen (Frisian statutes). Kiliaan (1599) lists *seyssen, *seyssen, *seysel, and he regards *seyne as specifically “holl. fris. sicamb.”; furthermore he gives *sende. Nearly all modern dialects display (a reflex of) *ei, compare the map in TNZN 1.13. The first syllable is mostly *zeis-, *zèès-, whereas metathesis to *-ns- is attested in a few areas: *zeinse, *zeinze in western Zeeuws Flanders, *zen in Kennemerland (but *zaans on Marken), *zein, *zain in Waterland, West-Friesland and Texel, *ze-nze on Urk, *zende, *zinde, *zeinde in northwestern Overijssel, Stellingwerven and southern Drente, and *seine and *saine in Fryslân. See van Vessem 1956 for further details.

The attested variation can be explained along the following lines. The preform *sagis-nó- led to MDu. *seisen(e), in which the suffix *-en could be replaced by *-el or (in some modern dialects) by *-em. MoDu. *zeis is a backformation provoked by a reinterpretation of *zeisen as a plural in *-en. The inherited form was competing with a metathesized form *saginsó from an early stage on (Old Dutch or earlier), which led to an outcome *seynse. The same metathesis is responsible for MoHG Sense. From *seyssen, the second s could be dropped analogically (because it was seen as a suffix) which yielded zeynnen, seyne. Dialectal *zende, *zeinde arose through the addition of a different suffix.

54. *zijl 'canal'. Possibly this noun reflects the same *sigila- or *sīgil- seen in ODu. sigil 'acorn harvest' in nr. 39 above, derived from to the verb *sīgan- ‘to collapse, fall down, descend’. But *zijl could also reflect the preforms *sig-la- or *sīg-la-. All the evidence comes from coastal Dutch, beginning with the toponym Sigeldriht (SHol.; 1101–50) ‘Zijl brecht’. Early Middle Dutch has the m. dat.sg. *sile, acc. *siil, zijl (4x Hol., 1x eastern Dutch). After 1300 it also occurs as a feminine *zile. Kiliaan (1599) defines *sijle, *sille as Hollandish and Frisian. In Modern Dutch, the noun is found in the toponym *Zijl ‘canal’.
9.2.2 Summary and discussion

In order to assess the value of the evidence under review I will analyse it according to six different phonetic contexts in which Old Dutch *g stood before any syncope of internal vowels took place: (a) word-internal *-VgC-, (b) word-internal *-VgC-alternating with *-VgV- (e.g. in masculine la- and na-stems), (c) word-internal *-VgV- in simplexes in all forms of the paradigm (e.g. in ila-stems, in feminine ulō-stems), (d) word-internal *-Vgi- in compounds, (e) word-final *-Vgi(V), and (f) word-final *-Vg#. Tables 20 to 25 specify whether the relevant forms have (1) palatalization in all forms, in all dialects (ALL), (2) never palatalization in any dialect (NONE), (3) palatalization in some dialects (SOME).

The evidence in Table 20 shows that gC always palatalized into jC across all dialects of Dutch. True, the evidence for the following consonant is restricted to d and l, and the preceding vowel is mostly e or at least it could be. In *tagla- we have a certain case of *ag, but here the palatalization is restricted to coastal Dutch. The verb zeinen/segghenen has -gn- but the exact reason for the partial absence of palatalization is unclear. Maybe g was restored in the dialects that have segghenen, or gn palatalized regularly only in coastal Dutch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>Some</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>breidel (*bregdila-) ‘bridle’</td>
<td>zeinen (CDu.) / segghenen (*segnōn-) ‘to bless’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breien (*bregdan-) ‘to knit’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leide (*lagd- or *legd-) ‘laid’ (pret.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeide (*sagd- or *segd-) ‘said’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steil (*staigla-) ‘steep’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teil, Teilingen (CDu.) (*tagla-) ‘tail’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. The evidence from word-internal *-VgC- alternating with *-VgV-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Some</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>deger (*digra-) ‘thick’</td>
<td>brein (CDu.) / bregen, bragen (*bragna-) ‘brain’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leger (*legra-) ‘lair’</td>
<td>dein (Fle.) / degen (*pegna-) ‘thane’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rein (Fle.) / regen (*regna-) ‘rain’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zeil (CDu.) / segel (*segla-) ‘sail’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence in Table 21 concerns stems in -la-, -na- and -ra-, which would have a paradigmatic alternation between, e.g., NOM.ACC. *segal versus GEN.SG. *segles, DAT. SG. *seglo in Old Dutch. Hence, there were varying conditions for the palatalization of g. The two ra-stems never show palatalization, which may be due to the phonetics of r. The other four stems show occasional (rein) or regular palatalization to ei in coastal
dialects versus the retention of g elsewhere. It is likely that, at least in coastal Dutch, an alternation between variants with g and with palatalization arose (e.g., between *segel and *seil-), which was leveled in the favour of the ei-forms. For non-coastal dialects, the existence of a similar alternation cannot be defended on the basis of Table 21.

Table 22, however, implies just such an alternation. Disyllabic stems in *-ula- or *-ila-, which would have had a vowel in between g and l at all times during Old Dutch (e.g., *kégel, *kègeles), generally retain g, as do the preposition jegen(s) and the noun zège. An exception is vleil. The retention in regel and tegel may be due to restoration of g from the Latin source word. By contrast, words of three or more syllables in Middle Dutch (which includes the stems in ulô- and *-ilô-, which yield MDu. nom.acc.sg. -ele) tend to show palatalization of g. Among this latter group, there are two subtypes: g is always palatalized in eizen, meisen, teil and zeis, whereas the other words show palatalization in coastal Dutch but not in the dialects of the interior. This points to syncope of word-internal schwa as a condition for the palatalization. In words such as *egison and *magadsin, syncope apparently happened in all dialects. In feminine -u/ilô-stems, the Early Middle Dutch paradigm would have been, e.g., NOM.ACC. *tegele, GEN.DAT. *tegelen, both offering a possible environment for e-syncope (as opposed to the m.n. u/ila-stems). The alternations between leget and leit ‘lies’, and between geleged and geleid ‘laid’, also suggest that the length of the word (here maybe governed by the occurrence of enclitic pronouns) influenced the rise of ei. The fact that most ei-forms occur in coastal Dutch needs to be explained in connection with regional tendencies regarding syncope of unstressed vowels.

Table 23 collects the palatalizations in compound names in -e/ige-, -e/igi-. Here, palatalization is found in the west (Ghent) and east (Ripuarian, Old Saxon) from the ninth or tenth century on. Since syncope does not otherwise occur in names with a disyllabic first member, and since there is no written evidence for a stage *egC, it appears that g phonetically became j so that *egi (and *ege as in Thegen- > Thein-) was interpreted as ei. The early date of palatalization in names as compared to appellatives suggests that the prosodic characteristics of the names may have been instrumental in bringing about the change. The names were compounds with a primary and a secondary accent and an unstressed vowel in between (e.g. *Éngil-brâht). In such a structure, the intermediate vowel could be reduced more than in trisyllabic simplex forms of the type *éngîlu (DAT.SG.). This explanation of the type Thein-, Eil- is supported by the retention of g in Sigeheri > Segere. Here, the loss of h and the subsequent contraction changed the rhythmic structure of the name: instead of a compound with a main accent and a secondary one, as *Sígi-hàri would have been, it became a single-membered name with a single accent, *Ségere. Ascribing the earliest layer of palatalization to the rhythmic structure of words is also supported by the oldest appellative form to show palatalization, viz. WPs. eiselika vs. egislikes (confirmed by MRB eislich): as is well known, the suffix *-lik-retained secondary accentuation for a long time.
### Table 22. The evidence from word-internal *-VgV- in simplexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Some</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eizen ‘be afraid’ (*agisōjan-)</td>
<td>degel, diggel (*digula-)</td>
<td>dweil (CDu.) / dwegel (*hwagilō- / -a-?) ‘towel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meisen (*magad-sïn-) ‘maiden’</td>
<td>egel (*egila-) ‘hedgehog’</td>
<td>eide (CDu.) / egede (*agilō-) ‘harrow’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teil (*tigulō-) ‘trough’</td>
<td>ekster (*aga/istrjōn-) ‘magpie’</td>
<td>heydisse (CDu.?) / egedis (*ag-i-ps(h)-ôn-) ‘lizard’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeis (*sagisnō-) ‘scythe’</td>
<td>jegen(s) (*gagin) ‘toward’</td>
<td>ijl (CDu.) / echel (*egilō-/egalō-) ‘leech’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zijl (*sïg(i)la-) ‘canal’</td>
<td>kregel (*krigila-) ‘touchy’</td>
<td>keilen (CDu.) / kegelen (*kagilōn-) ‘to fence’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regel, richel (*rigulō-) ‘rule’</td>
<td>geleid (passim) / geleged (*lagid-) ‘laid’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rigel, richel (*rigulō-) ‘cross-bar’</td>
<td>leit (passim) / leget (*legit) ‘lies’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tegel, tichel (*tigulō-) ‘tile’</td>
<td>meid (CDu.) / maagd (*magabî-) ‘maid’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zegel (*sigila-) ‘seal’</td>
<td>peil(en) (CDu.) / pegel(en) (*pagila-) ‘measure’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>zege (*sigu-) ‘victory’</td>
<td>vleil (CDu.) / vlegel (*flagila-) ‘flail’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gezeid / gezeged (*sag(i)d) ‘said’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sein (CDu.) / segen (*sagin-) ‘says’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 23. The evidence from word-internal *-Vgi- in compounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>Some</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eil- (Fle.) / Egil- (Rip.) (*agil-)</td>
<td>egislikes but eiselika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mein- (Fle. OS) / Megen- (*magin-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rein- (Fle. OS) / Regen- (*ragin-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sij- (passim) / Sege- (*sïgî-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thein- (Fle., OS) / Thege/an- (*þegna-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frilingim (&lt; Frigel-) 11th c. Fla.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pendrecht (&lt; *Pagin-) Hol.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilroda &lt; Tigelroda 11th/12th c. Flanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gheinmar (Fle.) &lt; *Gagin-?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word-final *-ag yields -ei in absolute auslaut in coastal Dutch in the names in -Dei, in kei, and maybe in the suffix -eie (Table 25).
An outcome *igC > /i:C/ is attested in ijl(e) ‘leech’, sile, sijle ‘canal’ and the personal names in Si-, Sij-; and possibly also in Frilingim in Tilroda. On the other hand, *igi yields ege in kregel, tegel, zegel and zege. This means that the palatalization of g to yield ij took place before short *i plus retained g was lowered to eg in open syllable in Late Old Dutch. The spelling <ij> is clearly secondary in ijzen ‘to be afraid’ for earlier eisen, and probably also in Hollandish brijne next to breyne (Flemish, Frisian brein).

To sum up, we cannot postulate a single sound law to account for all the evidence. The palatalized forms in Tables 23 and 20 exclude each other as to their context, whereas Tables 23 and 22 have a similar context but happened at different times. The forms in Tables 20, 21 and 22 might ultimately have the same phonetic conditions for palatalization (viz. preconsonantal position of g) but there are differences in the dialect geography between them. Like the existing handbooks (most closely to our findings is van Loon 2014: 187–88), we must therefore differentiate between a change affecting egVC in Old Dutch, and a later palatalization of g directly before a consonant. The latter is found more frequently in coastal Dutch dialects, but it is unclear whether this is due to different phonetics of g or to a different frequency of word-internal syncope of schwa.

Table 24. The evidence from word-internal *-Vgi(V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leie (941) &lt; Legia river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kei (*kagi) ‘stone’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. The evidence from word-final *-Vg(V)#

| -Dei (CDu.) // dag (*daga-) ‘day’ |
| -eie < -ege f. agent noun |

In chronological order, we can posit the following developments:

1. Old Dutch and Old Saxon *egi developed into ei and *igi into i at an early stage in compound names, from 800 in Old Saxon.
2. The sequence Late ODu. *egC regularly palatalized into Early MDu. eiC. If it occurred throughout the paradigm, palatalization is found in all dialects (breien, leide, etc.). If *egC arose only in some forms of the paradigm, generally only the western Dutch dialects generalized ei (at least, before l and n).
3. The sequences *a/e/igVC in Late Old Dutch could be subject to syncope of the unstressed vowel in Early Middle Dutch if they were followed by one or more syllables. When syncope occurred, the result could be palatalization to ei (before obstruents and resonants) or fortition of the fricative to a geminate gg or
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ch (before l, n only). The result ei cannot be called “palatalization of g before i” since the unstressed vowel would have become schwa before 1200, and since magad- did not contain *i in the second syllable. Palatalization to ei is more frequent in western dialects, though there are exceptions which occur across all dialects (e.g., geleid).

4. Palatalization of word-final -a/e/ig is sporadically found in western dialects (-Dei, -eie).

It seems likely that the phonemic shift of *g to j after palatal vowels was caused by the merger with /j/ in the diphthong /ei/, since we find general retention of /g/ after *i (zijgen, krijgen) and after the diphthong *ai (dreigen ‘to threaten’, eigen ‘own’, reiger ‘heron’, weigeren ‘to refuse’). In other words, ODu. /g/ had an allophone [γ’] near palatal vowels, but it shifted to /j/ only if it combined into another, already existing phonemic combination (compare van der Hoek 2010a: 5). This claim is supported by the retention of g in *-egr-, *-agr-, matching the fact that the sequence /eir/ did not exist in Old or Middle Dutch.

Among the alternating forms in Tables 21 and 22, there is a clear preponderance of palatalized forms in coastal Dutch dialects. This could be due to a different date of the word-internal syncope which created the cluster gC, to a different direction of paradigmatic leveling in the west than in the east, or to the different phonetics of /gl/. Since ei arose in words such as zeis and zeide in all dialects, it seems difficult to maintain that there was a decisive phonetic difference between western and eastern /gl/. There are some indications for different dialectal behaviour as regards the syncope of schwa in Early Middle Dutch. In trisyllabic word forms, Flemish sometimes has syncope where central Dutch dialects show apocope, e.g. in the dat.sg. segele ‘seal’ giving segle versus segel, see Marynissen 1995: 100. It can be hypothesized that coastal Dutch more often applied syncope (regenet > regnet) whereas eastern Dutch preferred apocope or the syncope of the post-posttonic schwa (> regent), and that this ultimately led to a higher proportion of ei-forms in the west. It remains unclear why coastal Dutch would have preferred syncope. A more extensive investigation of syncope patterns in Old and Early Middle Dutch is required to clarify this point.

The reflex teil of *tagla- ‘tail’ is striking in view of retained g in nagel ‘nail’ < *nagla-, hagel ‘hail’ < *xagla-, dial. gagel ‘gums, palate’ (Kiliaan gaghel) and wagen ‘car’ < *wagna-. Possibly, the latter words represent the Franconian forms which were adopted by the speakers of coastal dialects when they shifted from Proto-Frisian to Franconian. We may then hypothesize that teil ‘tail’ was not replaced because its Franconian counterpart was the different lexeme MDu. stert, MoDu. staart.
The prefix ge-/(j)e- < *ga-

In Dutch lexemes, the sequences *ge- and *gi- are regularly written with <g(h)> in Early Middle Dutch and realized with /ɣ-/ in the modern standard if the vowel is stressed: MDu. g(h)e(e)rne ‘readily’, g(h)even ‘to give’, g(h)eit ‘money; infertile’, g(h)eisteren, g(h)eisteren ‘yesterday’, etc. The velar is also preserved in the sequence *gai- which can yield gee- or gei-, as in geest ‘spirit, ghost’ and geit ‘goat’.

The only exception is the perfective and collective prefix PGm. *ga-, which was palatalized in some of the western Dutch sources but is generally ge- in southern and southeastern Dutch. Which intermediate stages between *ga- and the palatalized forms must we reconstruct for the different dialects, and how can we explain the geographic distribution of variants?

The use of *ga- in Proto-Germanic depended on the semantics and pragmatics of the word, which means that *ga- was an optional prefix. Verbs which already had another prefix, such as *bi- or *fra-, did not add *ga-. This optionality partly explains the vacillation in its usage in later times.

In the Old Dutch Leiden Willeram, nearly all past participles take ge-, with the exception of fundan ‘found’, cuman ‘come’, and worthan ‘become’. The latter are also frequently found as ge-less participles in later Dutch dialects (Weijnen 1976: 287). Some of the LW forms without ge- translate participles of the High German original that did have ge- (cf. Sanders 1974: 167): the ther iugethet sint ‘who are rejuvenated (there)’, thaz branda siluer ‘the purified silver’, thiu uzera rinda … in wine drunchan dualm machot ‘the outer rind (…), drunk in wine, makes dizzy’, gelich then scorenen scaphan ‘like the shorn sheep’, thero scorenon scapho ‘of the shorn sheep’, also ther wurzedo win ‘like flavoured wine’. Except for iugethet, these participles are used as adjectives, and one might even take iugethet as an adjective, since iugethen (for OHG iugên of the Vorlage) denotes a process rather than an action. It might be the case that the Dutch translator of the Willeram consciously omitted ge- in these attributive participles. Sanders (1974: 169) implies that the translator’s prefixless participle has resulted from Anglo-Frisian palatalization: “Da für die frühe Zeit ge-Abfall nur für das Friesisch-Nordholländische vorausgesetzt werden darf, liegt hier ein starkes Argument für Egmonder Herkunft der Handschrift.”

This view is not compelling. The syntactic similarity of the ge-less forms in the Leiden Willeram points in the direction of a functional rather than a phonetic reason for the absence of ge-. Quite possibly, ge- was never generalized in the past participle in the dialect of the western Dutch scribe.

---

60. ‘Because procope of ge- can only be posited for Frisian-North Hollandic at this early period, this provides a strong argument for the manuscript originating from Egmond.’
There is one palatalized form in Leiden Willeram 51.13, viz. iegiuon ‘given’ (the original has gegéban), as against usual ge- (e.g. gegiuon 69.16). Sanders (1974: 168) concludes that the western Dutch copyist had the three prefix variants ge-, ie- and zero in his morphological system; but if ie- is an indicator of the genuine speech of the translator, he may have used only ie- versus zero. In that case, we can surmise that he pronounced written ge- of the model as je-, which shows up in writing only once in iegiuon. This conclusion is supported by the single occurrence of the preposition iegen for gegin ‘against’ in the same text.

The other larger Old Dutch sources spell the prefix *ga- as ge- throughout (MRB), or with ge- next to gi- (WPs.). Among the toponyms from before 1200, only Southwest-Flemish Steniewerka, Stenieuuerka ‘Steengewerck’ (= MDu. steen ghwewerke ‘a stone construction’) shows je-.

The thirteenth century has been studied in detail by Berteloot (1984a, Map 145) and Mooijaart (1992: 184, 266ff.). Here, i- as opposed to ghe- is restricted to West Flanders and a single token in eastern Zeewuus Flanders. There are various ways of spelling the prefix, mainly as i-, hi-, j- or y-, which all seem to indicate /i-/. Less frequent, but probably more archaic, is the spelling ie- for /je-/ or /jǝ-/ as in ie-waschen ‘washed’ (Bruges, 1284). This variant is found more commonly in south-western Flanders: ieloven ‘believe’ (Veurne, 1298), jeconreit ‘ready’ (Calais, 1253), jemete ‘gemet’ (Oudenburg, 1282). These forms suggest that the first step in the development was the palatalization of ge- to je-, later followed by contraction of je- to i- in most varieties. Still, g(h)e- remains the preferred written form in Flanders. Palatalized variants surface most frequently in documents from Bruges, especially in the participle. In the noun gemet, a toponym indicating a measure of land, i- occurs more widely in West Flanders. Other evidence for palatalization includes jbanne ‘banned’, jwaerne ‘to vouchsafe’, ystade, jstade ‘steady’, hiheleke ‘wholly’, ymene ‘mean’, ylic ‘equal’, ywande, ijwande ‘cloth; loom’ (van Haverbeke 1955: 73f.), yslachte ‘race, species’, ynoouch ‘enough’. In inlaut of compounds we find palatalization in landimarc (= lande ymaerke) ‘border’ and ja(e)(r(h))itide ‘season’ (MoDu. getide).

The rise of the reflex i- is usually explained by the following chain of phonetic changes: *ge- > *gi- > ji- > i- (e.g., Hol 1941: 263, Schönfeld & van Loey 1970 § 136). The intermediate stage *gi- is hypothetical, as we find written evidence in Flanders only for ge-, je- and i-. Of course, the spelling gi- is common in the Wachtendonk Psalter and in Old Saxon sources; but for coastal Dutch, the forms of the Leidener Willeram and the earliest toponyms (with ie-) rather suggest a development ge- > je- > i-. An intermediate stage *ji- is conceivable but unattested in our sources.

Palatalization is also normally found in the verb *ga-unnan ‘to grant, concede, award’, German gönnen. All Early Middle Dutch forms have initial j- (1sg. +3sg. ian, pl. jonnne, pret. ionde, jonste), and all are attested in Holland or Flanders. They show a development from *ge-0nnen via *je-0nnen to jonnne. In the same period, the verb
is still attested without a prefix as sg. *an, pl. onnen, and twice with a past participle *gheonnet in West Holland / Northwest Brabant. In fourteenth-century Dutch, however, uncontracted *ghe-onnen (inf. *gheonnen, 2pl. *gont, 3sg.+gen. *ghean-s) has become frequent. Since jonnen is the original reflex of PGm. *ga-unnan, *ghe-onnen arose from the analogical addition of ghe- to onnen. Soon, *gheonnen underwent vowel contraction, so that we find 3sg. *gan for instance with Willem van Hildegaersberch around 1400. In the east, where ge- did not normally palatalize to je-, the verb forms of *gonnen may represent original *ga-unn with vowel contraction.

Unconditioned fronting of *u caused the change of western onnen into gunnen. In the seventeenth century, gunnen has already generalized the weak preterite (gan >> gunde). In Holland, jonnen and gunnen occur side by side, with the latter replacing the former in general usage. In Flanders, jonnen has remained a current word.

In Old Germanic, perfective and stative verbs normally formed their past participle without the prefix *ga-. In Early Middle Dutch this situation is still valid for all dialects, for example with the verbs blijven ‘to remain’, brengen ‘to bring’, komen ‘to come’, lijden ‘to go, pass’, vinden ‘to find’, worden ‘to become’. As appears from Mooijaart’s map (1992: 266), the addition of ghe- to these participles started in Holland but ghe- did not spread beyond that region in the thirteenth century. In the twentieth century, the prefixless use with these verbs was restricted to parts of southern Dutch.

Map 6 displays seven of the main forms of the participial prefix StDu. ge- in Dutch and Frisian dialects as spoken in the early twentieth century.61 A zero prefix (nr. 1) appears in a large area comprising North Holland, Fryslâん, Groningen and most of Drente, as well as in Twente and around Aalten in the Achterhoek. Directly to the south of this area, the prefix has the form ø- (nr. 2), among others, in the Zaanstreek of North Holland, and in a central-eastern area from eastern Utrecht across Gelderland and Overijssel to southwestern Drente. The same prefix ø- appears in a few coastal villages of South Holland, on the islands of Goeree and Schouwen-Duiveland and in Zuid-Beveland in Zealand. Finally, ø- also occurs in the western part of East Flanders (nr. 5) where it competes with ga-. In French Flanders and southwestern West Flanders (nr. 4), the prefix is realized as a low front vowel æ- (next to ø-). In most of East Flanders, in South Brabant and in relic areas in southern Limburg (nr. 3), the prefix is ga- but in a restricted number of (originally perfective) verbs, the participle does not take a prefix. The central Dutch area (nr. 7) and parts of West Flanders have only the Standard Dutch form ga-. Of course, this has local phonetic variants, of which the map only indicates the Zealandish areas where initial g- is pronounced as h- (nr. 6).

61. The original map is online at www.meertens.knaw.nl/kaartenbank/kaart/dialectkaart.html?id=14325.
Hol (1941) shows that sources from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century display a much wider original spread of ǝ- in rural Holland as well as in the towns. Therefore, there used to be a large ǝ-area in Early Modern Dutch which stretched from Zealand to North Holland. Some forms with ǝ- can already be found in Middle Dutch: niet vroed enoech ‘not wise enough’ (SHol., 1322; cited by MNW). The Flemish areas with ǝ- and æ- could be directly connected, though this has yet to be established.

It is striking that the medieval variant i- has completely disappeared from Flanders in the twentieth century. Hol (1941: 265) assumes that MDu. i- had been lowered to [i]- in Flanders and was then further lowered to [ɛ]- or [æ-], if not [ə-]. A parallel for this reduction would be initial bi- > be- in unstressed position.

In his reaction to Hol’s article, Verdenius (1942) points out that there is evidence for a zero prefix in South Holland in the Late Middle Ages with other verbs.
than the usual perfective and stative ones, citing forms such as wonnen ‘won’,
reden ‘driven’, cust ‘kissed’, and maect ‘made’ with Willem van Hillegaersberch,
weghen ‘remained silent’, slagen ‘hit’, and spaert ‘saved’ with Dirc Potter, and
others. However, the instances in van Hillegaersberch’s poems are almost certainly
determined by the metre, since they co-occur with ghewonnen, ghereden, ghecust,
ghemaect. For North Holland, Verdenius argues that the zero prefix area could be
found immediately north of Amsterdam in the seventeenth century, that is, further
south than was the case in the twentieth century. For more on the Middle Dutch
prefixless participles, see Pijnenburg 1982 and Berteloot 2004.

These observations lead me to reconstruct the following scenario. A zero prefix
in all past participles once existed in all of Zealand and Holland in the Middle Ages.
It was gradually ousted and now only remains in the north of North Holland. It is
conceivable that the original coastal Dutch dialects had a contextually determined
alternation between (*ge- > *je- >) ǝ- and zero, which may have depended on the
syntactic (predicative versus attributive participles) or on the phonetic environment.
In fact, so much is suggested by the Leiden Willeram (ca. 1100), where attributive
participles can take a zero prefix. Some dialects would have generalized zero and
others ǝ-, before the inland variant ge- was adopted. At a later stage, prefixless par-
ticiples were replaced with ǝ-, and, at a more recent stage (from the Late Middle
Ages on), with go-. It must be stressed, however, that this scenario remains tentative
due to the lack of data.

In Flanders, ǝ- was the phonetic successor of i-, and in Holland, as in Flanders,
jonnen attests to the original palatalization of unstressed *ga- to *jǝ-. This suggests
that all modern dialects which now have ǝ- (Flanders, Zealand, Holland, possibly
also Overijssel and Gelderland) went through a stage with unstressed *ge- > *ja- >
*i-. In that case, the absence of written i- or e- in Middle Dutch sources from
Holland is striking, though it must be noted that, even in Flanders itself, g(h)e-
is the preferred spelling of the morphologically transparent words, whereas i- is
mainly found in lexicalized formations such as gemet, a specific, regionally used
land measure (Mooijaart 1992: 186–7). In any case, an alternative explanation for
the modern prefix ǝ- is hard to find. There is no general loss of prevocalic g-.

A brief comparison with Frisian is in order. In Proto-Frisian, short *a was
fronted to *æ unless in front of nasal and a restricted number of consonant clusters.
Also excluded were some unstressed words, such as was ‘was’ (Bremmer 2009: 29).
WGm. *g became /j/ before and after front unrounded vowels, including *æ,62
whereas it remained a velar stop in most other positions. Unstressed *ga- also seems
to have undergone vowel fronting, judging by Runic Frisian ji- in jibæda ‘prosperity’

(OS *gibada*) in the Westeremden B inscription (ca. 750–800 CE). I quote Bremmer (2009: 86) on the main line of development: “The perfective prefix *ie- (< *ga-, *gi) has usually been reduced to e- or i- in Old East Frisian texts, or has disappeared altogether. This process has proceeded even further in Old West Frisian, and all Modern Frisian varieties (West, East and North) have no such prefix before past participles any longer nor does it appear before any other inherited verbal form. However, under the influence of Middle Low German and Middle Dutch, the prefix is regularly found as ge- or ghe-.” Examples of the retained prefix in Old Frisian are *eden ‘done’, eskepin ‘created’, enōch ‘enough’. Word-internal position is more likely to retain e-/i- in Old Frisian, viz. when *ga- is preceded by another prefix: *unidēld ‘undivided’, *unebern ‘unborn’, *unewis ‘uncertain’ (Bremmer 2009: 37).

Thus, unstressed *ga- yielded Old Frisian e- via *je-, which looks very much like the Middle Dutch outcome je- > i-. This supports the theoretical possibility that the western Dutch reflexes were part of a larger areal phenomenon (affecting Proto-Frisian and western Old Dutch), or arose by a language shift from Proto-Frisian to Old Franconian as a phonetic substrate feature.

9.4 Initial j- > g-

A change of word-initial j- to g- is found in all lexemes which had initial (stressed) *je-, *ji- or *jī- at the Old Dutch stage.63 There are no Dutch forms in j- from original *je-, *ji- or *jī-.

9.4.1 The evidence

1. *geden ‘to weed’.

The Proto-Germanic verb *jedan- (OS *gedan, OHG *jetan beside *getan, MoHG jätan, cf. Seebold 1970: 286, Kroonen 2013: 272) is reflected twice in Old Dutch. The Leiden Willeram has *getan, where the t probably stems from the original High German version iétan. The Prudentius glosses (951–1000, from the border of Guelders and Westphalia) have *gegedenen, dat.pl. of the past participle. Early Middle Dutch only yields *geden ‘to hoe’ and gede ‘hoe’ in Limburgian (1240). All

63. MoDu. *geur ‘scent’ has sometimes been adduced as representing a preform *juzi-. It is found in Brabant as ghoere (1265–70), goere (1276–1300), later also gure (1300–50), guere (1375–1400). It has been connected with German gären < OHG jesan, gesan with PGm. *j-. Yet *geur has also been connected with the adjective goor ‘muddy, filthy’ and the noun goor ‘mud’ (OE gor) which continue PGm. *g- (OE gyre ‘manure’ < *gurwja-). The etymology being unclear, I leave *geur out of the discussion.
subsequent Middle Dutch attestations are also southeastern, viz. *geden ‘to weed’ in the Limburgse Sermoenen (ca. 1300) and *gheden ‘to weed’ and *ghede ‘tool for weeding’ in Teuthonista (1477). In western Dutch, the verb appears to have been lost. This distribution is confirmed by modern dialectology, which shows that most Dutch dialects use *wieden and only parts of Limburg have *geden. In Germany, initial *g- instead of *j- is very widely attested in historical documents from the Cleves/Guelders area through Ripuarian and Moselle Franconian to Mainz, as well as further east and south (Koivulehto 1971: 75–99, 164, 166).

2. gene ‘yon’.

The demonstrative pronoun MDu. *g(h)ene m.f., ghent, ghint n. ‘yon’ (Gothic jains, OHG jener) shows some variation in the root vocalism, in particular the well-known rounding to /ø(:)/ in Flemish gone, goen (Berteloot 1984a, Map 89). The Dutch forms, as well as German jener, continue PGm. *jen- with lengthening in open syllable (see EWN s.v. gene). The pronoun is combined with demonstrative pronouns in StDu. diegene, datgene, also de-, hetgene, but the simplex gene survives as a demonstrative in locativial expressions in onomastics in southeastern Dutch (Jongen 1970). No forms in initial *j- are attested in Dutch outside Ripuarian, where every *g- has become *j-.

For adverbial PGm. *jendr- ‘yonder’ (Got. jaindre, jainþro, OS gendra), we find Early Middle Dutch *g(h)inder in all dialects. Another derivative is Early MDu. *g(h)ens, *g(h)ins (WBrab., WFla.) ‘to yonder side’, gontswaer ‘to the other side’ (Bruges 1281), MoDu. ginds. No forms with *j- have been preserved.

3. gij and jij ‘you’.

The second person plural nominative of the personal pronoun, PGm. *jūz ‘you’, was replaced by *jīz in West Germanic. In Dutch dialects, the change of *j- to *g- yielded the forms gi, gij. The oblique form *iu retains *j- in StDu. DAT.ACC. SG. jou, j-.

In Old Dutch, gi is found in the Blood Spell from northern Guelders (1000–50) and twice in the Wachtendonck Psalter (gi slapit ‘you sleep’ and uuanitgi ‘think you’) in ms. I, next to once ir in ms. A. The form gi never appears in the Leiden Willeram or the Middle Franconian Rhyming Bible, which have High German ir. The Old Saxon 2pl. gi, ge and 2du. git have a *g- which must phonetically have been close to /j-/ (Gallée 1993: 167), but Goossens 1994: 163 argues that it must represent a real /g-/ since we still find *g- in modern Westphalian dialects.

In Early Middle Dutch, the usual form is *g(h)i in the whole Dutch area, with the exception of southeastern gir. Inversion of the finite verb and the pronoun normally produces voicing of the final dental of the verb form plus a reduction of the pronoun to -i. For instance, gevet gi ‘give-you’ becomes ghevedi (van Loey 1976: 34).

In southern Dutch dialects, stressed gij has remained the form of this pronoun until today; the unstressed subject form ge of modern dialects is a later development.
In Holland, a different form jij /jei/, enclitic je, prevails in modern dialects. The oldest attestation of jij is found in a language guide from 1550: hier zalmen oac notéren hoe dat men zomnighhe lieden vind die zegghen iy of jy voor ghy ‘here it will also be noted how some people are found who say iy or jy for ghy’ (Lambrecht, Nederlandsche spellijnghe). In literary texts, jij starts to appear in the early seventeenth century when rendering colloquial speech from Holland, as in Hooff’s Warenar (1617). Enclitic je, however, is attested much earlier, viz. from the fourteenth century on: Onrecht hebje ‘you are wrong’, Wil ye horen, ghi scepenn ‘Will you listen, you aldermen’ (Aardenburg, 1300–50).

These data are open to different explanations and have been the subject of vivid discussions in the past (cf. Verdenius 1924, Muller 1926, Verdenius 1930, van Haeringen 1938: 204, Devos 1986, Goossens 1994: 39–63). Traditionally, it was assumed that jij and je are coastal Dutch forms which directly reflect *jī; they would simply have escaped the change of j- to g- which we find further south and east (Muller 1926). Their almost complete absence from Middle Dutch would be due to their colloquial status as opposed to written g(h)i. Verdenius (1924) was the first to object to this view, and a modified version of his own solution has now become standard (see Devos 1986, Goossens 1994: 39–63). Verdenius assumes that the j-forms developed from gi, with palatalization of the final dental of the 2pl. verb ending: *gevet-gi > geved’i. Such a palatal dental would either have developed into a cluster [dʒ] which was phonetically reduced to j, or it would have been reanalysed as t/d + j.

This theory accounts better for the historical attestation of the j-forms and for the modern dialectal distribution of the variants of ge/je. As to the historical sources, the traditional theory (viz. that jij, je directly reflect WGm. *j-) does not explain the absence of j-pronouns from Early Middle Dutch, nor why two centuries elapsed between the first appearance of enclitic je (14th c.) and tonic jij (16th c.). The traditional theory also does not explain why g-forms are found deep within modern j-territory in West Flanders (Devos 1986: 178f.), or why the final dental of the verb ending has disappeared in inverse sequences of the type West Flemish gaje ‘go-you’ (Verdenius 1924, Devos 1986: 74).

Thus, enclitic -je must have been the Middle Dutch product of gi after a dental stop, where a cluster *tg arose much like in the names in Gardis and like *tk in the diminutives in -tken. The j-pronoun was then extended to tonic preverbal position, in the same way that colloquial and dialectal me ‘we’ reflects enclitic me which arose from we after a preceding labial obstruent (Devos 1986: 179). What still needs to be explained is the restriction of j-forms to the coastal Dutch area (including southwestern Brabant for the type ‘go-you’). This restriction might be linked to the occurrence of palatalization (traditionally called mouillering in Dutch linguistics) of dental clusters in parts of Brabant and Limburg; see Devos 1986: 181f. for the relation with je and ge, and Keymeulen 1993, Taeldeman 1993, Goossens 1993 for
the palatalization of dentals in general. The d’ in gadget ‘go-you’ was apparently depalatalized in many dialects in Brabant, yielding gade, where palatalized dentals were normal allophones of the dental stops and resonants. In the west, however, such palatal allophones did not normally occur (in any case, not before the diminutives in -tje arose), which may explain why western dialects were more prone to resolve gadget as gad(d)+ji > -je.

The stressed form jij is (originally?) restricted to the dialects of Holland and is first attested in 1550. It may well have arisen next to je on the model of stressed mij next to enclitic me ‘me’, zij next to ze ‘she’, and wij next to we ‘we’; thus EWN. Note also that j- in oblique jou is spread more widely in Middle Dutch (and mainly in Holland and Zealand), and its j- probably has a phonetic origin from WGm. *iu. A Hollandish late medieval paradigm nom. gi, enc. je, dat. acc. ju, jou, enc. je would have provided enough paradigmatic pressure to replace the nominative gi by ji.

The oblique form WGm. *iu (German euch) was used in Old and Middle Dutch only for the plural: ODu. reslāt alla iu ‘he destroys you all’ (WPs.); Early MDu. wie doen ju te wetene ‘we are letting you (pl.) know’ (1274), vie doen jou allen tewetene ‘we are letting all of you know’ (1282). After 1500, jou is also found in the singular. As Lambrecht (1550) puts it: iou gebrūken de Hollanders ende mear ander als zy zegghen Ic heb iou ghegheven voor ic hebt ù gheghéven ‘jou is used by the Hollandish and others too when they say: ik heb het jou gegeven, instead of: ik heb het u gegeven’.

WGm. *iu was syllabified either as /ju/ or as /iu/ depending on the dialect; compare Goossens 1994: 64–71. In Middle Dutch, these further developed as ju > jou next to iu > u. The modern standard language retains both forms but has redistributed their functions: jou is the singular form and u the polite plural (French vous). The same formal variation is found in the possessive adjective ‘your’: ODu. iuwa, MDu. jow(w), jou(w) versus u(w), ou(w), MoDu. jouw ‘your’ (sg.) vs. uvw ‘your’ (polite pl.). In Early Middle Dutch, jow(e) is found in a minority of cases and only in western Holland (ju, juwer, iu) and Flanders (juwe, juwer, jue, juen, iu, ive, iven, once iouwe). Most dialects have uwe, uwen, but in the Cleves/Guelders area we also find iwe, iwen.

We may conclude as follows for gi and jij. The inherited pronoun *jii(r) developed initial g- in all dialects in all syntactic positions. Together with the final dental of the verb form, the inverted pronoun developed into a palatalized dental cluster, whence a new pronoun je was metanalysed in western Dutch, partly stretching inland towards southern Brabant. The oblique personal and the possessive pronoun *iu(wa) became ju(we) in coastal Dutch but u(we) further inland. In Holland, the combination of subject -je and oblique and possessive jou(w), je led to the analogical replacement of gi by ji > jij, which first surfaces in writing in the sixteenth century.
4. **gist ‘yeast’**.

Proto-Germanic *jesta-*(ON jöstr, OE giest, MoE yeast, MHG jest, gest) yields MDu. *gest*(NE-Dutch, 1300–50), *ghest*(Holland, Brabant, Cleves/Guelders) beside *gist*(Brabant), *onderghist*(Fla., 1426–60). Raising of *e* to *i* before *st* occurs in several other Middle Dutch words (gisteren ‘yesterday’, *nist ‘nest’, nistelen ‘to nest’) and confirms that *gest* was the original form. After 1600 we usually find *gist* in written sources, but see *Meertens Kaartenbank*[^64] for the dialect situation in the twentieth century. The change *j-* > *g-* also appears in many of the German forms.

5. **gicht ‘arthritis’**.

This variant of StDu. *jicht* is found in Middle Dutch and in some of the modern dialects. For its original *j-* compare OFri. *jecht* ‘arthritis’, OHG firgihtig, MHG vergiht(e) ‘paralysed’, MLG gycht, MoHG Gicht ‘arthritis’. Some scholars have derived the word from *jicht ‘confession’, as ‘an illness caused by a spell’, but I agree with *EWN* that this is semantically unconvincing (*pace* Weijnen/Ficq-Weijnen 1995: 115f.). A possible, though admittedly shaky alternative etymology could be to connect *jixti-‘arthritis’ to PGm. *jekta(n)-‘ice’, which belongs to a PIE root *jeg-* for ‘ice’ also found in Celtic and Hittite (see Kroonen 2013: 273). Since cold weather typically worsens the pain of arthritis, ‘coldness’ would make a good naming motivation. Also, the painful feeling of arthritis may simply have been called ‘cold’.

The Middle Franconian Rhyming Bible has the past participle *uer gíhtigot ‘lamed’ with word-initial *g-. Early Middle Dutch displays once *gicht* (Cleves/Guelders, 1253), whereas a number of early West Flemish forms have a rounded vowel /y/: the noun *iucht*, the adjective *iuchtic*, *iuchtegh* and the abstract *ivchtichede* next to *jechtechede*(both in van Maerlant). A verbal form is the past participle *veriucht* ‘in pains’. The meaning of these forms seems not to be ‘lameness’ but ‘(torturing) pain’, ‘very painful’. In Late Middle Dutch, we find *gicht* (Holland 15th c., Limburg, NE-Dutch) and *iechte*(Flanders, 1405); the latter form could continue earlier *juch* with unrounding.

Kiliaan (1599) knows both ghichte, which he calls German and Sicambrian, and *ietchte*, which he says equals gichte. In the course of the seventeenth century, the written language develops a preference for *jicht*, which seems to be native to Holland at that time. We may conclude that *j-* is native to Flanders, Holland (though in the fifteenth century, only <gh-* is found there), and possibly also to Brabant. The occurrence of *j-* in Brabant is confirmed by modern Limburgian dialects, which show a clear-cut isogloss between western *jicht*, in Belgian Limburg, and eastern *gicht*.

[^64]: www.meertens.knaw.nl/kaartenbank/kaart/dialectkaart.html?id=26473.
The rounded vowel of *jucht* is not fully explained. Rounding of */e/ to */ø/ next to a velar consonant is well known for Flemish (e.g., *degone* ‘degene’, *joghen* ‘jegen’, see van Haverbeke 1955: 40f., Mooijaart 1992: 118), but rounding of short */i/ is not. One might assume that Flemish first lowered *jicht* to *jecht* and then rounded the stressed vowel to *jucht*. In support of this possibility, note *plixti*- ‘plight, duty’, MoDu. *plinght*, which mostly gave Early MDu. *plecht* in Flanders and Brabant (van Loey 1976: 18) but also *plucht* in Flanders. The preponderance of */u/* in thirteenth-century Flanders, however, is unexpected for such a scenario. Franck (1910: 63) proposes that *jucht* analogically adopted the rounded vowel of the verb ‘to itch’, West Flemish *jukken*, Standard Dutch *jeuken* (see § 15.3.2), and the noun MDu. *jucte*, *jooc-te*, MoDu. *jeukte* ‘itch’.

6. MDu. *ghien* ‘to confess’, *biecht* ‘confession’. Proto-Germanic *jexan* ‘to announce, declare, acknowledge’ (OS *gahan*, MLG *gēn*, OHG *jehan*, MHG *jehen*, *gehen*, OFri. *ia*) is attested in Old Dutch as *iehen* (MRB), 3sg. *gie-t* (WPs. glosses), and 3pt. *iehent* (LW). The compound verb *bi-je-xan* appears as *begian* (WPs.) and 3s. *beget* ‘worships’ (MRB). Its derivative *bi-ji-xti*- ‘confession’ (OHG *bījiht*, *bīgiht*, MHG *bigiht*, *bīhte*, *begiht*, MoHG *Beichte*) occurs once in the Wachtendonck Psalter as *begihte*. Thus, Old Dutch has *j-* > *g-* especially before the vowel *i* (assuming that 3s. *beget* reflects *-*giët*), whereas *j-* has remained before *e*.

After 1200, the simplex verb is attested in 3s.pres.sb. *ghied* (Zealand, 1254), in the weak past participle *gheghiet* (Zealand, 1300), and in the infinitive *ghien* (WFla., 1287). *Ghiën* is also the usual form of this verb after 1300. Initial *g-* is also predominant in the Middle Dutch compound verb, the oldest forms of which are *begien*, *begijn* (Limburg, 1240). In the thirteenth century, all twenty-six tokens of this verb are from Cleves/Guelders, Limburg, and West Brabant. In the fourteenth century, *begien* is additionally found in the Flemish *Reinaert*. *Verghiën* ‘to declare’ (MHG *vergehen*, *verjehen*) is only found in Holland and Utrecht before 1300, but in subsequent centuries it also occurs in northeastern Dutch (data: CRM14 and MNW).

The usual Middle Dutch form of the simplex abstract is *ghicht(e)* f. ‘confession’, with the derived verb *ghichten* ‘to declare’ and the adjective *ghichtich* ‘stating; acknowledged’. At all stages, *j-*variants are found beside *g-*. In the southwest and the northeast, *j-* seems to be particularly frequent: a variant *yechte* appears in Groningen, and Ghent provides the verb *yechten* and the nouns *yechtebrieve* ‘letter of acknowledgement’, *yechte dagh*, *yechte dagh* ‘statement day’. As in the case of Flemish *plecht* (see nr. 5 above), it is possible that *yechte* directly continues earlier *jichte*. *Yechtig* is also found after 1400 in Drente and Groningen. Plantin (1573) gives the verb as *yjchten* or *iychten*, whereas Kiliaan (1599) only mentions *ghichten*

65. Possibly, then, *be-ghiën* and *ver-ghiën* were complementarily distributed in terms of their dialect geography.
as occurring in Frisia and Guelders. The geographic distribution of g/j- and -e/i-
allows for the hypothesis that jechte stood beside gichte, that is, that g- only arose
before i. That would match the Old Dutch distribution of gi- versus je- observed
above (both for ‘arthritis’ and ‘confession’), but it would be contradicted by the
development of ge- in the words ‘yeast’, ‘yon’ and ‘to weed’. This dilemma could be
solved by adopting Franck’s proposal (1910: 93) that jicht and jichte were retained
in order to avoid a sequence gh_ch with two velar fricatives.

The nouns bijgte ‘confession’ and bijgtere ‘confessor’ (Limburg, 1240) show a
contraction of *bī-jixte to *bīxte which predated the rise of g. This contraction is
confirmed by other dialects: Ghent biichte(n), bijchte next to EFla. biechte(n), WFla.
bijchte next to biechte. West Brabant has bichte next to East Brabant biechte, and in
Holland only biechte is attested. The form biechte must be due to phonetic retention
or analogical restoration of the hiatus between *bi- and *jixte. The early contraction
of *bi-jixte to *bīxte implies that the form begihte in the Wachtendonck Psalter was
built on the model of be-gian.

7.  gier ‘yeast; liquid manure’.

A PGm. noun *jēzō- (to the root *jes- ‘to seethe, ferment’) is reflected in MLG
gare ‘manure, yeast’ and Danish gær ‘yeast’, but OE gyru ‘manure’ (< *jeru-)
and OFri. jere ‘manure’, MoWF jarre presuppose *jerō- with a short vowel (cf. Bremmer
2012: 134). The oldest Middle Dutch forms are ghier (1343–46, Holland), eir (/eːr/,
North Holland, 1415), and yer (/iːr/, North Holland, 1531), see Pols 1885–1888 II:
354/119, 381/2. In the early twentieth century, this word for ‘manure’ was native
only to northern dialects. It had the forms gier (South Holland, Utrecht), ier (North
Holland), and jier, jiere, jirre (Groningen), cf. TNZN Map 1.7.

The geographic restriction of gier and its variants to Holland and Groningen
points to a borrowing from the previous frisophone inhabitants of the coastal areas.
In such borrowings, the vowel ie in Holland is often a reflex of Old Frisian long
ē (cf. de Vaan 2010, Versloot 2012), but that would be in conflict with the short
é attested in Frisian itself. Bremmer (2012: 134) proposes a new explanation for
Hollandish ie. Since it is often the result of a regular local raising of earlier *ē of
various sources, he posits a preform *jēr for North Holland which did not have its
long vowel from Frisian, but acquired it due to lengthening of short *e before r in
medieval Hollandish. Other instances of the same change er > ēr > īr may be StDü.
vieren ‘to loosen (rope)’, compare veer next to verre ‘far’, and the expression op een
kier ‘ajar’ to keer ‘turn’, MDu. kerre. This is an attractive solution for the discrep-
ancy between Frisian short e and Hollandish ie. In fact, the form eir from 1415
directly contains the intermediate stage (*jēr >) ēr. Initial j- was strengthened to
g- in Holland (note that the combination /jī-/ would have been alien to the dialect),
but in North Holland, it was lost. Heeroma’s attempt (1942b: 63–71) to explain g- in
Hollandish gier from a prefix ge- is unconvincing.
8. MDu. ghiemant ‘someone; no-one’.

Dutch iemand ‘someone’ has the regular reflex ie- from WGm. *eo-, compare OFri.
ammmon, éman, OS eoman, ODu. ieman (Leiden Willeram), Early MDu. ieman(t),
iman(t), iemen(t). The Middle Dutch variant g(h)iemant(t), Early MoDu. giement
(1644; Heeroma 1942a: 62), may be compared with initial j- or g- in MLG jum-
mant, jummende, gemant, gemants. Since initial g- must have developed from j-,
this presupposes an earlier, Old Dutch *jeman rather than the usual *ieman. A
similar variation is found between Dutch ieder /idər/ and German jeder ‘every’
from ieweder < eohwedar. The syllabification je- is more frequent in German than
in Dutch. Still, Dutch forms showing only je- are attested in Early MoDu. jegelijk
‘each’ (MoHG jeglich) < *eo-galika- and jegewelc ‘each’ < *eo-ga-hwelika-

Most of the Middle Dutch attestations of g(h)eman(t) ‘someone’ hail from
Groningen, Drente, Fryslân, and Overijssel, but g(h)ieman(t) also occurs in (north-
ern) Hollandish and even in Flemish sources. The origin of g- and the semantics
of the word have been satisfactorily explained by van Haeringen (1938: 207–9). He
argues that *jeman phonetically yielded gēman, whereas the variant gieman
would have resulted from contamination with ieman.

9. Dialectal gier ‘udder’.

two different but cognate preforms for ‘udder’ are continued in the Germanic
languages: (1) PGm. *ūdra- m., in OS ūder, MLG uder, OHG ūtar(o), OFri. ūder,
MoWF oer (‘teat’), OE ūder, MoE udder. (2) PGm. *eudra- n., in OIc. jür, júgr n.,
MoIc. júfur, júgur, OS dat.pl. gederun, MLG jeder, MoWF jaar n., MoCNFri. jååder,
jåder, jaoder (Sjölin 2006: 87) ‘udder’. In order to explain the co-occurrence of these
two preforms, Kroonen (2011: 157ff., 2013: 120) reconstructs a Proto-Germanic
neuter noun with ablauting paradigm, nom.acc.sg. *eudur, gen.sg. *ūdraz. The
preform *eudur is reflected in Scandinavian, Frisian, Low German, eastern Dutch
and Ripuarian German. The form in initial *ū- is found, roughly speaking, in
English, in southern and central Dutch, and in High German.

The number of Dutch medieval attestations of ‘udder’ is extremely small, so that
it will be best to start from the twentieth-century dialect situation as mapped
and discussed in detail by Heeroma 1936, Map 13 of the Taalatlas van Oost-Nederland
en aangrenzende gebieden, and Heeroma 1960: 55. Heeroma’s analysis is a good
starting point but his expansionist theories must be modified on a number of
points, as was already argued by van Haeringen (1937).

The main Modern West Frisian variant is jaar, to which correspond joar in
Groningen and jaar in North Holland. In combination with the North Frisian
cited above, we must reconstruct Old Frisian *jåder (Spenter 1968: 212). In North
Holland, there are some attestations of a form jadder in the seventeenth and
eighteenth centuries, e.g., in the writings of Vondel. In northwestern Low German, between Emden and Norden, *jadder* is still found. Departing from PGm. *eudr*-,
the regular development led to OFri. *jäder*, whence with *d*-syncope *jaar*, or, with shortening of the long vowel before *dr*, to *jadder*. This implies that the dialects of North Holland and Groningen have adopted the word for ‘udder’ from their Frisian substrate. Nearly the same northern coastal area uses a neuter *uur* /y.ɾ/ (North Holland, Groningen) or *eer* /u.əɾ/ (Fryslân) for the ‘teat’ of a cow’s udder; in northeastern Overijssel this is referred to as *uder*, *utter*. It follows that PGm. *uder*- also survived in these northern provinces, and that semantic specialization took place: *eudr*- or the corresponding substrate word from Frisian referred to the whole udder but *uder*- to the teats (Heeroma 1936: 125). This differentiation seems to go back at least to the time when Frisian was still spoken in North Holland.

An early attestation of *j-* is found in Kiliaan (1599), who calls *ieder* Saxon, that is, German. In modern dialects, initial *j-* outside Frisian is found in Groningen, Drente and in northern Low German. In Groningen, *jidder* ‘the udder of a slaughtered animal’ corresponds to *judder* and *udder* ‘udder’ in adjacent Low German. The short vowels have developed from *jēder* just like *jadder* was shortened from *jāder*. In central Drente we find *judder* and in southeastern Drente *juur*, which Heeroma (1936: 121) explains as contaminations, viz. from *jidder* with *udder* and from *jidder* with *uur*. In view of their limited distribution on the border between several larger dialect areas, this explanation is conceivable. Initial *j-* also surfaces further south, in East Westphalian *jeier* (around Paderborn), which suggests that *j-* once prevailed in all of Low German.

Initial *g-* is found in a large compact area in central and eastern Dutch: *geer* in northern Utrecht, the Veluwe and in Twente, *gier* in the intermediate areas from Drente to the Rhine, *gedder* along the Vecht, *gidder* along the Eems. It occurs more sporadically in eastern Münsterland and very rarely in southern Westphalia. The etymological explanation by Heeroma (1936: 126) from a prefix *ga-* is certainly wrong, because *g-* must reflect earlier *j-*. It does appear probable, as Heeroma (1960: 50) suggests, that the *g*-area has arisen *en bloc* within an earlier *j*-area, that is, *geder < *jeder < *ieder < *eudr*. In Middle Low German we already find *geider*, *geder*. Heeroma posits an original Westphalian focus area from which *geder* spread to the west and northwest; that is possible, but our data do not allow dismissal of the alternative possibility of a local development *j-* > *g-* in Gelderland and Overijssel. There is a relic area with *ier* along the Vecht which may originally have been contiguous with the large Rhenish-Ripuarian area stretching from Cleves to the Eifel where we find *eder*, *ier*, *eer* and variants, cf. *RhWB* II: 215–7). *Pace* Heeroma (1936: 127), Rhenish *eer* and *ier* are best understood as regular reflexes of *eudr*. This distribution suggests that all of eastern Dutch and western Westphalian once had *eudr* >
*eodr > *ieder/*eeder, which then developed into *jeder in the intermediate area which later acquired g-. The Ripuarian nouns in ee- and ie- usually have neuter gender as opposed to the continuants of *ūdr-, which are mostly masculine. It is possible that this difference is old and confirms the paradigm split suggested by Kroonen: the nom.acc. sg. *eudr remained neuter, whereas *ūdr- from the oblique case forms became masculine.

Western South Holland, Zealand, and West Flanders have elder or (rarely) ulder. It is likely that this variant was originally used in all of Flanders and maybe also in all of Holland. Elder is also found in central England, next to ewer in the north, showing that *eldur and *eudur must have coexisted already at the Anglo-Frisian stage (if western Dutch borrowed it from Proto-Frisian) or in West Germanic (if it was inherited in Franconian, too). Kroonen (2011) explains *eldur as the result of u-dissimilation in *eudur, which seems the best proposal so far.

Finally, reflexes of *ūdra- (Sauerland nūr, nudur), or i-mutated *ūdir (see Kroonen 2011, who explains the i-mutation from the original locative) are found in central southern Dutch as MDu. uder, Early MoDu. uder, uyder, Modern Dutch uier. In the dialects of Flanders and Brabant, the difference between *ū without and with i-mutation has been obliterated by later developments. Most of the Limburgian dialects continue an i-mutated form *ūder, usually with a long vowel or diphthong, but in southeastern Limburg it is udder with shortening before dr. In Belgian Limburg, however, we also find ouwer, with unmutated *ū-, and the same form also occurs sporadically in southeastern Limburg.

10. Limburgian get ‘something’.

Almost all of eastern Limburgian south of the Uerdinger Line (the *ik/ich*-isogloss), including the Meuse Valley in Belgian Limburg, uses the adverb get ‘something’ where Standard Dutch has *iets* /its/. The first attestation of get which I found is *ght*, given as a variant of *iet* in *Teuthonista* (1477). Next, get is attested in 1640 by Jacob Kritzraedt for the dialect of Gangelt, and in a witness report from Stokkem from ca. 1660 (published in Fagot 1956). Get goes back to *jet*, a dialectal form of Middle Dutch *iet* ‘something’, earlier *iewet*, from Old Dutch *iowiht*; compare OS and OHG *êo-*, *eowiht*. Within Dutch, Limburg is isolated in its acquisition of g-, but initial /j-/ is quite frequent in Middle Dutch. In the thirteenth century, we find *iet*, *yet* and *jet* in Holland (once *ijt*), mainly (h)*iet* in West Flanders (next to *yet*, *jet*, once *hiewet*, once *jeet*), *iet* and *it* in West Brabant (*7x iwent*), mainly *yet* in East Brabant, twice *it* in Limburg and once in Cleves, and *iet* in Cleves/Guelders. The spellings <yet>, <jet> and <iet> are ambiguous, their pronunciation could be either [iɛt] or [jet].

The type *jet* is also found in all of Ripuarian Franconian from the Uerdinger Line to the Eifel in Germany; compare the hand-drawn map in the *Sprachatlas der Rheinprovinz*, accessible at the website of the Digital Wenker Atlas, www.regional-sprache.de. Unfortunately, the map does not tell us which Ripuarian dialects have g-, though *Rheinisches Wörterbuch* mentions some sporadic occurrences. Of course, initial g- has become j- in many Ripuarian dialects (Aachen, Cologne, etc.), making it impossible to judge whether *jet* in such dialects has gone through a stage get.


The town of Julich (German Jülich, from Latin *Juliācum*) is situated about 25 km northeast of Aachen. Its usual name in Middle Dutch is *G(h)uli(c)k* /ˈɟy.ɪk/, attested mainly in surnames. In Germany, modern surnames mostly have the form Jülicher, but Gütlicher also occurs, especially in Aachen and east of Cologne. In the Netherlands, van Gulik is the most frequent form of the surname, found all over the country without a clear preponderance in one area. The name Guliker is concentrated in Nijkerk on the Veluwe, whereas Gulikers is mainly found in South Limburg. The form Julicher is found in Roermond and surroundings and is probably due to recent migration from across the state border.
9.4.2 Summary

In conclusion, we can state that WGm. *je-*, *ji-*, *jī- have yielded ge-, gi-, gī- in all dialects, with the single exception of jicht(e) in which the retention of j- may be due to the following ch. West Germanic *eo- has sometimes developed into ie- > je-, which could also become ge-. The last change shows that the rise of g- from j- must (at least for these words) post-date the resyllabification of the Late Old Dutch diphthong ie /ie/ to /je/ in word-initial position. Table 26 provides a summary.

The change of j- to g- before high front vowels could be interpreted as a dissimilation between j- and the next vowel. In articulatory terms, the pronunciation of j before a high (front) vowel is usually accompanied by more friction than before low vowels, as the tongue is lowered sooner in the latter case. Since initial g- was palatal(ized) before front vowels in many varieties of Dutch and German, it may be argued that the change of je/i- > ge/i- actually implies the identification of the fricative allophone of /j-/ with the voiced palatal fricative present in original ge-, gi-. This articulatory solution makes Franck’s (1910: 93) explanation for the preservation of j- in jicht(e) even more plausible, viz. that it was caused by the avoidance of an initial syllable *[jǐc-] with a (palatalized) velar fricative in both onset and coda.

Table 26. Results of initial j- > g-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WGM. *j-:</th>
<th>Area with g-:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>geden 'to weed'</td>
<td>*jēdan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen, gene 'yon'</td>
<td>*jēna-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gij 'thou'</td>
<td>*jīz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gest, gist 'yeast'</td>
<td>*jēsta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gicht 'arthritis'</td>
<td>*jīxti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>giën 'to confess, gichte 'confession'</td>
<td>*jexan, *jīxti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulik 'Julich'</td>
<td>Juliācum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gier 'manure'</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGM. *eo-:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g(i)eman(t) 'someone'</td>
<td>*eoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gier, geer 'udder'</td>
<td>*eodur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>get 'something'</td>
<td>*eowixt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I adopt the viewpoint that PGm. *g was a voiced stop which developed into a fricative in many West-Germanic dialects in different positions (Frings 1967), in spite of the position adopted by most scholars, viz. that Proto-(West-)Germanic had a voiced fricative in most positions (compare Moulton 1954: 24, Ringe 2006: 215). In anlaut, van Loon (2014: 197) assumes that fricativization in Dutch took place in the eleventh century, together with the voicing of initial f- > v- and s- > z- which created other voiced fricatives in word-initial position. This yields a probable date ante quem non for the identification of j- before front vowels with g-, although the occurrence of g- already in the Wachtendonck Psalter (10th c.) suggests a slightly earlier date. The fricative character of g and its allophonic distribution were shared by Old Saxon (Gallée 1993: 167–72), and, according to some scholars, by early Old English (Campbell 1959: 21, Minkova 2003: 113–20, Dietz 2006: 29–150).

9.5 Recent Frisian loans in North Holland and Groningen and other irrelevant evidence

Various coastal Dutch words in s or z which (seem to) correspond with inland Dutch words in g or k have been claimed to show palatalization of velars. A very extensive collection was presented by Kieft 1945, but Schönfeld & van Loey 1970 also acknowledge a number of forms. As I will argue below, many forms must be interpreted differently, in particular the Flemish evidence. In North Holland and Groningen, Frisian was spoken into the Late Middle Ages, which is why more palatalized forms appear there. Their possibly recent (that is, Late Medieval) adoption in the coastal dialects disqualifies them as evidence for language contact between Proto-Frisian and Old Franconian in the Early Middle Ages. I will not deal with the evidence from Groningen, as the number of palatalized forms is much higher. The shift from Frisian to northeastern Dutch dialect was relatively recent in Groningen (in the 1400s). For collections and discussion of the evidence from Groningen, see Heeroma 1951b, Heeroma & Naarding 1961, Feenstra 1998: 61–78, Niebaum 2001: 439–40. For a research overview of Groningen speech in the Middle Ages, see Reker 2002: 63–71.
9.5.1 Not restricted to coastal Dutch

Three forms have a wider distribution. Dutch *lenzen* ‘to sail before the wind with little sail’ was interpreted by Kieft (1945: 179) as a derivative from a putative noun *lenze* ‘length’ < *langīn-*, compare German Länge ‘length’. It is just a guess, however, that *lenzen* would have anything to do with sailing ‘lengthwise’. The earliest attestation of the verb as *lenssen, lentsen* ‘to make loose’ in 1599 (Kiliaan) points in a different direction, viz. to a derivation from the adjective *lens* ‘slow, weak’ (see EWN s.v. *lens* 2, and *lenzen* in WNT).

West Flemish *meuzie* ‘midge, mosquito’ was mentioned by Kieft (1945: 179) as a possible instance of palatalization of *g* before *j, since Dutch *mug* ‘midge’ goes back to WGm. *mugjō-. However, the sibilant in *meuzie* was not originally restricted to Flemish, and there is no trace of an original velar consonant in this word. We can therefore be certain that *meuzie* had s all along and does not represent the same etymon as *mug*. All of southern and western Dutch displays forms of the type /mø.ziə/, compare Early MDu. *moesie* (West Limburg, 1291–1300), plur. *muesien and messien* (both WFla.), Early MoDu. *meuziën* (Ghent, 1566), *meusie, mosie* ‘midge’ (Kiliaan, 1599). Van Ginneken et al. (1938: 336) provide a map of the distribution of *me(u)zie* versus *mug* in modern southern dialects. The former appears in the southern half of East Flanders and in adjacent parts of eastern West Flanders and southwestern Brabant. A more detailed map is offered by WVD, ‘Land- en waterfauna’, p. 153. The type *meuzie* is now found in the south of West and East Flanders, and cognate forms such as *meus/meuze*, *muis* and unrounded *mees* surface in southwestern Brabant. With an additional suffix, *meuzik* appears in a few places in the northwest of North Brabant.

Dutch *smetsen* ‘to smack one’s lips, tuck in’ is regarded by Kieft (1945: 177) and, with more hesitation, by Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 240), as a palatalized reflex of *smakjan; compare with geminate *kk and a similar meaning MDu. *smecken* (1539 Brabant), dialectal Dutch *smekken*. With ts the verb is attested in Kiliaan (1599) and in a number of Early Modern literary sources. The oldest forms in ts are found in Brabant and Holland, not in Flanders. This makes it likely that *smetsen* belongs to MDu. *smeten* ‘to stain, make dirty’ (compare *smette* ‘stain’), with the s-suffix that is sometimes found in expressive or frequentative verbs, as discussed by Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 239f.). Well-known examples of this type are *kretsen, kratsen* to *kretten* ‘to scratch’ and *plitsen* to *splitten* ‘to split’. *Smetsen* is used for ‘tucking in’ on food, ‘to binge’, which evokes the image of ‘messing about’ (to *smetten*).
9.5.2  
s for k in North Holland

We find a small but reliable number of palatalized forms in North Holland. As this area shifted from Frisian to Franconian around 1200, and as most traces appear in toponymy, we are surely dealing with Frisian loanwords into the Hollandish dialect (see van Bree 2012).

Beseeuwen 'to be bewildered, faint' was mentioned by Kieft 1945: 173 as a palatalized variant of Early MoDu. bekeeuwen 'to faint', to Dutch keeuwen, kieuwen 'to gasp for air (of fish); to chew', which has k- also in North Holland. The prefixed verb is known from all over North Holland as beseeuwen, bezeeuwen 'to swoon' (Boekenoogen 2004: 46, Karsten 1931–34 II: 200, Pannekeet 1984: 37). Yet in Modern West Frisian, the corresponding verb is besauwe 'to be amazed', with s- which cannot represent old k-. Hence, the etymology proposed by Boekenoogen for beseeuwen, viz. derivation from the word for 'sea', is more likely; compare also Holl. verzeeuwd 'seasick'.

Sermen 'to moan, groan'. Dutch kermen from karmen- 'to moan' is found as sermen in North Holland (Boekenoogen 2004: 467, Pannekeet 1984: 300). For the palatalized reflex, compare MoE chirm, and MoWF tsjirmje, dial. also kjirmje, tjirmje, tsjirmje < Anglo-Frisian *kærme-. Nowhere in Frisian do we find the reflex ts- or s-, and even tsj- seems to be a recent development from tj-. Thus, the North Holland form must either go back to a now extinct dialect in which the palatalization had proceeded further than in Modern Westerlauwers Frisian, or it is due to the adaptation of Frisian tj- as Dutch s-.

Tseen, sjaan, sien 'chine'. The noun kene 'small stream' < PGm. *kinan- (OE cinu, -an 'crack, fissure', ME chyne, MoE chine) is attested with k- in all Dutch toponyms which contain this noun: ODu. Kinlosun (9th c.), Chinmelosara genterchi, Westerkinlosen, etc., and modern Keent in Brabant, Keen near Zevenbergen and Klundert (NBr.), Kortgene in Zealand from Kortekine, Keenwatering (Delfland), Grote Keinse, Kleine Keinse near Schagen in North Holland, etc.; see Muller 1936: 40, de Cock 1980, Miedema 1972, 1980a. An exception carrying s- is Polder de Sien in Uitgeest, south of Amsterdam.

The latter form corresponds to the appellatives in s- or ts- as found on the islands off the coast of North Holland: Wieringen sjaan 'small gulley for drainage', Texel tseen, Terschelling sien. They seem to show the same palatalization as in the Frisian toponym ’t Sein (from kein) but may alternatively represent relics of OFri. útsiane, útsione ‘water course, outlet’ (Miedema 1972, Buma 1982). This interpretation implies that North Holland Kin-losun and Keinse have Franconian rather than Frisian phonemics, a conclusion supported by the reflex <o> rather than <a> from *au in Kinlosun. See below on Keinse.
Beets. The village of Beets (1481 Beets, 1494 Beetsch), southwest of Hoorn, represents the Frisian development of beek ‘brooklet, stream’ (WGm. *baki) to Beets as it is found in Fryslân too.

9.5.3 s and j for g in North Holland

Kallens(oog), Callantsoog. Kallens- contains the place-name suffix *-ingja-. Old attestations are Callinge (1083 falsum 12th c.), Kallinge (1125–30 copy 14th c.), and Calense (1396). From the survey by Gildemacher (2008: 101–44) of all medieval and later attestations from Fryslân, it is clear that spellings of this name in ns, nz only start to appear in the fourteenth century, all older attestations retaining <ing>. The attested forms of North Holland Kallens comply with this date. Probably, the earlier spellings with <ing> were already pronounced with a palatalized velar.

Keinse is the name of an inhabited mound near Schagen in North Holland. Older forms are 1319 bi der Kaense, 1388 twischen den Oghe ende der Kaynse, 1557 de Groote Keyns. Miedema (1980a: 211) reconstructs earlier *Kenenze from *Kiningja-. Possibly, Keinse was a hybrid formation, with the Franconian stem *kene and the Frisian suffix -enze.

Lanis is a regional variant of lanings (Pannekeet 1984: 199, Boekenoogen 2004: 291), the plural of laning ‘board, flooring’. The ending -is is not due to palatalization, but to (dissimilatory?) loss of the nasal in -ings.

Wadwaai (below Wognum) contains the noun *-weg ‘way’. The palatalization of word-final -g is irregular in Francoian but normal in Frisian, compare OFri. wei ‘way’.

There is no indication for a Frisian origin of zeunis ‘pigs’ trough’ (Pannekeet 1984: 414, Boekenoogen 2004: 619, Weijnen 2003: 428). The forms sony (Teuthonista, 1477) and suenie, both probably for /søːni/, with a plural in n, are attested from Late Middle Dutch onwards. Kiliaan mentions suenie for the regions Holland and Guelders. Other variants are zeuning, attested in 17th-century authors from Holland, and zeunis in North Holland. Map 1.11 of TNZN provides the dialectal variants for the earlier twentieth century. We find zeunis in northern North Holland, zeunie in Zaanstreek and Waterland, and zeuning in a large central area which includes the northeastern half of South Holland, the whole province of Utrecht plus the Gooi, and the Rhine/Lek area. A single attestation of zeunings is found in the north of North Holland. A smaller area with a short vowel, in zunnie and zunnië, appears between Arnhem and Zutphen and around Doetinchem in Gelderland. Thus, whatever the exact etymology of this noun (to *swōnō- ‘expiation’, *swōnjan- ‘to expiate, offer’? the connection with OE sunor ‘herd (of pigs)’ is formally difficult and semantically as well), zeunie and zunnie must be regarded as the oldest forms, which changed to zeun-ing by suffix replacement. The s-form zeunis is best explained from a plural zeunings.
9.5.4 Flanders

Two Flemish toponyms probably show Romance palatalization. Semmerzake is located in East Flanders, south of Ghent. The oldest, Romance spellings of the initial sequence have <ci>: Cimbarsaca (815 copy 941), Cimbresac (977), Cimbresacra (988 falsum ca. 1000), Cimbersaca (995 copy mid 11th c., 1148), Cimmarsaca (1088). From 1100, the vowel appears as <e> and we find alternative spellings for the initial consonant: Cembersaca (1110), Cembersaca (1123), Schemessake (1101 copy 1176–1200), Scommersake (1101 copy 1176–1200), Semmersake (1163 copy 12th c.), Tsemmerssake (1163 copy 12th c.), Sembmersake (1169 copy 12th c.), etc.; see Gysseling 1960a, Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 497, Besse 1997: 489–90. The lowering of i is frequently found in Late Old and Early Middle Flemish, cf. temberman < timberman ‘carpenter’, Grendberga < Grindberga. Whereas an initial sound [ts-] could in theory reflect an early palatalization of the Proto-Frisian type, it seems much more likely, considering the geographic area, that we are looking at a Gallo-Romance name which was incorporated into Old Flemish. Mansion (1924: 126, 217f.) suspects that Semmerzake continues an originally Celtic name in *-āko-, as found in other southern Dutch names in -āken. Gysseling (1960a: 909) suggested deriving *Cimbrasiacum from a Roman personal name *Cimbrasius, but such a name is unattested. Another toponym which may have the same etymology is Cambresèque, south of Calais in France. It is attested in 1087 as Kimbreseca, Cabresecque (Besse 1997: 490).

Serskamp is another place-name from East Flanders. The oldest form is Cerscamp (1148 copy end 13th c.); other earlier spellings are Scerskamp and Scherskamp (1242), Cerschamp (1246), Serscamp (1265 and 1352), Sarskamp (1384), Tsheerscamp (1398), Cierskamp (14th c.), Cheerscamp (1432), Tseercamp (1545), Serscamp (1572); later generally Cherskamp (Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 498). The modern dialectal pronunciation is [ʃɛ.ɔskam]. The spelling variants clearly point to a palatal affricate or fricative in Early Middle Dutch; a similar variation is found in some French loanwords, such as MDu. tsäert, chaertre ‘charter’ (see § 9.1.2). The older explanation as ‘cherry-camp’, with an assibilated form of MDu. kerse ‘cherry’ from Latin cerēsia, is problematic because ‘cherry’ is not otherwise found with palatalization in Dutch, Frisian or German (kers, Kirsche). Hence, Serskamp cannot date back to the Roman period (as per Debrabandere et al. 2010: 224). If it does contain the word for ‘cherry’, Serskamp could be a Gallo-Romance settlement called ‘Cherryfield’, founded during the Middle Ages.

None of the other Flemish forms for which palatalization of a velar has been claimed can be maintained. The word beek ‘brook’ < *baki, genitive *bakjas, as a second element of toponyms, is sometimes found with a spelling <ch> or <s> which suggests palatalization: Borsebeche (1220) ‘Borsbeke’, Nerebache (966 copy...
15th c.) ‘Meerbeke’, Albeche ‘Aalbeke’ (WFla., 1175), Bichengem (1107) ‘Bekegem’, Harlebecche (1186) ‘Harelbeke’. There can be little doubt that these are French spellings reflecting the Gallo-Romance palatalization of *baki, as found in place-names in French -baix, such as Roubaix.

Kieft (1945: 175) draws the attention to West Flemish blessen ‘to debark a tree; to look threateningly, show the white of the eye; to bark (of a dog)’. This corresponds to Early MoDu. bleeken (1599), Du. blekken or blikken from PGm. *blakjan- ‘to bleach’. In fact, the same West Flemish dictionary (de Bo 1892: 146–8) which ad-duces blessen also has blekken as the more usual variant of the verb. This makes an explanation of blessen from an early palatalization implausible. The noun blesse can refer both to a ‘debarked place on a tree’, a ‘bald patch on a man’s head’ and to a ‘blaze’ on the forehead of a horse or cow. The latter meaning is the usual one for Early MoDu. blesse, StDu. bles. The same word also occurs as an adjective in MDu. bles, blesse ‘having a blaze’. Dutch bles and blek both have the meaning ‘blaze’ and ‘the white of the eye’. Hence, it seems likely that the verb blekken ‘to bleach’ and the noun blesse ‘blaze’ have influenced each other in Flemish, giving rise to a verb blessen with the meanings of the noun blesse. The closely related dialects of Zeeland (WZD 106–8) show the more original distribution, with kk in the verb and s in the noun: blekken ‘to shine; show one’s teeth (of a dog)’, blikken ‘to shine up; mark a tree’ next to blis kieken ‘to look scared (showing the white of the eye)’, and blis(se) ‘blaze’ on a horse’s head.

The town name of Bruges is attested in Old Dutch both with the Dutch development of *bruggjō- to /brygge-/, as in Bruggas (840–75, on Carolingian coins), Bruggis (11th c.), in porto Bruggensi (ca. 1010), and with retention of j- and later the rise of an assibilated cluster in Bruccia (840–75, coins), Bruciam, Brucciam (892 copy 11th c.), in Brutgis vico (end of 9th c. copy 941), Bruzzias (1051–1100 copy 13th c.), Brutgensis (1111–15). We can safely regard the second group of forms as reflecting the French pronunciation, as was already concluded by Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 364. In view of the international fame of Bruges, the continued transmission of the name in the nearby Gallo-Romance area is not surprising. Note that none of the other Old Flemish place names in brug ‘bridge’ show any sign of palatalization.

66. Possibly, the earliest attestation in Dutch is the name Johannes Blesse in Calais, 1298 (Gysseling & Bougard 1963: 17).

67. “elk spoor van zulk een assibilatie (…) wordt slechts aangetroffen in M[iddel]lat[ijnse] teksten, geschreven in Noord-Frankrijk of in Vlaanderen. Derhalve lijkt het vooralsnog aangewezen die geassibileerde vormen voor Frans te houden, speciaal Fra. leestaalvormen. ” [“every trace of such an assimilation (…) is only attested in Middle Latin texts, written in Northern France or Flanders. Hence we are for the time being bound to regard those assimilated forms as French, in particular, as forms from French written language.”]
The locality of Butsegem in West Flanders, close to the Hainaut border, is found twice as Bucingehem (965 falsum 990–1035; 966). Probably, <c> is to be read as [ts]. Another place-name with the same anthroponym is Bussenghem (1227) in East Flanders, which has secondarily developed a voiced /z/ in the modern pronunciation. It has been suggested (Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: xxix, Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 211) that Bucingehem can be compared to English Buckingham and that it would show palatalization of a hypochoristic name *Bukkan- in Flemish. Yet Mansion (1924: 33, 94) regards Bucingehem as a derivative of a hypochoristic name *Butsa < *bud-san-, with the s-suffix added to a stem in a dental. This name is attested as Old Dutch Bozo (Liège 1080, cop. ca. 1700) and indirectly in its derivatives Bozelini (Sint-Truiden, 1006–23 copy ca. 1250), Buzimanni (gen.; Douai?, 1067), see Marynissen 1986: 82. Mansion’s etymology seems preferable over an isolated case of palatalization.

A noun *friskinga- ‘young piece of cattle, piglet, lamb’ (MDu. versching, OHG frisking) is attested once in the Old Ghent documents as acc.sg. frisingiam (801–900 copy 941). The spelling with single s- instead of sc or sk leads Mansion (1924: 179) to assume French influence on the spelling of frisingiam because the cluster sk is normally retained in Old Dutch; compare Old French frésange. We do find a graphic representation of the cluster /sk/ in all other fifteen Old Dutch attestations. It follows that the ending -giam may also reflect the French pronunciation of the word, and cannot be counted as evidence for Dutch palatalization.

The form geldindas ‘castrated ram’ (801–900 copy 941) stands for nom.acc.pl. *geldingas, as proven by the nom.pl. geldingi (801–900 copy 1060); it is derived from gelt ‘unfertile’. Schönfeld & van Loey regard -nd- as the reflex of a palatalization of -ng-, but Mansion (1924: 163) simply assumes that d in geldindas is a mistake for g.

Krensen, krinsen (also written and pronounced with z) means ‘to winnow grain’, ‘to clean grain by passing it through the winnow’. The word is used figuratively for ‘to wriggle the body for pain, cold or itch’ in various dialects, among which is Flemish (see WNT s.v. krensen and krenselen). The same meanings ‘to winnow’ and ‘to wriggle’ are attested for the frequentative krinselen, krenselen. Hence, this verb has nothing to do with kringen ‘to turn’ or palatalization of g. Debrabandere (2011: 214) derives krens and variants from Old French crincier ‘to winnow’, which is much more attractive.

The verb ve(i)nzen ‘to smoulder’ is adduced by Kieft (1945: 179), de Tollenaere (1957) and Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 240, with hesitation) as a possible case of palatalization. The verb is restricted to Flanders. Modern dialects show several forms: venzen, veizen, vinzen, vunzen, veuzen. The forms with a nasal are the more original ones, as they are already found in the sixteenth century: veinsen (Lambrecht 1562), venzen (1567), geveinsd (1568). The diphthong ei represents a regular development of e before n plus a dental obstruent. Vunzen has rounding
after v, whereas in veizen and veuzen, the nasal was lost. In my view, venzen is best explained from an s-verb *veng-sen to *veng- ‘to kindle’, compare MHG vengen ‘to kindle’ < *fangjan-, as opposed to MHG fenken < *fankjan-, MDu. ontfenken ‘to ignite’, southern Dutch vinken ‘to smoulder’ with k (Kroonen 2013: 127). On Dutch, and in particular West Flemish presents in s-, see van Loey 1958.

9.6 Summary and conclusions

It turns out that we can distinguish between two main groups of evidence: changes due to palatalization in a TK-cluster, and changes which involve the phonetics and phonemics of /g/ and /j/. There is no independent palatalization of *k other than in the clusters dk, tk.

a. The palatalization in TK can be viewed as the direct and trivial result of cluster simplification. It is not confined to coastal Dutch, nor was it caused by the quality of the vowel following the velar consonant.

The earliest forms concern dg > dj in the Old Dutch names in Gard(is) which are restricted to coastal Dutch (in Flanders from 948, in Holland and Zealand evidenced after 1200). In the thirteenth century, the combination te gegen ‘against’ has developed to tjegen (palatalization) whence finally tegen by cluster simplification. This happened in various dialects across the Low Countries. A different result of tegegen was jegen, which, at least in eastern dialects, came about by metanalysis of the intermediate stage tjegen as consisting of te+jegen. The same metanalysis may have happened in Flanders independently and a little earlier (shortly after 1200), unless Flemish jegen arose from a dissimilation of the first g– in original gegen. Another palatalization of g after dentals led to the rise of je and jij ‘you’. Unstressed je developed in the fourteenth century from 2pl. gi ‘you’ in inverted combinations with the corresponding verb form ending in -t, e.g. *gevet-gi ‘you give’ > geved’i. The palatalized dental developed into a cluster [dʒ] which was phonetically reduced to j or was reanalysed as t/d + j. Stressed jij first appears in 1550 and was probably formed by analogy with me, mij ‘me’, we, wij ‘we’. The j-forms are restricted to coastal Dutch (including southwestern Brabant), which may be due to the contemporaneous existence of palatalized allophones of the dental stops in Brabant and Limburg versus their absence in the west.

The origin of the diminutive suffix -tje from palatalization in clusters dk and tk has been proven by Marynissen (1998). Palatalization happened in different regions across the Low Countries independently between the thirteenth and the sixteenth century. Partly, these differences may have been caused by different timing of syncope of the (first) schwa in the suffix -ekin > -eken. The syncope of
an unstressed schwa was also the condition for the palatalization found in the place-name *Kortgene* and for southern Limburgian *aetje* 'vinegar' from *edeke*.

b. A number of developments, all of which are also found in parts of Low and/or High German, affect West Germanic *g*. They presuppose its status as a voiced velar fricative [ɣ], at least in anlaut and inlaut. It may also be assumed that /g/ had a palatal allophone [j] before i, e and a velar allophone [ɣ] before a, o, u. It is likely that the palatal [j] also occurred between i, e, a and a consonant or an unstressed vowel.

In word-internal position, there are four different contexts in which palatalization to j took place. 1. The oldest change (from 800) is that of Old Dutch and Old Saxon *egi* to *ei* and of *igi* into *ī* in compound names. Probably, between two front vowels, [j] phonetically became [j], and [ej] and [ii] were interpreted as /ei/ and /i/. 2. A subsequent change of *egC* to *eiC* was regular in all Early Middle Dutch dialects (*breien* 'to knit', *seide* 'said', etc.). In paradigms with an alternation between Old Dutch *egR* and *egeR*, the result *eiR* appears to have been generalized only in western Dutch dialects. 3. Words which had *a/e/igeC* throughout the paradigm in Late Old Dutch could syncopate the unstressed vowel if it was followed by one or more syllables. When syncope took place, palatalization to *eiC* occurred more frequently in western dialects than in the east (e.g. *eide* vs. *egede* 'harrow', *heinen* vs. *hegenen* 'to fence'), though some exceptions with *ei* are also found in the east. 4. A few words show palatalization of word-final -g in western dialects (*kei*, -Dei, -eie).

In all of these cases, we may assume that original [ej] merged with the already existing combination /ei/. There was no discernable difference in phonetics between western and eastern Dutch, and for the oldest developments (nr. 1 and 2 above), eastern and western Dutch provide an equal amount of evidence. We do find that coastal Dutch more often generalized *eiR* from alternating paradigms (nr. 2), more often syncopated the middle syllable of trisyllabic forms, leading to *eiC* (nr. 3), and is the only region to show palatalization of word-final -Vg (nr. 4). The first two differences have their origin in different syncope patterns or in different morphological preferences, whereas only the last one might show an older, possibly Frisian/Franconian dialect difference.

In word-initial position, g- is usually retained in Dutch before front vowels. The only exception is the unstressed prefix *ga-* in past participles and collective nouns. In Early Middle Dutch, this appears as *ye- or i- in part of West Flemish. In modern dialects, initial *a-* occurs in Flanders, Zealand, Holland, and in parts of Overijssel and Gelderland. Probably, these areas experienced a shift of *ge-* > *je-* > *i- > a-. The initial shift of g- to j- was either dialect-internal, and motivated by the phonetics of unstressed [je-], or it was due to the language contact process between Proto-Frisian and Franconian in the coastal area.
The mirror image of the change from *g to j is the exceptionless change of word-initial *j- to g- before stressed *i, *i or *e at the Old Dutch stage. This fricativization occurred in all dialects. J- has also become g- in one Frisian loanword in Holland and Utrecht (gier) and in a few words in which the diphthong *eo- did not become Early Middle Dutch ie- but (*j)e-. The change of je/i- > ge/i- can be interpreted as the identification of the (more) fricativ al allophone of /j-/ before front vowels with the voiced palatal fricative \[\text{j}\] in original ge-, gi-.

The general conclusion of this section is that, on chronological and geographical grounds, few of the reviewed palatalizations qualify as (influenced by) Proto-Frisian or can be linked to the difference between western and eastern Dutch, see Table 27. As a result, the Dutch palatalizations do not have any bearing on the subgrouping of West Germanic.68 Only the sporadic palatalization of word-final -Vg, and possibly the palatalization in the prefix ge-, might result from the Frisian-Franconian language contact in western Dutch.

Table 27. Summary of the consonant phenomena reviewed in Chapter 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Coastal vs. inland Dutch</th>
<th>Status in coastal Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>palatalization in TK-clusters</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g &gt; j before i,e,C</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Vg &gt; -Vj</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>imposition from PFri.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*j- &gt; g- before i, i, e</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ga- &gt; je-</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>imposition from PFri.?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second conclusion is that there is no meaningful way to connect the palatalizations of g with the modern distribution of its allophones. As is well known, Modern Dutch has for the phonemes /g/ and /x/ the voiceless allophones uvular [χ] or pharyngeal [h] in western and northern dialects (mostly the same pronunciation indistinctly for both phonemes), versus palatal voiced [j] and voiceless [ç], respectively, in the south and southeast. If anything, the indiscriminate palatalization of g before a consonant in both western and eastern dialects as well as the general fricativization of j- before front vowels in all dialects, point to all dialects having a palatal allophone before front vowels up to Early Middle Dutch. That includes western and northern dialects which now typically have a uvular allophone. It follows that the modern distribution of allophones is due to a reorganization of the original, vowel-conditioned distribution per region: the west generalized the

68. An indirect connection of the Dutch palatalizations of g with similar events in Frisian and English remains a possibility if one assumes that Anglo-Frisian merely phonologized fronted West Germanic allophones earlier and much more pervasively than did Dutch and German.
velar allophone (which became pharyngeal in parts of Flanders and Zealand, and uvular in parts of Holland and the northeast), the southeast generalized the palatal pronunciation (Goeman 1998: 217). Our data imply that this redistribution of allophones post-dates the Early Middle Dutch stage.
CHAPTER 10

Other issues involving consonants

10.1 Retention of *ft

A typical characteristic of Modern Dutch is the reflex *xt <cht> from WGm. *ft, as opposed to the retention of *ft in English, Frisian, and Modern High German. For Dutch, van Loon (2014: 236) dates the change to the twelfth century based on toponyms.

Map 8. kopen in VMNW
Van Loey (1976: 99–101) formulates the following sound change: $ft$ became $xt$ after a short vowel, but remained after a long vowel or a consonant. This rule has not been adopted by subsequent handbooks, and probably rightly so, since several dialects preserve long vowels before $xt < ft$, such as zacht ‘soft’ and zuchten ‘to sigh’. Van Loey’s examples of retained $ft$ can be due to analogical restoration of $f$ (helft ‘half’ to half, dorfte ‘needed, dared’ to dorven, vijftich ‘fifty’ to vijf ‘five’) or involve $ft$ that arose by syncope, as in heeft ‘has’ from hevet, and hoofd ‘head’ from hoved.

In place-names with a relatively clear etymology, most instances of $xt$ appear in the twelfth century at the earliest, viz. in Hocht (Limburg): Huste 952, Hufte 929–62, Hothe 1212, Hochte 1221; Kachtelgaver (EFla.? and if from *kaftel-): Cactegauer 1171; Lichtaart (Antwerp): Lifterde 1146, 1186; Lichtervelde (WFla., from *luftar-feld-): Lichtervelda 1127; and Ochtezele (dept. Nord, France, *Uftinga-sali-): Ohtingesale 1183, Uthingesela 1187. The toponym Gundinisgrabt (1144, EFla.) ‘Gundin’s ditch’ retains $ft$ in the middle of the twelfth century (Tavernier-Vereecken
The earliest appellative showing \( *ft > cht \) in Flemish is *achtinge ‘confiscation’ (Ghent, 1176–1200) from *haftinge.

The tenth-century Wachtendonck Psalter mostly preserves \( ft \), but in a few cases we find <ht>, in *hahtnodi ‘imprisonment’ (in glosses), senihte ‘softness’ (once in a gloss, versus senifti, -e), stihtan ‘to found’ (in glosses, vs. gestiftoda in Psalm 68). Since \( ht \) is only found in glosses, it may have entered the text during the textual transmission and not be original.

Nevertheless, it is possible that southeastern Dutch implemented the change to \( xt \) earlier than the dialects to its west. In neighbouring Old Saxon and Moselle Franconian, \( ft > xt \) is found already in the tenth century (Lasch 1913: 153, Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 § 139 Anm.7). This date suggests that the change spread from the interior of the continental West Germanic dialect continuum to the northwest, reaching the Low Countries in the twelfth century and the western dialects thereof in the thirteenth. The coastal dialects preserve \( ft \) until the end of the Middle Ages and in some relic forms even today.

In Early Middle Dutch, \( ft \) is characteristic for Holland and Utrecht, but some attestations are also found in Zealand and Brabant (e.g. in nichte ‘niece’), see Mooijaart 1992: 178–83. Maps 8 and 9 compare the data for the preterite and participle of kopen ‘to buy’\(^{69}\) with the noun gifte, gichte ‘gift’.\(^{70}\) The latter noun clearly shows the western retention of \( ft \), whereas the former displays \( xt \) also in Flanders and Zealand. The discrepancy between the two maps may be explained by the analogical restoration of \( f \) in gifte on the model of \( v \) in geven. Similarly, \( ft > xt \) is much more restricted in the conjunction ofte ‘or, whether’ (see Berteloot 1984a, Map 136), where \( f \) could be restored on the model of the conjunction of. Analogical restoration of \( f \) can also explain schrift ‘writing’, for which \( xt \) is only once attested in Limburgian scregt. The data for after, achter ‘behind’ from the thirteenth century are rather restricted (Berteloot 1984, Map 133, has \( ft \) only in a few places in Holland and Utrecht), but CRM14 shows consistently after in all of Holland and Utrecht, in a considerable portion of the North Brabant evidence, and sporadically in West Limburg. Van Loey (1976: 101) mentions the sporadic preservation of \( ft \) throughout Brabant into the fifteenth century.

---

\(^{69}\) In red the spelling (ge)coft- is indicated (total 57), in yellow the spelling (ge)cocht- (total 365).

\(^{70}\) In red the spellings with \( ft \) are indicated (total 1235), in yellow, the ones with \( cht, ht \) or \( gt \) (total 105).
10.2 Final -g > -f in Flemish

The change of final (devoiced) -x to -f is attested in various contemporary Dutch dialects. Examples given by Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 100) include West Flemish *genoef ‘enough*, *ploef ‘plough*, and Groningen *sloef* (beside *sloeg ‘quiet, down*, Fri. *slûch ‘sleepy*). All of these have a rounded back vowel, which may partly explain the shift to labiality of the following fricative. Schönfeld & van Loey call the change an Ingvaeonic phenomenon since it can also be found, for instance, in English *enough* and *laugh*, both with [f]. Taeldeman (1982: 282) regards the phenomenon as attested in Modern Flemish dialects as one of the possible Ingvaeonic characteristics of Flemish. Van Bree (1997a: 15) adds Frisian *genôch ‘enough* versus *noflik* (Du. *genoeglijk ‘pleasant*).

The converse change of -f to -ch is found in Early MDu. *viscoigh ‘fishmonger*, *viscoighhighe ‘female fishmonger* in Calais (1293), and in other surnames from the same town, such as *Apelcoich* (1291), *Honecoigh* (1293), *Honecoech* (1296), *Houtkoich* (1298) (Gysseling 1966c: 157). The etymology of -*coich* is thought to be *-kōf ‘seller, salesman* (comparable to OHG *koufo*), but this is not without its difficulties: there is no attestation of putative *koof*, its *f* (instead of *p*) would be unexplained in Dutch, and the formation itself is not known outside Calais.

As to the phonetic background of -x > -f, note that the acoustic impression caused by *f* and *x* is similar. The change could therefore be explained as perception-driven. In Middle Dutch, syllable-final *x > f* is also attested in other contexts, albeit sporadically (van Loey 1976: 100, note 1). An example from the thirteenth century is *sorfechtech* (WBrab., 1291–1300) for *sorg-echtig ‘careful*; the simplex *sorge ‘care* retains its velar fricative in the same text. For modern dialects, Weijnen (1966: 245) mentions some other instances of this change. In fact, *f > x* and *x > f* can be observed in many languages, particularly in syllable-final position. These changes are linguistically too trivial to project them back into the time of Frisian-Franconian language contact.

10.3 h- > zero, g > h, and hypercorrections

In Modern Dutch, the loss of prevocalic *h* is a feature of the dialects of Flanders, Zealand, western Brabant, and some of the more archaic dialects of Holland (Scheveningen, Egmond aan Zee, Enkhuizen, Volendam, Marken).71 Procope of *h*- is furthermore found in parts of Overijssel, Groningen and Belgian Limburg; see

---

According to De Wulf (2003), zero anlaut used to be characteristic for several other towns of Holland, such as Schiedam, Vlaardingen, Gouda, Monnickendam, etc., and for Groningen, where $h$- has been reintroduced under the influence of the standard language. Crena de Iongh (1959: 77f.) has argued that $h$- had a weak position in the colloquial language of Holland in the seventeenth century. There is no reliable written proof, however, for the absence of $h$- in the earlier language of Holland.

It seems likely that most of the Limburgian $h$-less dialects have dropped $h$- under the influence of urban dialects from Brabant (Goossens 1992b). In Brabant, the loss and the hypercorrect addition of $h$- is found in some western dialects from the thirteenth century on, though van Loey (1976: 108) argues that the early cases may be due to the influence of the Flemish writing tradition.

It is possible, then, that $h$-lessness in Late Middle Dutch was restricted to Flanders, Zeeland, and Holland, whereas $h$- was preserved in Brabant, Limburg, Gelderland and Utrecht. And although $h$-loss is found in many languages independently – and would be a trivial development of any phonological system – the geographic distribution in Dutch justifies the question whether the western $h$-loss is due to the Frisian-Franconian language contact.

Already in Old Dutch, hypercorrect instances of $h$- point to the loss of etymological $h$-.

72. Of course, some of the modern, eastern $h$-less dialects, e.g. those of Limburgian Maasland and of Overijssel, may have arisen independently.
Gosin, Gosekin. Note also the place-name *Gansbeke > Hansbeke (1160) > Ansbeke (1236), in which $g$- > $h$- occurred early enough to share the change of $h$ > zero. Flemish also occasionally shows the reverse phenomenon, viz. initial $g$ for original $h$: Genderdik 'Hendrik', Gobarnus 'Hobarnus'. Tavernier-Vereecken interprets these spellings as an indication for the pronunciation of initial $g$- in Flemish as a laryngeal fricative, which could then disappear together with etymological *$h$-. Note that, in modern Flemish, etymological $g$- is pronounced as [h-], or, especially in Zealand, as [ɦ-].

The Old Dutch toponyms from the northern Low Countries seldom show $h$- loss or hypercorrect $h$-. Additional $h$- appears in some of the oldest Latin sources from the eighth and ninth centuries, e.g. Hisla ‘the river IJssel’ (814 copy 1170), Hemi ‘the river Eem’ (777 copy 10th, end 11th c.), Hecmunde ‘Egmond’ (922 copy early 13th c.). It would have to be investigated whether this may be due to Romance scribes of the documents in which these names are found. For most of modern Belgium, the same is basically true: both $h$- loss and hypercorrect $h$- are rare. The number of such cases is slightly higher than in the north, probably because we are nearing the francophone area, and the number of toponyms occurring in (Latin or) Old French sources is therefore higher.

In West and East Flanders the loss of $h$- is significantly more frequent. Examples include Hatinghem (9th c.) > Atingehem (995) ‘Aaigem’ (EFla.), Haleftra (974) > Haltra ‘Aalter’ (EFla.), Herlebouds kapelle > Erlebaldi k. (WFla.), Handelingahem (10th c.) > Andelgem (WFla.), Hardoia > Ardoie (WFla.), Hasnetha > Assenede (EFla.), Hicclesbeke (962) > Ycelsbeke (1126), Icklesbeke (1191–1200) ‘Ekelsbeke’ (Nord, France). Hypercorrect $h$- is also found more often in Flanders than in other regions. To a certain extent, this preponderance will be due to the simple fact that the number of toponyms from Flanders by far outweighs that of other regions. But it may also be due to the strong influence of the French writing tradition, and to francophone scribes. Such cases, therefore, do not allow reliable statements on the actual occurrence of hypercorrect $h$- in Old Flemish.

In order to get more reliable data on the geographic situation, we will have to take a look at Early Middle Dutch (van Loey 1976: 108f., Mooijaart 1992: 196f.). As far as we can see in VMNW, $h$- loss occurs in West-Flanders and, more sporadically, in Ghent and Brabant, but not elsewhere. Compare the attestations of words such as haghe ‘fence’, halen ‘to get’, hebben ‘to have’, etc.; see also Berteloot 1984a, Map 134 and p. 95–6. Early Middle Dutch thus seems to confirm that Flanders was the original locus of the loss of $h$-.

There is another issue at stake here. The isogloss concerning the change $h$ > zero is continued on the French side of the language border in the same direction. This was first noted by Grootaers (1942: 221 including map II; see also Weijnen 1964: 12–3). The explanation for this phenomenon is still unclear. Weijnen 1964 discusses a number of other phonological and lexical isoglosses which seem to
transgress the Dutch-French language border, such as the fronting of /u:/ to /y:/ and the diphthongization of /ε:/ to /je/. Weijnen argues that mere Romance-Germanic bilingualism cannot account for the shared isoglosses on both sides of the linguistic border, and he concludes that an earlier, common substratum language may have been responsible for the shared developments. Just which substratum this would have been, Weijnen does not say. Von Wartburg (1971: 86) and van Bree (1996: 270) apparently disagree with Weijnen’s conclusion. They ascribe the shared isoglosses to intense language contact between Dutch and French. In the words of von Wartburg, “Il y a ici une rare communauté de tendances d’évolution, qui montre l’intensité de la symbiose des deux races”.73 De Schutter (1999: 126) is somewhat more specific, and traces shared features of southern Dutch and Wallonian French back to the broad language contact zone between Romance and Germanic dialects in the early centuries of the Germanicization of the Low Countries.

Let us have a closer look at Weijnen’s h-argument. Latin h had become silent in all of Gallo-Romance, but a new h was introduced with Germanic loanwords from the fifth century (as in haie ‘hedge’, héron ‘heron’, haïr ‘to hate’; Bourciez 1971: 125). This h- was preserved in central-northern France until the end of the Middle Ages, but was then lost. In Normandy and Lorraine, however, h- was retained. As Map 10 shows, the Lorraine part extends into the eastern part of Wallony. The disappearance of ‘Germanic’ h- from most dialects in the later Middle Ages probably happened under the influence of Central French, as was the case with many changes in French.74 Its spread, from Isle de France to Artesia and Picardia, would imply that the zero/h isogloss originally had a very different course, and probably did not even reach the French/Dutch linguistic border before the Modern Era.

On the Dutch side of the border, the modern course of the isogloss is also not ancient. The earliest attestations of h-loss and hypercorrect h- appear in Flanders in the tenth century. Zero anlaut was originally confined to Flanders before it spread to Brabant in the thirteenth century, to the cities of Antwerp and Brussels, among others. The map shows that the southern part of the h-less area (from Brussels eastward) stretches much further to the east than the northern part (from Antwerp

73. “This is a rare case of common tendencies of change, which shows the intensity of the symbiosis of both races”. Of course, the equation of ‘language’ with ‘race’ is scientifically untenable (or, rather, meaningless).

74. This scenario is supported by the occurrence of a very similar development with Frankish /w/. In his treatment of the West-Frankish loans in Gallo-Romance, Gamillscheg (1970: 393) has shown that Frankish /w/ was borrowed as /w/ in northern France (the actual area of settlement of the Franks) whereas it was replaced by /gw/ in areas further south, where the contact was less intense. In the later period (say, the second half of the Middle Ages), w- was replaced in many words and names by gw-.
eastward). As Goossens 1992b has argued, this must be due to recent expansion of \( h \)-loss from Brussels into smaller provincial towns in southern Brabant and Limburg. It follows that the continued \( h/zero \) isogloss north and south of the linguistic border, as seen on Map 10, is the result of two chronologically and linguistically independent changes: one from Flanders eastward, another from Central France northward. Its twentieth-century course was certainly very recent, and so may be the fact that the Dutch and French isoglosses meet at all.

We thus return to the western Dutch origin of \( h \)-loss. A tentative scenario can be written, according to which \( h \)-loss would be due to language contact between Franconian and Proto-Frisian. Suppose Proto-Frisian did not yet have the \( /h/ \) of Franconian, but had kept the velar fricative \( /x/ \) of Anglo-Frisian. There is some circumstantial evidence to this effect. In the clusters \( hl-, \, hn-, \, hr-, \, hw-\), the \( h-\) disappeared in southern Dutch already in the eighth century, according to van Loon 2014: 117, whereas \( hl-\) and \( hr-\) were retained in northern and eastern Dutch until at least the tenth century, judging by the spelling of toponyms. Since the spellings \( hl-, \, hr-\) etc. presuppose an audible consonant, which in this position cannot be [h], they actually point to phonetic [xl-], [xr-]. In Old Frisian, \( h-\) was still preserved in writing before resonants until the fifteenth century (Nijdam 1999). Suppose, also, that Old Low Franconian had already changed initial \( *x-\) into \( h-\) by the eighth century, around the time when Flanders shifted to speaking Franconian. The native speakers of L1-Proto-Frisian may not have identified Franconian \( *h-\) with their own velar \( x-\), since [h] is quite an unstable sound. Instead, \( h-\) was lost from Flemish.

To illustrate how this language contact may have worked, I reconstruct in Table 28 the relevant phonological systems as far as the voiced velars and fricatives are concerned, at a stage after the Proto-Frisian palatalization of velars next to front vowels, and after the loss of intervocalic \( *x > *h > zero \) in both varieties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1 Proto-Frisian:</th>
<th>L2 Early Old Low Franconian:</th>
<th>New L1 Old Flemish:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( g- ) -g- (-gg-) (-g &gt; -k)</td>
<td>( \gamma- ) -( \gamma- ) (-gg-) (-\gamma &gt; -x) ( x-) (-x-) (-gg-) (-x)</td>
<td>( h-/x-) -( xx-) (-x) zero (-xx-) (-x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This whole scenario is of course highly speculative, and merely intended to illustrate the theoretical possibility of language contact playing a role in \( h \)-loss. In particular, the discrepancy between \( h \)-loss in Flanders and (apparent) \( h \)-retention in thirteenth-century Holland is striking.
10.4 Metathesis of \( Vr \) to \( rV \) before \( xt \)

In the second member of personal names, the sequence \( Vrxt \) is metathesized to \( rVxt \) in Old Saxon, Old High German and Old English. The restriction of this shared metathesis to personal names is generally ascribed to the prosodic status of the second member, which presumably carried less stress than the first member (cf. Gallée 1993: 154, Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 § 120, Campbell 1959: 185). In Old English, metathesis in stressed position is mainly found in Late Northumbrian and Late West Saxon (Campbell 1959: 184), always beside unmetathesized forms.

In Old Frisian, \( thruch \) ‘through’ (MoWF \( troch \), MoEFri. \( truch \), InsNFri. \( troch < WGm. *purx \) and Briocht (*berhta-, in which metathesis preceded breaking) point to a Proto-Frisian date of the metathesis (Bremmer 2009: 40). Thus, the metathesis in Frisian was much earlier than in Dutch, to which we turn now.

In Old Dutch, the metathesis is absent from most of the available evidence, which includes the place-names corresponding with modern \( Bracht, Brecht, \) and
Merchtem, the Wachtendonck Psalter glosse filoberht ‘praeclarus’, the words nunt-forhte ‘do not be afraid’, uorhten ‘awe’, thurg ‘through’ in the Middle Franconian Rhyming Bible, and thurgh in the Leiden Willeram. Only a few place-names containing personal names in *Berxta- show r-metathesis in the twelfth century, viz. UUoubrechtengem (1122) < *Wald-berxt-, Engilbrehtes ambelhte (NHol., 776 copy 1183–95), and Osprehtashem (Holland, 889 copy 1206–26), Osbragtashem (918–948 copy end of 11th c.). Of the many personal names in *-berxta- in the Old Ghent sources mentioned in Tavernier-Vereecken 1968, nearly all are attested with a second member -bertus. Metathesized instances are Albrecht de Campin (12th c.), Albreht Scipboem, Albrech Scipboem (1201–50), Wootin filius Gedebreds (1201–50), Giselbrech (1200), La[m]bret Scipboem, Lambrect (1201–50), Voubrech (1201–50), Willebret (1034–58 copy 12th c.). Thus, the Old Dutch situation is – as far as the sources allow us to tell – similar to that of Old Saxon and Old High German.

In Early Middle Dutch, the metathesis has extended to stressed syllables in most dialects, as shown by its presence in vrucht ‘fear’, vruchten ‘to fear’ < *furxti, wracht(te) ‘made’ < *warxt- (to werken ‘work’), and scipwrictere ‘shipwright’ (Calais, 1289). Original Vr is only preserved in the Limburgian Servatius Legend (ca. 1200), which has uorgten /vorxtan/ ‘to fear’ and uerwargte /vərwarxtə/ ‘made angry’. Original or secondary *Vrxt has been preserved in the place-names borchte (Antw.), merchtene (Mechelen, from *Marktin-), and werchtere (*werf-ter-; Debrabandere et al. 2010: 274).

There is evidence that the development *-ft > -xt, which can be dated to the twelfth century, preceded the metathesis of *-Vrxt to -rVxt. Early MDu. noetdorft (WBrab., 1266–67, 1291–1300), MoDu. nooddruft ‘poverty, need’ continues PGm. *naudi-þurb-ti-, compare OS nodthurft, OFri. něðhreft, Got. naudípaurfs. In the thirteenth century, rcht(t) is attested indirectly in East Flemish noetdorch (1289, with -cht > -cht), and in Limburgian notdorten (1290–1310; plural, with rcht > rt). These forms still have no metathesis, but the form nootdruchte from Zwolle (1399–1425) shows *-rft > -rcht plus r-metathesis. It follows from these early attestations that -ft- as found in Early MDu. noetdorft and MoDu. nooddruft must be due to restoration of f on the model of the verb dorven ‘to need’. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, r-metathesis of Vrft to rVft is reflected in tokens from Holland and northeastern Dutch (e.g. noodruf regularly in Drente and Groningen). In the southern dialects, r(f)t predominates until at least 1500. In literary Modern Dutch, the metathesized variant has become usual in all texts after 1600.

75. There are exceptions with metathesis in the south, such as noitdroftich ‘opportunus’ in Teuthonista (1477) from the Cleves/Guelders area.
If MoDu. *gewricht* 'joint', which is first attested in 1599, goes back to *ge-werf-te*, it supports the relative chronology of *ft > xt* and r-metathesis as based on *nooddruft*. Yet it is uncertain whether *gewricht* indeed belongs to *werven* 'to turn': its *ch* may have been influenced by MDu. *wrijgen* 'to turn, grow crooked'.

As to the cause of the leftward metathesis of *r* before *cht*, we can only speculate. Van Loon (2014: 222) ascribes it to the rise of a prop vowel after *r* (*furxt > *furuxt*), as attested in Old Saxon and Old High German: OHG *forahta* < *forhta* (Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 § 69), OS *thurfti* < *thurfti* (Gallée 1993: 110), etc. Subsequently, the vowel to the left of *r* would have been weakened and the new distribution of consonants (*fr – xt*) would be more balanced.

Geographically and chronologically, there is no compelling reason to assume that the metathesis belongs to the coastal Dutch phenomena. One could speculate that the cluster *rcht* is more difficult to pronounce without a prop vowel if the fricative had a uvular or pharyngeal quality (as it does in the modern coastal dialects) than if it was a palatal fricative (as in southern and southeastern Dutch). This distribution would match, though only very roughly, the preservation of -rcht- in the Limburgian dialect, which has generalized the palatal fricative.

10.5 *xs > ss*

The assimilation of *xs* to *ss* is typical of Dutch and Low German, as against the retention of the cluster as /ks/ in Frisian, in Standard English and in High German: Dutch *vos, was*, Middle Low German *vos, was*, versus MoWF *foks, waaks*, E. *fox, wax* (but Yorkshire *owse* 'ox'), MoHG *Fuchs, Wachs*. In the Wachtendonck Psalter, we find assimilation in *uusso* 'foxes' (gen.pl.) beside retained *xs* in *wahsan* 'to grow', *wihsel* 'change', *ohsson* 'oxen'. The assimilation seems to have taken place earlier in western dialects than in eastern ones, because in Ghent no trace is left of *x* before *s* by the eleventh century (Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 589). By 1200, *ss* has become general in Dutch. In Old Saxon, *hs* mostly remains in the Heliand though there are some spellings with single *s*. In the Freckenhorst *Heberegister*, the older parts preserve *hs*, but *s* becomes normal in the younger parts: *Thahsbeki, Thasbiki* 'Badger’s Creek’, *ses* ‘six’, etc. Single *s* also surfaces in the Prudentius glosses and in other Old Saxon sources, cf. Gallée 1993: 178.

The early rise of /ss/ also in Old Saxon and the Dutch distribution by 1200 leave little room to argue for a coastal Dutch origin of the change. On the contrary, Frisian has retained the velar obstruent in the cluster as /kl/.

76. To *werven* 'to turn', compare *wervel* 'vertebra' and MDu. *ghewerve* 'pivot'.
10.6 Medial *pp > ss and tt

Most of the relevant handbooks state that the West Germanic geminate *pp yields ss in Dutch (van der Meer 1927: 105, Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 57f., van Bree 1987: 157, van Loon 2014: 79). At the same time, they claim that some words also show tt. The latter reflex is sometimes regarded as a feature of the Frisian substrate in coastal Dutch, most recently so by Bremmer (2008: 293). Yet since tt sometimes occurs in dialects which are far removed from possible Frisian substrate influence, not all words with tt can come from a Frisian source. In fact, as I show in detail in de Vaan 2014a, WGm. *pp regularly yielded s(s) in all dialects of Dutch whereas t(t) continues WGm. *tt. Here is a short summary of the main evidence.

Two nouns in *pp have the reflex ss in all dialects, viz. wisse ‘stere’ (< *wiþjōn-) and klosse ‘lump, bobbin’ (<*kluþþōn-). Next to klosse we also find klotte, which probably reflects a variant West Germanic preform *kluttōn-. The words latte ‘lath’, motte ‘moth’ (see Kroonen 2011: 214–21), and spot ‘mockery’ must also be reconstructed with original *-tt-, which existed side by side with preforms in *-þþ-. They have no ss-variants in Dutch.

In three other words, the variants in tt can be explained as resulting from analogical influence of related forms. The noun smisse ‘smithy’ (<*smiþjō-) is sporadically found as smitte, which may have introduced the final t of smit, smet ‘smith’. Dutch klisse ‘tangle’ (< *kliþþōn-) has a variant klitte in western and southeastern dialects; its tt may stem from cognate forms such as Du. klijt ‘clay’ (< *klīt-, G. Kließe ‘burdock’ < *klit-). The verb bessen ‘to dab a wound’ (< *baþjan) is only found in central West Flanders, whereas betten of the standard language is at home in the other coastal Dutch dialects. I regard bessen as the original reflex, whereas tt in betten might have been influenced by bat, bet ‘better’.

The main exception in Dutch is zwet(te) ‘border (ditch)’, which is a genuine loanword from Frisian. WGm. *swaþjō(n)- (f.) ‘border, demarcation’ was derived from *swapa- ‘swath; track’. We find it in Frisian and in Dutch dialects bordering on Frisian. Old East Frisian swe(th)the, -swiththe retains the dental fricative which became tt in OWFri. swette, switte (f.) ‘border’, MoWF swette, zwette. In Old Dutch, we find the toponym Wimnorasuetha, ‘border of the inhabitants of Wimmenum’ (ca. 1125–50) in North Holland. Middle Dutch swette, zwette ‘border, demarcation’, MoDu. zwet is attested in Groningen and in Holland. In Holland, it is mainly used for a water course, for instance in the compound zwetsloot, ‘border-ditch’. For a collection of Hollandish toponyms involving Zwet (found from Delft northward), see Blok 1959a: 21. The geographic restriction to Holland and Groningen and the identical meaning and usage of the words guarantees that Dutch zwette, zwet is a loanword from Frisian.
A similar case is presented by Hollandish til(le) ‘wooden bridge; attic’ (Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 58, Bremmer 2012: 133), for which compare MoWF telle ‘threshing floor’, OWFri. tille. Initial t- represents the Frisian development of WGm. *þ-, as opposed to Dutch d-. The same etymon WGm. *þiljôn- which has given Frisian telle is the source of MDu. dele, MoDu. deel ‘floor, threshing floor’ (German Diele). Tille, til occurs as ‘(small wooden) bridge’ from the sixteenth century onwards in North Holland, Fryslân and Groningen (see WNT s.v. til). As ‘attic (in a barn)’, til(le) is attested in Holland around 1400 (MNW s.v. til, 1390–1400; the text is a report of the war against the Frisians, so this might be a frisianism) and still in the twentieth century (see TNZN Map 7.5). In Fryslân, this meaning is found for til(-)ing. It represents a semantic specialization of the ‘wooden planks’, as in German Diele. In the seventeenth century, til in Holland developed the meaning ‘falling bridge to catch doves or pigeons’ whence ‘pigeon cage’. The borrowing presupposes the change of þ- to t- in Old West Frisian, a process which Laker (2014) dates roughly between 1300 and 1450. Hence, tille may have been borrowed in North Holland as an important infrastructural term in the landscape of West Friesland. The fourteenth century seems rather late for the borrowing, but the word might have still had th- in Frisian but was borrowed with t- by Hollandish, which, already in the second half of the thirteenth century, had no th- anymore.

The development of *þþ is confirmed by the evidence of intervocalic *þm, which mainly shows the reflexes -dem(-) and -s(se)m- in Dutch. The former was the regular reflex when m was vocalized to -Vm, whereas sm regularly resulted from a Late Old Dutch cluster *þm. Inner-paradigmatic alternations between *þVm and *þm- are reflected in the geographic variation between d and ss in adem beside asem ‘breath’ (*aþma-) and vadem ‘fathom’ (*faþma-) beside vessem ‘to fathom a needle’ (*faþmjan-). Three different reflexes co-occur in peem, pessem, and pettem ‘root, field horsetail’, all from *piþma(n) -. Whereas peem < *pedem and pessem show the same reflexes of *þm as adem beside asem, the form pettem in Belgian Limburg and near Brussels (Goossens 2004) is the result of contamination with *pitt- ‘pith’ (Dutch pit).

The assimilation in *þþ and *þm can be dated to the early twelfth century, the first witness being the place-name Kneslara, Klisnara (1129) from *kiþþōn-. A possible structural reason for the Dutch development may have been systemic pressure. Old Dutch initial þ- was voiced to [ð-] in the tenth and eleventh century and merged with d- early in the twelfth (Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 580f. based on the personal names from Gent). Geminate *þþ did not share the voicing of single *þ but remained voiceless until the further change to s took place in the early twelfth century. This date coincides with [ð-] > d- and can be explained as resulting from the (loss of) coherence in the consonant system. As long as *ð existed, *þ could be paired with it in the phonological system; but when *ð had become d, voiceless *þ
was the only dental fricative remaining, found in only a limited number of lexemes. For Old Dutch *þm we must similarly assume that the fricative remained voiceless and was then reinterpreted as /s/. This explanation in terms of voicedness also helps to understand the different outcome tt in Frisian, where initial single th- remained unvoiced and became t- (except for function words). On the development of dental fricatives in all varieties of Frisian, see Laker 2014.

10.7 Summary

Table 29. Summary of the consonant phenomena reviewed in Chapter 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Coastal vs. inland Dutch</th>
<th>Status in coastal Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ft &gt; xt</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-g &gt; -f</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h-loss</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>imposition from PFri.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vrxt &gt; rVxt</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xs &gt; ss</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þþ &gt; ss and tt</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fronting of WGm. *\(a\) to /æ/ is an Anglo-Frisian characteristic, see § 8.2.4. It affected stressed *\(a\), unless:

- *\(a\) was followed by *\(x\),
- *\(a\) was followed by one of the clusters \(lC, rC,\) or \(xC\),
- *\(a\) stood in open syllable followed by a back vowel in the next syllable,
- *\(a\) stood between \(w\) and \(rC\),
- *\(a\) stood in the unaccented variant of a stressable word (e.g. \(was\) ‘was’).

Also, /\(a/\) may in some cases have been restored due to paradigm pressure, e.g. 3sg. *\(far\(i\)p\) << *\(faer\(i\)p\). In Proto-Frisian, *\(æ\) merged with *\(e\) before 700 CE. This implies that there were a number of cognate forms in which Proto-Frisian had *\(e\) but Proto-Franconian *\(a\), for instance, *\(dej\) vs. *\(dag\) ‘day’, *\(ek\(k\)\)er vs. *\(ak\(k\)\)er ‘field’.

Several authors have therefore interpreted western Dutch forms with written <\(e\)> or phonological /\(ɛ/\), which correspond with eastern Dutch <\(a\)> and /\(a/, as traces of an Ingvaeonic stage of coastal Dutch with /\(æ/\) or /\(ɛ/\) just like Frisian (Weijnen 1972, Taeldeman 1982: 279). We will first look at the modern dialects, and then turn to three sets of forms in which *\(a\) has became e at an earlier stage: before \(st\) and \(sp\), by analogy with other words containing \(e\), and in two Flemish names.

11.1 Phonetics of short /\(a/\) and /\(e/\) in modern dialects

Some modern dialects have a fronted reflex of *\(a\) across the board, or in a phonetically conditioned subset of forms with inherited *\(a\). Weijnen (1966: 144) interprets sporadic occurrences of *\(e\) for /\(a/\) as coastal relic forms. Actually, most of his examples are found in the western Betuwe, which does not belong to coastal Dutch. In
the introduction to the reflexes of short *a in Dutch, the editors of FAND I (p. 2) write that a fronted variety of short a occurs:

1. In a fairly large part of northeastern Dutch;
2. Sporadically in North Holland;
3. Often in South Holland, Utrecht, western North Brabant and (south)western Gelderland;
4. Often in the province of Antwerp;
5. Sporadically in western South Brabant and southeastern Flanders;
6. In a small southwestern part of French Flanders.

Most frequently, FAND (p. 12) observes fronting of /a/ before a velar in the noun dak ‘roof’, viz. short [æ] or [ɛ] in West Flanders, Zealand, Holland, Utrecht, and South Brabant. Whereas the Ingvaeonic origin of this front vowel in western dialects, as per Weijnen (1955: 19), is considered possible, FAND argues that the e-vocalism in South Brabant may be due to the influence of i-mutated forms (for instance, in tek ‘branch’ after the diminutive tekske, in dek ‘roof’ after dekske or the verb dekken) or to the reinforcement of the palatal quality of the vowel before velar obstruents.

Seven to eight centuries have elapsed since the thirteenth century, which makes it hazardous to use modern, whole-scale distinctions as evidence for the phonetics of /a/ at the time of the Frisian-Franconian language contact. Also, the distribution of the fronted variants does not exactly match the putative spread of Proto-Frisian. For instance, short /a/ in the North Holland dialect of Volendam has two allophones, according to Van Ginneken (1954: 283), viz. [a] before labial and dental consonants but [æ]79 before velars, -st, -sp-, -r(C), and in diminutives with the suffix -i. This is clearly a recent, phonetically determined distribution. In nearby Monnikendam, the sound [æ] has been generalized for all instances of short /a/.

An exception may have to be made for North Holland in general. When Boekenoogen (1897: xvi) tells us that e (probably [æ]) instead of a is found in the Zaanstreek in a number of high-frequency words such as hed(de) ‘had’, wes ‘was’, wet ‘what’, wen ‘when’, went ‘because’ (Du. want), den ‘than’, one may note that Old Frisian also has e in some of the corresponding words, such as h(w)et beside h(w)at ‘what’, (h)went beside (h)want ‘because’, thenne beside thanne ‘than’, and it is possible that these words (which are often used in unstressed position) preserve an older, general palatal pronunciation of /a/. But it is also conceivable that, as unstressed words, they developed somewhat differently from the main lexicon, as is

79. Van Ginneken writes “a”, but calls it a more or less palatalized vowel.
often the case. To give just one parallel: in modern Limburgian, *dat* ‘that’ and *als* ‘if, when’ have become *det* and *es*, but they are the only words with /a/ to have done so. Dupont (1910–11: 155) suggests that they underwent i-mutation in sandhi contexts, e.g. *dat-ich* ‘that I’ > *det-ich*. This is an ingenious but not necessarily correct solution.

Boekenoogen also mentions other North Hollandish forms, such as *ekker* ‘acre’, which is found with *e* in texts of the seventeenth century. This may be a real loanword from Frisian, as is the case with several North Hollandish words for local toponymy. The Zaanstreek adjective *lef* for MoDu. *laf* ‘weak, cowardly’ (Boekenoogen 2004: 294) refers particularly to (plat-)*fish of inferior quality. The word *dem* ‘hoarse’ seems to be a relic form for *damp* ‘moist, weak’. The neuter noun *stet*, plural *stetten* for ‘landing place, jetty’ is given by Boekenoogen (2004: 503) for the restricted area of Akersloot and Uitgeest. The word is already attested in the sixteenth century as *stedt* and seems to have been more widely spread, occurring also in the town of Hoorn. The word is not mentioned by Pannekeet (1984). It is tempting to regard *ste(d)t* as a loan from Old Frisian *sted*, *stēd* ‘place’, surviving in specialized usage. In any case, the meaning of *stet* differs enough from synchronic *stad* ‘town’ to exclude that *stet* is merely due to a general, western Dutch raising of *a* to *e*.

I conclude that only North Holland shows what may be traces of an earlier, general raised reflex of short */a*. In view of the certainty of a Frisian substrate in this province, this is also the least surprising area to find the *e*-reflexes.

### 11.2  

*a* > *e* before *sk* and *sp*

In Middle and Modern Dutch, a few nouns have raised *a* to *e* before *sk* and *sp*, as was noted, for instance, by van Loey (1976: 11) and WNT s.v. *esch*.

Raising before *sk* is found in MoDu. *tas* ‘bag’, *fles* ‘bottle’ and *es* ‘ash-tree’. MDu. *tassche* ‘bag’ (MoWF *task*, MoHG *Tasche*) shows a variant *tesche* across all dialects and in different genres of literary and non-literary texts (MNW). The *e*-forms were also regularly used in northern and southern Dutch in the seventeenth century, after which they became restricted to southern Dutch (thus WNT). In modern dialects, *tesch(e)* features in southern and northeastern dialects of Dutch.

The word for ‘bottle’ (MoHG *Flasche*, E *flask*) is *flasche* in a few Flemish sources listed by MNW, whereas *flessche* is found in Brabant, Limburg (Tongeren 1396, CRM14), Holland, Utrecht, the eastern city of Deventer, and in the Cleves/Guelders area (*Teuthonista*, 1477). In Modern Dutch, after the last *flasch* was sighted in the sixteenth century, only *e*-forms survive.

The ash tree is found as *ask-* in Old Dutch toponyms and *asch* in 1240 in Limburg. West Flemish has *essche*, also in the surname *van der essche*, at the end
of the thirteenth century. Later in Middle Dutch (Hol. eske) and Modern Dutch (see PLAND), es(k) is the only form left, including in Limburgian. The toponym Esselijkerwoude in South Holland (from *aska-leka-weri-wald ‘wood of the inhabitants of Aska-leka = Ash-stream’) has a- in all Old Dutch attestations, such as Asclekerwalt (1001–50) and Aslecarwald (1156). Initial e- appears in Eslicherwoude (West Holland, 1280–87), and early modern Esselickerwoude. Similarly, the town of Assendelft in North Holland is spelled Ascmannedelf and Ascmannedilf (1063 copy 12th c.); the first member contains *askman- ‘sailor’ or ‘pirate’ (OE æscman).

After 1100, the first syllable usually has e-. Eskmadelf, Eskendelf, etc. (Künzel, Blok & Verhoeff 1989). Quak cautions that the twelfth-century attestations with E- are all from documents originating from the abbey of Egmond, and may display the local, Frisian reflex e- from short *a-. The raising in ‘ash’ is attributed by Franck & van Wijk (1912) and EWN to i-mutation in the adjective *askina- > esschijn ‘ash-wood’ (Limb. 1240 eschen, EBrab. 1260–70 esscin, EFla. 1260–80 essence), and the same explanation is given by Seebold (2011: 258) for MoHG Esche as against MHG asch (next to esch). Yet this analogical explanation of e is not available for tesche ‘bag’ and flesche ‘bottle’. Together, these three words can be explained if a > e was due to sk. If this is correct, we are dealing with a sporadic tendency rather than a completed sound change, since other words in *-ask- lack the raising, for instance, MDu. assche ‘ashes’ (modern as), lassche ‘connection’ (modern las), masche ‘mash’ (modern maas), pasch ‘meadow’ (modern pas), rasch ‘quick, rash’ (modern ras), and waschhen ‘to grow’ (modern wassen). The regional distribution of e does not allow for a connection with the difference between coastal and inland Dutch.

There are four nouns in which WGm. *-asp- is certainly or possibly reflected as Dutch esp, viz. esp ‘asp’, gesp ‘clasp’, hesp ‘ham’ and wesp ‘wasp’.

1. esp ‘asp’. In Old Dutch toponyms without i-mutation factor, we find both e- and a-:Espouth (< *aspa-holt) in West Flanders (4x in the 12th c.), Esphot (EFla., 1195), (H)asplar (< *aspa-lār) in East Flanders (12th c.), Aspanmora in Frisia (890 copy ca. 900). The field name Espt in East Flanders (1272) is explained as *aspōþu- by Gysseling 1960a, again without i-mutation factor. Middle Dutch glossaries yield espe (Glos.Haarl., 1440–50) and espenboem ‘asp tree’ (Teuthonista, 1477). In Modern Dutch, the tree is only sporadically attested before the twentieth century, and always with e-. Most dialects have replaced it with a heteronym, such as ratelpopulier ‘trembling poplar’ or ratelaar (see
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PLAND). Middle Low German also has espe(-), contrast OHG aspa, MHG aspe, MoHG Aspe > Espe.83

2. gesp ‘clasp’. Cognate forms are MoWF gasp, MLG gespe, gaspe ‘clasp’, gespe, gepse ‘space between two hands clasped together’, ME gaispen, gaspen ‘to gape, gasp’, MoE to gasp, OIC. geispa ‘to yawn’. Franck & van Wijk (1912), followed by EWN, reconstruct two Proto-Germanic ablaut variants for the noun, viz. *gapsō(n)- next to *gipsō(n)-. They could have arisen due to contamination of the roots *gap- and *gī- ‘to yawn’. By this interpretation, Dutch gesp(e) could be a direct reflex of *gipsō(n)-. Unfortunately, ‘clasp’ is never actually attested as gisp(e), and an inherited sequence *-isp- is normally retained in most Dutch dialects, compare MoDu. gispen ‘to flog; to rebuke’, kwispen ‘to wag the tail’, mispel ‘medlar’. Hence, the alternative explanation of gesp(e) from *gasp(e) gains in likeli hood. This etymology is supported by the occasional occurrence of a-tokens beside the majority of e-forms: Early MDu. pl. gespen (EHol., 1276–1300), Late MDu. gasp ‘hook’ (Hol., 14th c.), ‘clasp’ (Hol., Deventer), gesp (Hol.), ghisp (Fla. 1350, Hol.). Modern Dutch literary texts always have the noun gesp and the verb gespen ‘to clasp’, but in dialects, gasp survives in North Holland (Boekenoogen 2004: 141). Since i-forms are absent from all West Germanic cognates except for a few Middle Dutch instances of gispe beside gespe, and since -isp- does not normally yield Du. -esp-, gispe can safely be explained from the raising of short e to i which is occasionally found in many Dutch words. Gasp being the normal form in English and Frisian, we must conclude that West Germanic had a noun *gaspō(n)- which was raised to gespe in Dutch.

3. hesp ‘ham’ < WGm. *xaspjō 84 (ON hespa) and hasp ‘bobbin’ < *haspō-. The original meaning of *xasp- may have been ‘joint, hinge’, as shown by the cognate forms MHG and MLG haspe, hespe ‘hinge; bobbin, clew’, MoHG Hespe ‘id.’, OE haspe ‘hinge, clamp’, ON hespa ‘hinge; ball of wool’. From the first attestation of the noun in Dutch (Ghent, 1276–1300) until today, hesp(e) means ‘ham’, also ‘hip joint’, in Flanders and Brabant. A variant form is hisp (Ypres, 1614). In northern Dutch, hips and hieps ‘pork from the upper leg’ are found particularly in the province of Utrecht and western parts of Gelders, and in some eastern dialects of North Holland and South Holland (van Veen 1968). The a-form first appears in the verb onder haspen ‘to mix during coiling’ (Bruges, 1301–25). Haspe is attested as ‘bolt’ in medieval northeastern Dutch, and Kiliaan gives hasp, hapse ‘ball of wool, yarn taken from the reel’. Modern West Flemish still has hasp m. ‘winding reel’. Kiliaan also gives haspe, haspel, ‘spindle, winding

83. “Der Umlaut im Neuhochdeutschen ist offenbar nördlicher Herkunft, er könnte vom Materialadjektiv espen herrühren” (Seebold 2011: 259).

84. Not *haspa- as given by EWN.
The derived verb haspen ‘to wind yarn around the bobbin’ is found in Flanders and Brabant (MNW). The diminutive haspel (MoWF hispel, hespel, haspel, verb hespelje, OHG haspil, MLG MHG haspel) ‘bobbin’, also ‘hinge’, and its derived verb haspelen, have a in all of Middle and Modern Dutch, with only one exception in WNT (hespel, van Beverwijck, 1643).

There are two important aspects about this word family. Firstly, there is no general raising of asp to esp as with ‘clasp’ or ‘wasp’. Secondly, we have a strict separation between e-forms meaning ‘ham’ and a-forms meaning ‘hinge, bobbin’. Since the cognate forms in other Germanic languages require the existence of both PGm. *xaspō- and *xaspjō-, it seems best to explain Dutch haspe from the ō-stem and hesp from the jō-stem. It is possible that these were semantically specialized already in the protolanguage, *xaspō- meaning ‘hinge’ and *xaspjō- ‘joint, hip’.  

4. wesp ‘wasp’ < *wabsō- (OS waspa, MoLG weps, OHG wafsa, wefsa, MoHG Wespe, Bavarian wapsn, MoWF waps, also wapse, weps, weeps, OE weaps, wesp, wefs). There is no evidence for a Proto-Germanic preform *wabes- which could have caused i-mutation. The Reichenauer glosses from northern France (ca. 750, copy end 8th c.) have uuapces, /wapses/, for ‘wasps’ or ‘hornets’. Middle Dutch wespe (Limburg, 1240) means ‘gadfly’. In Middle and Modern Dutch, wesp(e) is the usual form of the noun, but several other variants exist, notably wisp(e) or wips(e) and wa(a)ps(e). WNT attributes the variant with e-vocalism to raising of a before sp, an environment that could also have caused the further raising to i in some dialects, cf. Franck 1910: 66. If uuapces has any real link with Dutch, it would follow that the raising to e took place somewhere between the ninth and the thirteenth century.

Map 11 for modern Dutch was made using the GTRP database. It neglects all forms of ‘wasp’ containing a mid or mid low front vowel, either rounded or unrounded (weps, weeps, waeps, wups, etc.). Instead, the map focuses on the a- and i-vocalism and the ways in which they may confirm the scenario sketched above. The map shows four groups of deviant forms. The blue squares in and around Drente show the forms wapse, waspe, waaps(e), waaaspe: these may preserve the original a-vowel, and, partly, its shortness. Another group of a-dialects is found in northern Zeeland and the adjacent islands of South Holland: wasp(e), waasp(e), waaps, indicated with red circles. Both a-areas are known for other retentions of phonological features which changed in central Dutch (e.g., they resisted e-apocope and retain *i and *ū as monophthongs). The green triangles in the central and eastern Betuwe give the form wips, whereas the yellow quadrants in Limburg have wisp. In both areas, this vocalism is due to recent raising of /ɛ/ before sC-clusters.
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Map 11. Variants of *wesp* in Dutch dialects

In conclusion, we have established that *hesp* probably contained an *i*-mutation factor. The nouns *esp*, *gesp* and *wesp* have raising of original *a* conditioned by the following *sp*. As far as we can tell – the best data are from ‘wasp’ – this raising took place at least in the coastal dialects (with some exceptions, notably Zealand), Brabant, and Limburg, ultimately in the thirteenth century. It therefore has no connection with Frisian-Franconian language contact.

11.3 Dutch *e* for *a* by analogy and/or *i*-mutation

In some other forms, the unexpected *e* instead of *a* can be ascribed to analogy. Van Loey (1976: 11, note 2) lists a number of instances, which we must relate to their models.
The noun ghel occurs once for ghetal 'number' (in a ms. from 1340), and can easily be due to the influence of tellen 'to count' and its derivatives. The occasional form achterstel (e.g., in van den achterstellen renten in Holland, van achterstellen beden in Zealand)\(^\text{85}\) for the adjective achterstal 'past due' will be due to the model of the noun achterstelle 'arrear', which continues an earlier ja-stem.

Dutch blad 'leaf' is found with a in all of Early Middle Dutch. Later in Middle Dutch, there is one instance of the dative plural bladden 'the flat part of an oar', and, according to MNW, modern dialects have bled 'table-top'. MoDu. bled(de) occurs with specialized meanings, especially for denoting certain parts of instruments, e.g. bledde 'blade of a chisel' (Gullegem, West Flanders, WVD II.6a: 200). The specialized meaning and the final -e of Flemish bledde may point to a derivative of blad, such as an original jō-stem. For blad 'leaf of a tree', WVD does not give a single instance of e in Flemish.

MDu. scende 'shame, dreadful state' can be deleted from the list: it is not a by-form of modern schande 'shame' but a separate lexeme. This is asserted by MNW, which adduces semantic differences between MDu. scande and scende. Whereas schande has developed as a derivative *skamdō- from the root of schamen 'to shame', schende must hail from the verb schenden (*skandjan-). In Modern Dutch, schende has disappeared.

Flemish step and dek for modern stap 'step' and dak 'cover, roof' were mentioned as Ingvaeonisms by Taeldeman (1982: 279); van Loey also mentions MDu. dek and tek. Yet MNW, under the lemma dec 'roof', equates dek with German Decke 'cover, ceiling', which is the better solution. Dutch inherited from West Germanic two nouns, *þaka- n. 'roof' (G. Dach, Du. dak) and *þakja- 'cover' (G. Decke, MDu. dec). The latter may have been reinterpreted as a derivative of the verb dekken 'to cover, thatch', which would explain its neuter gender and the lack of final -e in Middle Dutch and modern Flemish. In Early Modern Dutch, the neuter deck can still refer to either 'cover' or 'roof' or 'ship's deck'; in the modern standard language, dek usually means a 'ship's deck' whereas dak means 'roof'.

The noun stap 'step' has a variant step, steppe in Flemish according to Kiliaan (1599), which is confirmed by modern dictionaries. As another variant of stap and the verb stappen, Kiliaan also mentions stip and stippen. These remind us of the occasional raising of e to i, and they may therefore confirm earlier *step and/or a verb *stappjan-. There are other traces of e, e.g. in MDu. voetsteken (dat.pl.) 'foot-steps'. The probable history of the word is carefully explained in EWN. For West Germanic, there is evidence for three different stems, viz. a noun *stappa(n)- (Du. stap, MLG stappe, OHG stapo, stapf), an a-stem *stapa- (OFri. stap) and an i-stem *stapi- (OFri. stepe 'step', OE stepe, stepe; OHG dat.pl. stepfen). All of these can be derived from a single original paradigm with nominative singular *stapō, genitive

\(^{85}\) See MNW.
*stappaz*, which then split to yield *a*-stems, *n*-stems, and *i*-stems, some with intervocalic *p* and others with intervocalic *pp*. Dutch inherited both *stap(p)a- and *stapi-. The *i*-stem is reflected in the *i*-mutation in *voetstappen*, in Flemish *step(pe)* and in *stip* (compare the suffix -skep/-skip ‘ship’ from *-skapi*). A verb form 3sg. pres. *stept ‘steps’ is adduced by van Loey 1976: 84 as a form of *stappen*: *ende stept over die greppe* ‘and if he steps over the gutter’ (i.e., to enter someone’s house; in *Rechtsbronnen van Aardenburg* 210, 58). 86 Quite clearly, this form is an early instance of MoWFle. *steppen*, and continues a jan-verb.

MDu. *tac* ‘sharp point, tooth’ m., MoDu. *tak* ‘branch of a tree’ (MoWF *tak, takkel*) is found occasionally as *tek*, e.g. *den middelsten teck wt den rieck* ‘the middle tooth of a hay fork’ (Sprang, NBrab., 1530–43). Cognates are MHG *zacke*, MLG *tack(e)*, ME *tacke*, MoE *tack*. Whereas English and German point to an *n*-stem *takkan-*, MDu. *tac* represents an *a*-stem *takka-*. For details on the etymology, see Kroonen 2011: 317–19. There is no indication that it was an *i*-stem, and the attestation from Sprang adduced by MNW is from an area in North Brabant where *i*-mutation (in the plural) cannot be excluded.

Dutch *vak* ‘compartment, section’ continues PGm. *faka- n. ‘enclosure; section’. Cognate forms are OS *fac*, OHG *fah*, OFri. *fek*, OE *fæc*; compare also in Middle Dutch and in modern dialects *veken* n. ‘fence, barrier’ < *fakina-. A local variant is Zealandish *vek* ‘part of a barn in which the grain was stored’ (*WZD* 1037), pl. *vekken* and *veken*. In *de Bo* (1892) and *WVD*, *vek* ‘section’ is not attested, though it is striking that, for ‘storage space’, *WVD* gives the word *(schuur)vlek* in northwestern West Flanders, between two adjacent area’s with *vak* (Veurne-Ambacht and northern Waasland). Hence, it seems conceivable that *vlek* ‘spot’ replaced earlier *vek* once the latter was replaced by the more standard form *vak*. Zealandish *vekke* f. ‘surface, piece (of arable land)’ probably also belongs here, and the word may be found in the toponym *Veckeput ‘Vecke-pit’ in East Flanders (1276–1300; VMNW).* This would suggest a reconstruction as a f. noun *fakjō-.*

According to van Loey (1976: 11), the Middle Dutch adjectives *gram* ‘angry’ (PGm. *grama-; nat ‘wet’ (*nata-) and *tam* ‘tame’ (*tama-) had variants *grem, net, tem*, which might be due to the influence of inflectional variants or cognate forms. Of *grem* I only found one instance in *Die Rose* by Heinric van Aken, rhyming with *hem* ‘him’ (alternatively, *grem* could represent the adjective *grim*, which is otherwise not found in Middle Dutch), beside hundreds of instances of *gram*. I found no instance of *net* ‘wet’ in the major dictionaries, but Plantin (1573) has *genet* ‘wetted’, participle of *netten*, as a synonym of *nat*. An *e* is found more often in ‘tame’, where *tem* (less frequently than *tam*) appears in Jacob van Maerlant’s *Der Naturen Bloeme* (WFla., 1287: *dat si den otter tem maken* ‘that they make the otter tame’) and *Leven*

86. Full text on www.rzuser.uni-heidelberg.de/~cd2/drw/F8/aardbrbr/g210-211.htm.
van Sint Franciscus (1301–50). The Hollandish poet Willem van Hildegaersberch has tem rhyming with clem. Karel van Mander uses tem (1597), as does Hondius (1621). Tem survives in southern dialects for cultivated plants, e.g. as temme or teme kastanje ‘sweet chestnut’ in Flemish (see PLAND).

The correctness of van Loey’s analogical explanation of e clearly emerges from a comparison with the extant cognate verbs: all three adjectives stand beside well-attested causative verbs in e. Next to gram we find MDu. gremmen ‘to make angry’, cognate with Got. gramjan, OHG gremmen, MLG gremmen, OE gremman, gremian. The causative of nat is found in Got. natjan, OHG netten, MDu. and Early MoDu. netten ‘to wet’. Finally, MoDu. temmen is still the causative of tam, compare Goth. gatamjan, OHG zemmen, OE temman.

The standard Dutch suffix -schap’-ship’ reflects PGm. f. *skapi- ‘shape’. It is found as -schip or -scheep in medieval coastal Dutch and in modern dialects from Flanders to North Holland. The nouns occur as neuters and as feminines. Marynissen (1995: 250–4, 270–7) provides the overview given in Table 30 for the form of the neuter stems in southern Dutch in the thirteenth century:

Table 30. Neuter -schap in southern Early Modern Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West Flanders</th>
<th>East Flanders, Brabant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.</td>
<td>-scep/scip, -scheep</td>
<td>-scap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN.SG.</td>
<td>-sceps</td>
<td>-scaps, -scaeps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.SG.</td>
<td>-scepe</td>
<td>-scape; Utr. -scaep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.SG.</td>
<td>-scep/scip, -scheep</td>
<td>-scap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the feminine abstracts in *-skapi-, Marynissen’s tabular summary is reproduced in Table 31, which shows the same distribution: a front vowel throughout in the west, and a low vowel throughout in Brabant (and Utrecht). Holland holds an intermediate position:

Table 31. Feminine -schap in Early Middle Dutch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Flanders</th>
<th>Holland</th>
<th>Brabant, Utrecht</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM.SG.</td>
<td>-scepe, -scep</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-scap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT.SG.</td>
<td>-scepe(n)</td>
<td>-scap / -scep(e)</td>
<td>-scap(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC.SG.</td>
<td>-scepe</td>
<td>-scap / -scep(e)</td>
<td>-scap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marynissen concludes that western Dutch treated f. *skapi- as a light stem, retaining the suffix *-i in Old Dutch and yielding i-mutation of *a. In the east, the word was treated as a heavy stem, and *-i was lost without causing i-mutation. This situation is similar to stede vs. stad ‘town’ from WGm. *stadi-.
She gives two possible solutions for the front vowel of coastal Dutch. It could be due to phonetic raising \( a > e \) of the type step, bled (but see above for doubts about this phenomenon). Alternatively, it could be due to generalization of the \( i \)-mutated vowel \( *ä \) which arose in the oblique case forms in the Old Dutch paradigm: nom. acc. \( *skap \), gen. \( *skepis \), dat. \( *skepi \). Inland Dutch would have generalized the unmutated variant. This solution seems preferable, as it allows us to compare the reflexes of \( *skapi- \) directly with those of \( *stadi- \) and those of \( *stapi- \).

The \( i \)-vocalism occurs very rarely in the feminines of the thirteenth century, viz. only in *binnen der baliuscip van zuet hollant* `within the bailiffship of South Holland` (Dordrecht, 1293), and *onser vrouwen daghe ter boedscippe* `the Annunciation of Our Lady` (Bruges, 1278). The other, sporadic instances are in the neuter: *sgheselscips* (Bruges, 1291), *sin ghezelscip* (Hulst, 1297), *enich herscip* `army` (Bruges, 1299), *tvinderscip* `the mediation` (Bruges, 1280). Probably, \( i \) is due to raising of \( e \) before \( p \), possibly with the additional factor of reduced stress. Lengthening of \( i \) is found in the unique form *in orcontsciip* `in attestation` in Hulst (1297).

Thus, it is confirmed that none of these words is due to an unconditioned raising of \( a \) to \( e \) in coastal Dutch. The nouns ghetel, achterstel, scende, dek and the adjectives grem, net, tem must be due to the analogical introduction of \( e \) from cognate words, whereas bled(\( de \)), steppen, tek and vek(\( ke \)) have regular \( e \) from \( i \)-mutation of \( *a \). In *step*, *stip* `step’ and *-schep*, *-schip ‘-ship’, the front vowel was introduced from oblique case forms where it arose regularly from \( i \)-mutation of \( *stapi- \), \( *skapi- \).

### 11.4 Flemish Feger- and Gent

The adjective PGm. *fagra-* `beautiful` (OHG *fagar*, MHG adv. *vagere* `lovely`, OS *fagar*, MoE *fair*) occurs with \( e \) in the Old Ghent names *Fegernodus* (Ghent, 948 copy 11th c. copy 12th c.), *Vegericus* (Ghent, 11th c.), *Vegericus* (Ghent, 1098), MDu. *Veieric* (1306–07), and the modern family name *Feyerick* (in Ghent). As a simplex, the adjective does not occur in Dutch. Hence, Mansion (1924: 116) interprets \( e \) as well as intervocalic \( j \) as ingvaeonisms. This could be true for \( j \), which is an unusual reflex of intervocalic \( g \) in Dutch. For \( e \) in *Feger-*, by extension, one might then assume the same explanation.

The city of *Gent* `Ghent` is usually spelled with \( a \) in the Old Dutch period: *Ganda* and *Ganth* in the ninth century (but *Gend*, *Gent* in a ninth-century Anglo-Saxon Chronicle), *Gand*, *Gant* in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. A variant of the name is *Gandao*, latinized to *Gandauum*, which the Life of Saint Bavo (819–840 copy 12th c.) seems to regard as the actual toponym: *in loco qui dicitur Gandauum castrum cuius nunc caenobium aperte vocatur Ganda* `in a place called the Gandauum cas- trum, the monastery of which is clearly called Ganda`. Furthermore, we find *in uico/
castro/portu Gandauo in the ninth and tenth century, and so on until the twelfth century, beside Gant. There is no written evidence for an original umlautfactor. The final -a in Ganda, which is first found in a document from 819 (monasterium quod antiquitus uocatus est Ganda), must be the locative singular ending (Gysseling 1944). Are we dealing with a case of the Late Old Flemish lowering of unstressed vowels to <-a>, as in the Rochester Poem and elsewhere (van Loon 2014: 178 points, among other forms, to Bugginsela for *-sali in 964), so that Ganda may have been a locative *Gande? The earliest attestations seem too early for this explanation.

The first appearance of the vowel e in local sources is Gend in 1127. The reality of the front vowel is confirmed by the raising to i in Chintbruge ‘Gentbrugge’ (1165), Ghint (Velzeke, 1249), which matches other cases of raising of enC to inC in Flemish. In the thirteenth century, most Flemish and Hollandish documents spell the name as Ghent, but there are sporadic spellings as <ae>, which probably reflects /æ:/ gaent (Ghent, 1210, in a Latin document; Bruges, 1269, in a Dutch document; see VMNW), ghaent (Calais 1298, 2x in French documents), gaent, ghaent (Guemps near Calais, end of 13th c.), see Gysseling 1966c: 148.

Weijnen (1958: 17) notes the problematic appearance of e and compares Genderen (NBrab.) for earlier Ganderon (11th c.), and, with i-mutation, Gendringen (Gld.) < *Gandringon, Gendt (Gld.) < in Gannite (790–93 copy 1170–75). Besse (1997: 374–6) posits *Gand-ja-, which she interprets as the Germanic adaptation of earlier, possibly Celtic, *Gand-avo-. Yet in that case, one would expect <e> to show up much earlier than the twelfth century. Also, for a ja-stem, the lack of a second syllable in both the Romance and the Dutch forms of the name (MDu. Gent, not *Gende) would be conspicuous: compare MDu. ende ‘and’ < *andja-, ellende ‘foreign country, exile’ < *alja-landja-. Gysseling (1966c: 148) ascribes the lengthened vowel in Calais ghaent to a preform *ganut, which would have alternated with *ganit whence ghent. Yet in view of ODu. Gand, Ganda, such forms are hardly likely.

11.5 Northwestern Dutch sel ‘shall’

The 1sg. and 3sg. present MDu. sal, MoDu. sal, appears as MDu. sel, dial. MoDu. zel particularly in North and South Holland and in Utrecht. It has been claimed that it reflects an Ingvaeonic fronting of short *a. This explanation is not certain because the inclusion of the whole province of Utrecht means that its spread would be wider than usual for coastal Dutch forms. Also, sal > sel could be due to pretonic weakening of the auxiliary verb. More details of the variation in the paradigm of zullen and its present sg. zel vs. zal are discussed in § 15.2.1, nr. 22.
11.6 Summary and interpretation

Of the dialectal reflexes of /a/ as [æ] or [ɛ] in modern western dialects, we cannot be sure that they are old. An exception may be made for some North Hollandish words which are attested with e, sometimes already in the seventeenth century: in theory, some of these words may be direct borrowings from Old Frisian, but it cannot be excluded that they continue an earlier, (more) general raised reflex of *a, either in the local Old Frisian substrate or in an earlier phase of coastal Dutch.

The auxiliary sel ‘shall’ might belong here too but remains uncertain. Our analyses have furthermore shown that the raising of a to e before sk, sp was a non-coastal development of Dutch dialects, and that the e found in a number of nouns and adjectives is either due to analogy (e.g., in ghel, dek, grem), to regular i-mutation (bled(de), steppen), or to a combination of both (the e in step, -schep). Only the Old Flemish name element Veger-, Feier- and the place name Gent show an apparently unconditioned raising of *a to e, which might be due a coastal Dutch adoption of an earlier phoneme short /a/. Yet on their own, these two forms do not allow any generalizations, except for the fact that in both words *a is flanked by g, and we know that the sequence *-agC- was prone to palatalization.
Van Loey (1976: 11–2) gives a number of Middle Dutch forms with o for usual a, and notes that, in general, o is a western feature and a eastern. Traces of this western rounding can still be found in modern dialects. Van Loey’s collection contains a number of different environments which must be discussed separately. For each of these features, there is a clear link with Anglo-Frisian and Low German developments, in the sense that a was backed to o in the same environments in Old Frisian, Old English, and, to some extent, in Old Saxon.

12.1 Before a retained nasal

Nasalization which led to centralization and/or rounding of stressed low vowels took place in the Anglo-Frisian period, as shown by the variation between a and o in Old English and Old Frisian words such as lang/long, man/mon (Campbell 1959: 51–2, Bremmer 2009: 24–7), and by the reflex ô if the nasal consonant dissolved before a voiceless fricative, as in OFri. tôth ‘tooth’ (*tanp-), ôther ‘other’ (*anpara-). Backing of *a before nasals is also known from Old Saxon glosses, toponyms and personal names, such as biuongenę (Prudentius glosses, Paris ms.) to vangen ‘to catch’, Langon beside Longon (Werdener Heberollen),

87 but the phenomenon is unknown in Middle Low German (Sarauw 1921: 90, 301).

There is little evidence for this development in medieval Dutch outside Flemish. The place-name Longonmor ‘Long-moor’ on Texel (751–800, copy 9th c., copy 12th c.) is located in former Frisian-speaking territory, and the undiphthongized /o:/ in -mor suggests Frisian phonology (Quak 2003: 291). In Middle Dutch, the name Bomborc ‘Bamburg’ (WFla., 1210) may represent *ban-burg (Gysseling 1960a: 97).

Jacobs (1911: 31) regards the change of anC to onC as specifically West Flemish. Attestations include Langhemarc (WFla., 1219), Longmarc (1220) ‘Langmark’, the personal name heinekins longhe speis (gen.sg., Bruges, 1270), and, from the fourteenth century, commen for cammen ‘to comb’ (Bruges, 1322), onveren for an- ‘to start’ (Bruges, 1325), onder for ander ‘other’ (Ypres, 1348), and ontsende < *hands-ende ‘handle’ (Damme, 1382).


The form *onderhalf* for MoDu. *anderhalf* ‘one-and-a-half’ is characteristic of Middle Dutch texts from Brabant and Limburg. Since these dialects do not normally have *o* in *ander* ‘other’, *onderhalf* probably contains the preposition *onder* ‘under, between’, see Mooijaart 1992: 82, note c. By contrast, the form *onderhalf* as found in Bruges in the thirteenth century (24 tokens, as against 46 tokens with *an-*) is likely to show rounding of *a* before *nd*.

The above evidence does not necessarily point to a Proto-Frisian substrate feature, especially in view of its recent and sporadic nature. But it does not conflict with such a hypothesis, either. The variability within Old Frisian (*long/land*, *lond/land*; cf. Boutkan 1997 on this issue) implies that the nasalization was preserved until well into Old Frisian, where we see a preference for *on* in eastern texts versus *an* in western ones. If, around 700, speakers of Proto-Frisian imposed their own allophonic distribution of /a/ onto Proto-Franconian words, the almost complete absence of traces thereof in the later sources would not be unexpected. After all, coastal Dutch would have acquired allophonically nasalized vowels which could be denasalized at a later stage. For instance, Proto-Flemish *lånd* would become Old Flemish *land*. An alternative solution would be to hypothesize a paradigmatic alternation in Proto-Frisian which depended on the syllable structure, e.g. NOM. ACC.SG. *lōnd* vs. NOM.ACC.PL. *landu*. The coastal dialects would have generalized the oral allophone [a].

12.2 Before a nasal which was lost

Proto-Germanic vowels were nasalized before *mf, ns, nlp, and nx*. When the nasal consonant disappeared, it left a lengthened vowel in all of Germanic (in the case of *nx*), in all of Dutch (with *mf* and *nx*), or only in Anglo-Frisian and Low German (in all four sequences). Prenasal *a* was centralized and, often, rounded in Anglo-Frisian. If the nasal consonant disappeared, the vowel ō usually resulted. In western Dutch, there are rounded reflexes of *a* in these contexts which have been argued to reflect the same development as in Anglo-Frisian, for example, western zocht ‘soft’ versus eastern zacht (ANKO I: 24–32, Taeldeman 1982: 279, van Loon 2014: 90–2).

12.2.1 WGm. *mf*

Dutch zacht ‘soft’ represents a merger of WGm. *samftja-* (ADJ.) and *samftō* (ADV.). The adjective would have undergone *i*-mutation but the adverb did not. The form *senfte*, phonologically /senfte/ in the Wachtendonck Psalter, has *i*-mutation, and e

89. See VMNW, CRM14.
is also found in some Limburgian derivatives of ‘soft’. Due to the merger with the umlautless adverb, the unfronted reflex in Dutch zacht may simply have been generalized from the adverb. The absence of i-mutation does not have to be ascribed to the umlaut-blocking influence of cht or to an external cause, such as language contact with Proto-Frisian in Buccini’s theory (cf. 15.1.1).

In Early Middle Dutch, the southeast (Limburg, Lower Rhine, East Brabant) has the spellings sachte /sa(:)akte/ and saëgte /sa:xte/, whereas in West Brabant, sachte (10x) by far outnumbers sochte (1x). In contrast, all four East Flemish instances have o, whereas in West Flemish and Hollandish, sachte and sochte occur side by side (21 tokens of a versus 34 of o in West Flanders; one each in Holland). It seems safe to say that sochte must have been the vernacular form at least in all of Flemish. A similar distribution – with fewer tokens – of a and o is found in sachten ‘to soften’ and onsachte ‘difficult, painfully’. A Hollandish text from 1488 has besaft ‘softened’. From other Middle Dutch texts it transpires that Holland has saft, sometimes saeft, whereas saechte dominates in Brabant and sochte in Flanders. Map 12 shows the occurrence of s/zocht(e) in Dutch dialects according to the MAND database; see also the map in FAND I: 19. We find that all of Flanders and Zealand have a rounded back vowel, as well as adjacent parts of southern Brabant. A separate o-area with long /ɔ:/ is located in central Limburg and southeastern North Brabant, but here, every long /a:/ predating open syllable lengthening was backed to /ɔ:/

For a possible explanation of the o-vocalism in ‘soft’ of Flanders as opposed to the a-vocalism in Holland, see further below.

Map 12. /o/ or /ɔ/ in ‘soft’ according to the GTRP database
12.2.2 WGm. *ns

1. Germanic *ansu- ‘god’ occurs as <os-> = /o:s/ in the Old Ghent personal names Osdey, Osdei (several times between 1000 and 1200) ‘Ansdag’, Osfridus, Usfridus ‘Ansfrid’, Osmundus ‘Ansmund’, Oswalo, Uswalus ‘Answal(h)’, and Ose ‘Anse’. Among Old Dutch place-names, the same reflex surfaces in ‘Oosmanskerke’ in Zealand (Osmundi capellam 1166 copy 12th c., Ostmondskerke 1213, Ostmundi capella 1150), ‘Oegstgeest’ in South Holland (Ogest 1201, Ogeresgest 9th c. copy end of 11th c., Ogest 1220), ‘Osprehtashem’ (Osprehtashem 889 copy 1206–26, Osbragttashem 918–48 copy end of 11th c.), ‘Osfrithhem’ (Osfrithhem ibidem), and ‘Oslem’ (Oslem ibidem), all in Holland. For places north of the Meuse, we may suspect that Os- simply represents the Old Frisian form.

2. Both PGm. *bansa- (ON báss ‘part of a stable’, OE bösig ‘stall, crib’, Scots boose ‘stable for cow or horse’) and its competitor *bansti- ‘cowshed’ (Got. bansts ‘shed’) have descendants in Dutch. In South Holland, in the seventeenth century and later, the form boes ‘cowshed’ occurs. It is a formal match of MLG bōs, MoLG boos. In Frisian, the word is preserved in OWFri. bōsdure, bōser ‘stable door’, MoWF boasdoar, as well as in InsNFri. busem, CNFri. bousem ‘stable’ (Sjölin 2006: 23). The word bansdeur ‘barndoor’ in northeastern Dutch is not attested with the early development to *bōs-, see Heeroma 1960: 25–7 and Map 12 ‘achterdeur’ therein.

Banst means ‘basket’ in the Reichenauer Glosses (ca. 750), where a Romance plural banstas is found, and in MDu. banst in Bruges (1285, 14th c.). Likely continuations of the same noun are poest ‘cowshed’ and poestdeerne ‘cow maid, milk maid’, attested in the dictionaries of Plantin (1573) and Kiliaan (1599). Poester is still generally used for ‘cowhand’ in southern and central West Flanders, and was also known in French Flanders, see WVD (the word poest itself has disappeared from the dialects). If poest indeed continues *boest (with irregular devoicing of b- to p-), it may ultimately go back to *banst, although the deviation in meaning from banst ‘basket’ is striking. Alternatively, the original word was *boes, which developed a paragogic -t in Flemish (cf. Dutch rijs-t ‘rice’) due to hypercorrection, cf. van Loey 1976: 110–12. Since the surrounding varieties of Dutch, Low German and Frisian all have t-less *bansa- ‘cowshed’, this second solution seems preferable.

3. The word *gans ‘goose’ is usually gans in Dutch, but Flanders and Zealand show traces of nasal loss and vowel rounding. In Old Dutch, we have the name Gerardus Gozh in 1185 (without location) and the place-name Goselant from 1093 (copy 15th c.) near Dunkirk. The surname Goes is frequent in Bruges in

90. Tavernier-Vereecken 1968: 143.
the thirteenth century and occurs in *van Goeseuorde* 'of Gooseford'. Aardenburg in 1278 has the surname *Scoudoes* 'Seethe-goose'. Another trace of the coastal development is the West Flemish plant *ganzemoes*, literally 'goose mush', for Dutch *vogelmuur* 'common chickweed': in the northern part of West Flanders, *goezemoes* is the only word used for this plant.\(^91\)

Schönfeld (1934) has added more evidence for *n*-loss in *goose*. In Groningen, we find *gooze* 'goose' and *geeze*, *gooze* 'stupid woman' (Molema 1895). Junius’ *Nomenclator* (1567), which often gives regional words from West Friesland, calls the female goose *goes*. In a manuscript from 1636 with Hollandish hunting terms, *gans* is used for 'gander' and *goes* for 'female goose'. Finally, Kiliaan (1599) lists “Frisian, Hollandish, Saxon” *goes*, *goese* 'goose', besides *gheese* as an antiquated word for both 'female goose' and ‘whore’. *Gheese* is interpreted by Schönfeld as an original *i*-mutated form of the coastal dialects (cf. E *geese*; *i*-mutation could stem from the dative singular or from the plural), which replaced the original nominative and accusative singular. In that case, admittedly, the absence in Holland of raising to *ie* would be striking. We do not know where the form *gheese* was actually used; it may have been a northeastern Dutch form, compare Groningen *geeze* mentioned above. Jarich Hoekstra calls to my attention Saterfrisian *Gäise* 'goose', which also contains the front vowel reflex. In the dialect of Zealand, *goes* may have been in currency until the sixteenth century (Heeroma 1935: 88).

12.2.3  WGm. *ŋʰ*

Proto-Germanic *smanþa/i-* 'smooth, weak' (MoWF *smeudich/smedich*, OS *smōthi* 'gentle', OE *smōþ* 'soft, weak', *smœþe*, *smēþe* 'smooth', MoE *smooth*, dial. *smeeth*) is reflected both without and with *i*-mutation in western Dutch. Without *i*-mutation, we have Flemish *smood* 'even, smooth' (of a surface). With *i*-mutation, French Flemish *smie*, *smieë* is an adjective indicating damp or moist earth (*WVD* I.1: 70). In Zealand, *smieë* is at home on Walcheren, Schouwen and Goeree, but *smœë* on North and South Beveland, Overflakkee and also on Schouwen. With final -g, we find *smieïg* in western Zeeuws-Vlaanderen beside *smoeg* on South Beveland, Tholen and St. Philipsland (*WZD*). To sum up, *i*-mutated *ie* is largely found in western Zealand versus *oe* in the east of the province, but since *smieïg* was found on South Beveland by Knuttel in 1931 (in *WNT* s.v. *smieg* 'flexible'), it appears that both forms may have coexisted earlier on. Heeroma 1968b offers an elaborate discussion of the dialectal situation in Dutch and Low German. Among his many findings is the

\(^91\)  *WVD* III.3, 193–95.
identification of the verbs MDu. gesmieden (Yperman, 1351) ‘to become soft, ripen’ and gesmiede ‘soft’ (Ghent, 1485) as probable old instances of the i-mutated reflex of *smânbâ-. Also, Heeroma argues that Zaans smeu in North Holland may be due to rounding of e, the earlier form being *smede/-ig. Heeroma summarizes his etymological conclusions on p. 282. He argues that, at the beginning of the Middle Dutch period, the coastal dialects knew both *smeide < *smêde and smoede < *smôde ‘smooth, soft’. Similarly, both variants existed in northeastern Dutch (Gron. smui, smuu, etc.) and in Westphalian. In the intermediate area, that is, in central Dutch, these words were replaced by different etyma, e.g., smîdîg and smedîg.92 Note that Flemish smood, in addition to showing coastal Dutch loss of the nasal and vowel rounding, would show the retention of /o:/ as against its normal raising to /u:/.

No old nasalless forms of ander ‘other’ or tand ‘tooth’ exist in Dutch. All forms of ‘tooth’ preserve the dental nasal. For ander we find the variants aer,aar (both /a:r/) in Holland from the fifteenth century onwards. In Modern Dutch, aar ‘and’ occurs in archaic Hollandish dialects, and the standard language has the reciprocal pronouns elkaar, mekaar ‘each other’ from MDu. elk ander ‘each other’ and mallik ander ‘manly other’. Franck & van Wijk (1912) still thought that aar and -aar were regular result of *anþar in western Dutch. Van Haeringen (1923b: 280ff., 1927: 261) then showed that the development to aar fits with other Hollandish reductions of the intervocalic sequence nd, as for instance in seventeenth-century keijeren for kinderen ‘children’. Hence, the reduction in elkaar and mekaar is clearly the result of strong reduction in a pronominalized form, and is not due to a Frisian substrate in Holland (cf. van Haeringen 1936). In a similar vein, the surname Hollander has a variant Hollaar which is concentrated on Voorne-Putten and Goeree-Overflakkee; it is first attested in Cornelis den Hollaer who lived from ca. 1460 to after 1548 in Schiedam (source: NFB s.v. Hollaar). Another reduction of unstressed -ander- to -aar- is presupposed by the evolution of van der ‘of the’ with feminine nouns to ver- in surnames of the type Van der Beke > Verbeke, Van der Brugge > Verbrugge, etc. As argued by Debrabandere (2012: 128), there is sparse evidence for the intermediate stages vaar /va:r/- and var /vær/- which eventually led to ver- /vær-, such

92. In his own words: “De situatie wordt dan op een gegeven ogenblik, laten wij zeggen omstreeks 1200, deze, dat er in het vlaams-zeeuws-hollandse westen een ‘litoraal-ingweoons’ relictgebied van smiede < smêde en smoede < smôde bestaat, in het westfaalse oosten een ‘binnenlands-ingweoons’ relictgebied van smôde en smôde, en dat tussen deze beide relictgebieden in het begrip dat men vroeger door het woordelement *smôþ- placht uit te drukken door andere vormen, bv. smidîg en smedîg, is opgevangen.” [“Around 1200, the situation becomes the following: in the Flemish-Zealandish-Hollandish west, there is a ‘littoral-Ingveonic’ relic area with smiede < smêde and smoede < smôde, in the Westphalian east an ‘inner Ingveonic’ relic area with smôde and smôde, and in between both of these relic areas, the concept that was formerly expressed by the word element *smôþ- has been taken care of by other forms, such as smîdîg and smedîg.”]
as Pieter van der Kindert = Pieter Varkindert (1582, Kortrijk) = Pieter Verkindert (1592, Kortrijk), Pieter van der Hamme (1587, Gullegem) = Jan var Hamme (1582, Gullegem). The shift from van der to ver- took place in northern Campine in the fourteenth century, but not before the sixteenth century in South Brabant and Flanders.

12.2.4 WGM. *nx

1. The preterite of *brengen (OS brengian) ‘to bring’ was PGm. *branxtē, its participle *branxta-. In Early Middle Dutch of Flanders and Holland, the preterite is regularly *brochte(n), sometimes explicitly spelled with /o:/ as broecht, broichte, and the participle is *ghebrocht. Contrast the forms *brachte(n) and *ghebracht in Brabant, Limburg and East Holland (Berteloot 1984a, Map 12). The o-forms have remained in use in Flanders and Holland, see ANKO I: 24–32.93

2. Another piece of evidence is *denken ‘to think’ (< *þankjan-) with its preterite *þanxtē and participle *þa/unxta-. In the thirteenth century, the preterite *dachte(n) is found as *dochte(n) in Flanders and West Brabant. The 2sg. pret. *bedocts appears in Holland (1276–1300). The interpretation of *da/ochte is not as straightforward as with *bra/ochte ‘brought’. Next to *þankjan-, Proto-Germanic had a cognate present *þunkjan- whence MDu. *dunken ‘to seem’; its preterite *þunxtē (> OHG *dühta) would, with shortening before xt, yield MDu. *dochte as well. This verb often enters into an impersonal construction, e.g. *mi dochte ‘it seemed to me’, *mi ghedochte ‘I thought of’, *mi verdochte ‘I felt sorry’. Hence, it cannot be excluded that the preterite *dachte(n) of *denken was influenced by the preterite *dochte(n) of *dunken.

The participle is found as the adjective *bedocht ‘thoughtful, intent’, especially in legal texts from West and East Flanders, next to bedacht. The abstract noun *ga-*þanxti- ‘thought’ appears as gethahti in the Wachtendonck Psalter and *gedahte in the Middle Franconian Rhyming Bible. After 1200, beside *gedachte we find the o-form *gedochte in Holland, in Flanders (beside *gedachte), and once in West Brabant. *Achterdocht ‘suspicion’ is only attested from the late sixteenth century onwards, e.g. in Kiliaan, who calls it Hollandish for *achterdenckinge. All in all, the geographic distribution of the o-forms corresponds with what we find for ‘brought’, so that it seems safe to regard at least the nominal forms in -docht as direct reflexes of *-panxt-. The same may be true for the preterite of ‘think’, but the etymological uncertainties make this impossible to prove.

93. On the modern dialect situation, and in particular on the modern o-vocalism in Brabant, see De Wulf 2008: 345–51.
3. The noun *xanxu- or *xanxa- ‘hook’ (OE hōh, MoE hough, ON há in hámót ‘heel’), of which Du. hiel < *xanxilō- ‘heel’ is a derivative, is attested in coastal Dutch toponyms. The word haai occurs in southern Dutch (de Bo 1892: 348) for a ‘slanting piece or strip of land’. Haaiman is known on the island of Zealand and South Holland for ‘inferior sandy soils, used as hay-land’, and haaimete is used on Goeree with the same meaning. In some of the oldest attestations, we find a rounded vowel in the first element (cf. Foerste 1959): Hoymilla (near Dunkirk, 1067; from *xanxa-muldjō-, see s.v. -melde in § 15.2.1, nr. 8), Hoymunde (south of The Hague, 1216; *-mundu-), Hoymannen, Hoiemen (Zealand, 1220, 1294; *-mandō- ‘basket; enclosed area’). See Foerste 1959: 146–7 for the semantics behind Hoy-, haai ‘hooked, slanted, enclosed’.

4. There is no evidence for rounding of the nasal in the rare word acht(e) ‘prosecution, banishment’ (OS ōht, OHG āhta, OFri. acht(e), OE ēht < *anxtō-), nor in MDu. haen ‘to hang’ (*xanxan-) and vaen ‘to catch’ (*fanxan-). In the latter two verbs, the sequence /an/ remained transparent in the paradigmatic variants hang- and vang- and could have been restored at any given moment.

The same transparency of /an/ cannot be claimed for two other etyma without any trace of rounding. viz. MDu. haessen, MoDu. haas ‘joint, leg’ (as in varkenshaas ‘knuckle of pork’) < PGM. *xanx-sinuwō- (OHG hāhsena ‘foot tendon, Achilles tendon’, MoHG Hachse ‘leg, thigh of animals for slaughter’, OFri. hoxne, hoxene, OE höhsinu, ON hásin), and the adjective MDu. tay, MoDu. taai ‘tough’ < *tanxi-(MLG tā, teie, OHG zāhi, MoHG zāh, OE tōh, MoE tough < *tanxu-).

In the noun hiel ‘heel’ < *xanxilō-, the vocalism speaks in favour of a Proto-Frisian loanword in coastal Dutch (see § 19.2); therefore it is not directly relevant to the development of inherited *anx in Dutch.

12.2.5 Interpretation

There is sufficient evidence for rounding of *a before nasal plus voiceless fricative in Flanders, Zeeland, and Holland. In particular, we have good evidence before *mf and *ns. With *nb there is only the unclear form smood (and its i-mutated variant smied), and, with *nx, the toponym Hoy-, haai- and the preterites and derivatives of brengen and denken, dunken. Within the context of the Frisian-Franconian language contact, the presence of the rounded variants in coastal Dutch cannot be explained if we assume that *an had already yielded denasalized *ō in Anglo-Frisian, as there would have been no L1-model to impose nasalization on L2. The explanation proposed by van Haeringen (1923b: 287) seems still the most attractive one: when Franconian was adopted by speakers of Proto-Frisian, both varieties had a nasalized vowel, the difference being that it was a rounded vowel in Frisian but
not in Franconian (where \*ã merged with \*ā from PGm. \*æ). Vowel rounding was then imposed onto \*ã in the coastal dialects by the L1-speakers of Proto-Frisian: in their speech, it was an automatic phonetic feature of nasalized vowels before voiceless fricatives.

This order of developments does not explain why we find Hollandish sa(e)ft versus Flemish sochte. If Holland took over its coastal dialect from Flanders, and if the latter had rounded vowels, we would expect to find \*soft in Holland. On the other hand, we do find rounded reflexes in Holland before \(s, \theta\) and \(x\), so maybe it was the \(f\) of \*sāft- which occasioned the non-rounded reflex sa(e)ft in Holland; in other words, the \(f\) may have absorbed the roundedness of the vowel.\(^{94}\)

A different model is proposed by van Loon (2014: 95–6), who connects the difference between western brochte, dochte, sochte and eastern brachte, dachte, saechte with the development of long \*ē. This gave Proto-Frisian \*ē but Old Franconian ā, the latter being a low back vowel, yielding Limburgian \*\(o:\) by the end of the thirteenth century (actually \(/s:/\) in modern Limburgian, but usually a short vowel before \(cht\)). Van Loon thinks that, when \*ã was denasalized, it merged with \(/a:/\) in Old Franconian, giving \*brāxte > brachte, but with \(/o:/\) in coastal Dutch, giving \*brōxte > brochte; the reason being that coastal Dutch at that time had \(/æ:/\) and \(/o:/\), but no \(/a:/\). If coastal Dutch was the result of a language shift from Frisian to Franconian, this view would have to be reformulated as follows: Old Franconian \*brāxte was adopted by L1-speakers of Proto-Frisian, who associated the vowel \[a:\] with their phoneme \(/o:/\), since their other low long vowel, \(/æ:/\), was too fronted. The obvious objection to this solution would be: why did other Old Franconian words in \(/a:/\) not end up with \(/o:/\) in western dialects? This objection pertains both to my interpretation and to van Loon’s view. As far as I can see, it can only be countered by assuming that the vowel was still nasalized when it was adopted into the coastal dialects, where a nasalized low vowel was usually rounded. Hence, OFra. \*brāxte was adopted as (in the shift scenario) or developed into (in the continuity scenario) \*brōxte in Flanders. As a result, the word cannot tell us much about the vowel quality of WGM. \*ē in those dialects.

Van Haeringen 1923b: 287 explains the wider distribution of \(o\) in brocht, docht as opposed to zocht from the paradigmatic influence of the present with brengen and denken, from which the nasal could have been restored.

\(^{94}\) Jarich Hoekstra adds that, in the Insular North Frisian of Fering-Öömrang, a labiodental context seems sometimes to have blocked rouding: FÖ maan ‘man’ (CNFri. moon), FÖ faan ‘of’ (CNFri. foon).
The rounding of *a in *all- ‘all’ is best known from Old Dutch olla uogala ‘all birds’ (Nom.Pl.) in the Rochester verse. All other Old Dutch forms have initial a-. In Early Middle Dutch, ol- for al- ‘all’ is characteristic of West Flemish; see Berteloot 1984a, Map 9. In reality, ol- is almost only attested in Bruges, with two more tokens each in Roeselare and Maldegem. The words als(e) ‘if, as’ and also ‘thus’ appear as ols(e) and olso only in Bruges; as Mooijaart (1992: 81) has established, only 12 out of 100 clerks use the o-form. There is one instance of ols(o) in Holland, which might match oltare ‘altar’ in Wateringen (1282). Yet the latter form is suspect because the usual form in western Dutch is outaer with l-vocalization; thus oltare might have restored the l on the model of altare.

Other inherited words with the sequence -als- (hals ‘neck’, valsch ‘false’, walsch ‘French’) do not show the rounding in Early Middle Dutch. Since al before t, d regularly turned into ol before becoming ou in western and southern Dutch by the thirteenth century, the change to ol and ols(o) could be due to the tendency to round a before l plus dentals; the restriction to West Flanders would then imply that the rounding had progressed further in Flanders than in Holland. The rounding is also known from Old Ems Frisian ōlle and ōlsā versus western all, alsā (Bremmer 2009: 114). But in Old Frisian, lengthening of a- to ā- preceded the rounding, whereas there is no evidence for lengthening in Flemish.

Note that al ‘all’ goes back to PGm. *alla-, and had a geminate ll in all case forms with a syllabic ending. Other words with a geminate *ll do not show the rounding in Early Middle Dutch: compare gal ‘bile’ < *galla-, bal ‘ball’ < *balla/u-, vallen ‘to fall’ < *fallan-, halle ‘hall’ < *xallō-, dral ‘firm’ < *pralla-, wal ‘wall’ < *walla-. Thus, it seems worthwhile to consider the possibility that al ‘all’ got rounded in unstressed position, in which it – as a pronominal adjective – often stood. In that case, it would be comparable to the rounding in of and ambocht (see the next section).

The alternative solution is to assume that Bruges ols(e), also is the forerunner of the later tendency to round a before l in West Flemish. In modern dialects, a is rounded to /ɔ/ before stem-final l and lC in a larger Flemish area, which comprises the southern half of West Flanders plus an adjacent part of French Flanders; see the map on /ɔ/ in stal ‘stable’ in Taeldeman 1979: 51. The GTRP data show occasional instances of the same rounding in ‘stable’ in Zealand and southeastern East Flanders. The vowel is sometimes lengthened. In vallen ‘to fall’, the area with rounding is even larger, and includes all of French Flanders, possibly because of initial v-. A back vowel [ɔ] is found in gal ‘bile’ in Bruges (/ʰɔlo/) and twice in South Holland, viz. in Delft and Hellevoetsluis (/xɔl/). Willemyns (1997: 192) surmises that ol-vocalism apparently was omitted from writing in Late Middle
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Flemish (the last known attestation dates from 1391 in Kortrijk), but has always been preserved in speech.

In either case, there is no credible link between the rounding in all- and a possible Proto-Frisian substrate along the coast.

### 12.4 Unstressed \( a > o \) near labials

This subsection discusses two isolated forms with a rounded reflex of \( *a \) in coastal dialects. For one of them, the adverb \( of \), Anglo-Frisian offers a parallel but probably independent change, whereas the other is not found in Anglo-Frisian.

1. \( of \) ‘off’ < \( *ab \) (OE \( of \), OFri. \( of \), \( af \), OS \( af \), \( of \)). The adverb ‘off, down’ is \( of \) in thirteenth-century Dutch in all of Holland, Zealand and Flanders. In Brabant and Limburg, the variant \( af \) competes with \( ave \) (Berteloot 1984a, Map 10). Mooijaart (1992: 83) claims that \( af \) mainly occurs as an independent adverb or a verbal prefix, as against \( of \) when used as the second member of a pronominal adverb (\( daaro\)f etc.), as would be shown by the documents from Corpus Gysseling, no. 566, from Bruges and no. 1040 from Oudenaarde. In Late Middle Dutch we still find \( of \), for instance, in North Holland. For modern dialects, WNT Supplement writes that \( of \) occurs in Zealand and Holland, and predominates in West Flanders, the Veluwe, the Achterhoek, Overijssel, Drente and Groningen. The authors of the supplement ascribe the rounding to the unstressed status which the adverb often had (Mooijaart 1992: 83).

Although rounding to \( of \) is also found in Anglo-Saxon and in Frisian, we cannot simply attribute the Dutch rounding to a Frisian substrate. First of all, the \( o \)-forms are also found in Gelderland, Overijssel and Drente, for which (with the possible exception of Drente) a Frisian substrate is out of the question, and in Old Saxon. Secondly, the attested forms reflect the lexicalization of two West Germanic variants, \( *ab \) and \( *abο \), OHG \( ab \) and \( aba \), \( abe \), ODu. \( af \) and \( aua \) (both in the Leiden Willeram), MDu. \( af \) and \( ave \). The short form was generalized in Anglo-Frisian and Low German, it appears. In Early Middle Dutch, the disyllabic variant \( ave \) is found in Limburg, Brabant, and in literary texts from Flanders, as in \( ave \) saghen ‘to saw off’ (WBrab., 1275–76), \( aue \) breken ‘to break off’ (WBrab., EBrab.), \( aue \) comen ‘to come off’ (WFla., EFla.). In other words: \( ave \) was a regular variant at least for the independent adverb in all southern dialects, though it was on the retreat in Flanders more than in Brabant and Limburg. This matches the modern distribution of variants quite well, which shows a long vowel \( /a:i/ \) or \( /ɔːi/ \) from open syllable lengthening in nearly all Limburgian dialects.
De Wulf & Taeldeman 2005 discuss the distribution of *of* and *af* in Middle and Modern Dutch dialects on the basis of the corpora of the thirteenth (*VMNW*) and fourteenth (*CRM14*) centuries and of the dialect enquiries of *RND* and *GTRP* in the twentieth century. They note that *of*, besides being regular in West Flanders, Zealand and Holland between 1200 and 1400, is also regularly found in Utrecht and sporadically in the northeastern dialects in the fourteenth century. In the twentieth century, *of* in western Dutch recedes to West Flanders, central Zealand (but not Walcheren) and North Holland, with traces elsewhere.  

95. French Flanders is not on Map 13, but data for this region are provided by Ryckeboer 1979: 152 + Map 9. Most of French Flanders has *af*, and only a strip of land bordering on Belgium has *of*. Ryckeboer interprets *af* in France as a relict form. De Wulf & Taeldeman 2005: 125–7, contrariwise, start from their assumption that the allomorphs *af* and *of* depended on the phonetic context. In French Flanders, the generally quite fronted reflex of WGm. *a* would have led to the generalisation of *af* rather than *of*. 
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Short, rounded of is also found, to the exclusion of af, in Overijssel, Drente and – at least in the interpretation of De Wulf & Taeldeman 2005: 120 –, in the province of Groningen. In their explanation, they adopt the theory that the coastal dialects had a grammatically governed alternation between a strongly stressed variant af and a weakly stressed variant of. This distinction is inspired by the grammar of Old English: beside doublets such as bī- vs. be- ‘by’, ūp- vs. op- ‘out’, æt- vs. ot- ‘at-’, Campbell 1959: 30 also recognizes stressed æf- (e.g. Æfpunca ‘source of offence’) versus unstressed of- (ofþýnċan ‘to displease’). De Wulf & Taeldeman directly link the alternation between Early MDu. af and of, as observed by Mooijaart, to this inherited distinction. For the northeast, they (p. 121–3) suggest that this area had a relatively retracted pronunciation of short /a/, such as [ɒ], which led to confusion with short /ɔ/. 96

In conclusion, the distinction between af and of may have been stress-related in origin. Most of the coastal dialects, then, but also the northeastern ones from Groningen to Overijssel, generalized the variant of. There is no conclusive evidence that af > of was due to the language contact between Frisian and Franconian in the coastal area.

2. ambacht ‘craft’. The noun ambacht ‘work, craft; service, jurisdiction’ reflects PGm. *ambaxti- (OS OHG ambaht, OFri. ambecht, amb(e)t, OE ambiht ‘office n.; servant m.’, Got. andbahts ‘servant’, andbahti ‘service’). In Old Dutch it always has a or e in the second syllable, e.g. ambacht in the Fontes Egmundenses, and in villa Wudacres ambachte, a toponym in Zealand (776 copy 1183–95). In Early Middle Dutch, the western dialects show a variant ambocht which is almost ubiquitous in northern West Flanders (Bruges and the smaller towns around it), Zealand and Holland. In East Flanders and Utrecht, ambocht is a variant occurring beside ambacht (VMNW, Berteloot 1984a Map 11, Mooijaart 1992: 83 and Table 1a). In official texts from South Holland and Zealand, ambocht can be found until at least the sixteenth century. Occasionally, a lengthened vowel is found in ambocht (in the thirteenth century), as well as a fronted variant ambucht, and lengthening plus fronting in ambuecht (Holland, Zealand). For the fronting, Mooijaart (1992: 81) compares the more regular fronting of short *u in op and vol in coastal Dutch – but of course that fronting is characteristic of stressed vowels, and is not found e.g. in bisscop ‘bishop’. Other words endings in an unstressed syllable in a labial plus /axt/ do not show rounding in any attested Middle or Modern Dutch form, but all of these remained morphologically transparent throughout all stages. Relevant words are compounds in -pacht ‘hire’, -vacht ‘fleece’, -wacht(e) ‘guard’, -macht ‘power’, and versmacht ‘(it) gets parched’.

96. In fact, for *o in open syllable we know that the reverse has happened in northeastern and eastern dialects down to North Limburg, viz. confusion with lengthened *a, as in aver ‘over’, etc.
Since the geographic distribution of a versus o in *ambacht: ambocht* is similar to that in *af: of*, one may suspect a similar cause for the rounding, viz. a development to o in unstressed position. The (somewhat) more restricted distribution of rounding in *ambocht* may be due to the fact that the labial consonant did not follow unstressed a but preceded it. Thus, the scenario proposed by Mooijaart may be correct: in unstressed syllable, the a of *ambacht* was rounded to o under the influence of b, and the lack of morphological transparency preserved this situation. This happened only in western Dutch, or maybe the o-form only survived in western Dutch. One might surmise, as a cause for the geographic division, that the unstressed vowel was reduced sooner in the west than in the east, and hence was sooner liable to be coloured by neighbouring consonants.

### 12.5 Summary

Table 32. Summary of the vowel phenomena reviewed in Chapter 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Coastal vs. inland Dutch</th>
<th>Status in coastal Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long for lang, etc.</td>
<td>yes (Flanders)</td>
<td>imposition from PFri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a &gt; o plus lengthening</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>imposition from PFri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*mf, *ns, *nþ, *nx</td>
<td></td>
<td>(possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all- &gt; oll-</td>
<td>yes (Flanders)</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>af &gt; of, ambacht &gt; ambocht</td>
<td>yes / partly</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the four different contexts in which PGM. *i, *a or *u could stand before a nasal plus a voiceless fricative (*f, *s, *þ, *x), the position before *nx was conducive to loss of the nasal and nasalization of the vowel in all varieties of Germanic, including Gothic. The sequence *anx has been discussed above with reference to the rounding of *anx to *onx. Examples of nasal loss in *inx and *unx which survive in Dutch are dicht ‘tight, closed’ (PGM. *þenxta-), gedijen ‘to thrive’ (*penxan-), licht ‘light, not heavy’ (*lenxta-), vijl ‘file’ (*finxlō-), ach tend ‘morning’ (*unxtwōn-), and vocht ‘moist’ (*funxti-). The other three environments require a closer analysis. 97

13.1 WGM. *mf, *nf

The sequence *Vmf was very rare in West Germanic. The two Dutch words which clearly contained this combination, viz. zacht < *samft- (see above) and vijf ‘five’ < PGM. *fimf < Pre-Gm. *fēmfe,98 show no trace of a nasal consonant. Even though it is likely that nasal loss before *f started in the Anglo-Frisian part of West Germanic, as it did before dental fricatives, it apparently spread further south before *f than before *s and *þ.

A different case is West Flemish uval ‘poverty, discomfort, illness’, ADJ. uvallig ‘disgusting, weak; nice’ (de Bo 1892 s.v. uivval and uvalligh), ouvallig ‘dirty, sloppy’, with unrounding also in Zealandish ival, ivallig. In French Flanders, a form oevallig is found (Moeyaert 2005). Until recently, the etymology was unknown. WNT s.v. u(i)val explains ival, uival as dialectal variants of euvel, evel ‘evil’ < *ubila-, whilst not excluding influence from a formation in *ūp- ‘over, across’. But there is no evidence for the variant *ūp- elsewhere in Dutch, nor does the comparison with e(u)vel work: there are no other words showing uu- for eu- or ie- for ee- in this position in West Flemish or Zealandish. Debrabandere (2007: 147) has identified the correct source, viz. the adjective MDu. onvallig ‘poor, wretched’, found in texts from Holland from the fifteenth century. It is cognate with MLG unvallich, unvellich


98. See Boutkan 1995: 74–5 for the PGM. loss of unstressed *-e in absolute final position.
‘unfortunate, disliked’. Thus, *uival* is identical in form and meaning to MoHG *Unfall* ‘bad luck, accident’, reflecting Old Franconian *un-fala*.

I disagree with Debrabandere on the phonetic details. He argues that *onvallich* became Flemish *oenvallig* which led to French Flemish *oevallig* and West Flemish *uvallig*, but the latter assumption goes against the regular vowel developments of West Flemish, where MDu. /u:/ does not become MoDu. /y:/ Thus, I think that we are dealing with two chronologically different forms. The Middle Dutch form *onvallich* regularly yielded West Flemish *oenvallig* (cf. Taeldeman 1979: 59–60 for the isoglosses between WFle. *uNC- and EFle. oNC-*) which lost its nasal and remained unrestored in French Flemish *oevallig* (and de Bo’s *ouvallig*). The forms *uival* and *ieval*, however, presuppose an Old Flemish /y:/, and hence show that, in this particular variant, the negative prefix *un-* was not restored as it otherwise was. I reconstruct *unfal-* > *ūfal-* > Middle Flemish /y:vəl/. Since Dutch *viij* and *zacht* show nasal loss in all dialects, *uival* may be a relic form showing this regular development, and it does not have to be explained on the basis of a Proto-Frisian substratum. High German *Unfall* is explained (by Seebold 2011) as a Late Middle High German replacement of the earlier compound *un-ge-val*, compare Early MDu. *ongheval*, MLG ungeval ‘fate, disaster’, OFri. ungefal. Whereas such a replacement may be true for the written standard, the co-occurrence of the verbs *vallen* and *gevallen* leaves no doubt that *un-fal-* must be older than *un-ga-fal-*.

13.2 WGm. *ns*

The *n* was lost before s, and *a* was rounded, in the coastal dialects in the words *bansa-* (*boes* ‘cowshed’), *gans* (*goes* ‘goose’), and in the name element *ansu-* (*Os-, Oegstgeest*); the details have been discussed in § 12.2.2 above. Reliable evidence for the sequence *ins* is missing. Two words in *uns* have nasal loss and compensatory lengthening:

1. WGm. *dunsti-* ‘dust, pollen, chaff’ (OE *dūst*, MoE *dust*, MLG *dūst*, MoWF *dūst* ‘dandruff’) is attested as Early MDu. *dunst* ‘pollen, fine flour’ (Limburg, 1240), *dost* ‘soft hairs of plants’ (1401), *donst* ‘soft hairs of thistles’ (Holland, 1423). To Kiliaan (1599), *dunst* and *donse* are synonyms, which suggests that *dunst* developed into *dons* by assimilation of word-final -st to -s; *dunse* must be the plural of this noun. Early Modern Dutch *duist* meant ‘chaff, pollen, down’ but has now disappeared from the language. It is not often attested; Kiliaan also mentions it but refers to *donst*. The evidence, though meagre, is not in conflict with the supposition that *duist* was a western Dutch form, as against eastern *donst*.
2. The pronoun ‘uns ‘us’ has often been discussed in Dutch and German dialectology (e.g. Frings 1926, Kloeke 1932, Goossens 1994, FAND I: 216). The modern dialects can be divided into four different historical-structural groups (thus FAND) as regards their reflex of ‘uns ‘us’. 1. The central dialects from Utrecht down to South Brabant mostly have the type Vns like ons in the standard language. 2. The n has disappeared, leaving a nasalized vowel in much of Zealand, Holland, western North Brabant and northeastern dialects (e.g. [õ.s]). 3. The nasal has disappeared completely in Limburg, leaving a short vowel (e.g. õs ‘us’), and in some South Flemish and some northeastern dialects, where it left a long back vowel or diphthong (e.g. u.s or õws). 4. The nasal has disappeared completely, leaving a front rounded vowel or diphthong. This is the case in French and West Flanders and in a few archaic dialects of Holland: Flemish uuus, Volendam uis, Ouddorp ŵs.

Only group 4 is relevant to the question of Frisian-Franconian language contact, since in groups 2 and 3, the nasal has probably disappeared in late medieval or modern times. Kloeke 1932 includes a map which indicates the occurrence of probable old (Ingvaenonic) nasal loss; see also his discussion in the text (p. 350–6). It seems certain that uuus (in Zealand) and uis (in Holland) were quite generally used in rural dialects in the seventeenth century, see also Boekenoogen 2004 for uis in North Holland. The coastal Dutch forms go back to Old Dutch *ūs and shared the usual development of inherited *ū in those dialects.

Other words containing PGm. *Vns do not show nasal loss, but they do not have to be regarded as counterevidence to a phonetic rule of nasal loss. In all these cases, it is possible to assume analogical restoration of n on the basis of cognate words. For MDu. bronst, brunst ‘fire, flame’, we can assume influence of the verb branden ‘to burn’. MDu. jonste ‘favour’ < *ga-unsti-, MoDu. gunst, and MDu. af onst ‘jealousy’ < *ab-unsti-, had a transparent connection with the verb onnen ‘to grant’ at least until the thirteenth century. ODu. kunst, MDu. const, MoDu. kunst ‘art’ is easy to relate to kunnen ‘to be able’.

13.3 WGM. *nþ

The lexemes with *a, viz. ander ‘other’, tand ‘tooth’ and smieë/smoeë ‘smooth’, have already been discussed in § 12.2.3. Among the forms in *inþ, the nasal is retained in MDu. ghesinde ‘companion; company’ (> *gezinne) > MoDu. gezin ‘family’ (*ga-sinþ-an/-ja-, cf. OE gesīþa, OS gisīði) and kind ‘child’ (*kinþa-). MDu. teende, tiende ‘tithe’ from the ordinal *texunþō/-an- ‘tenth’ (OS tehando, OFri. tegotha) may have restored n after the cardinal ‘ten’.
The nasal was also retained in Dutch *rund* ‘bovine’. This has two Middle Dutch sets of variants, viz. *rint*, *rent* and *runt*, *ront*, which go back to two different Germanic ablaut variants *xrinþ-* versus *xrunþ-*. Both have lost the nasal in Anglo-Frisian and Old Saxon (OS hřīth, OFri. hṛīther, MoWF rier ‘heifer’, OE hṛīder < *xrinþ-; OE hṛŵder < *xrunþ-*) but preserve *n* in High German and in all Dutch forms: OHG (h)rud, MoHG Rind, Old Dutch place-names Hrindsalis (near Ghent, 639 copy 941), Rondeslo (near Ghent, 1105), Middle Dutch dat.sg. rinde (Limburg, 1220–40), dat. pl. (WHol., 1282–87), runt (northeastern Dutch, 1373–76), runderen, runtvliesch (Holland, 1377–78), MoDu. rund, pl. runderen. For more on the etymology and the vocalism of this noun, see § 15.2.4.

Seven lexemes in *inþ* and *unþ* provide evidence for nasal loss in (parts of) Dutch:

1. The adjective *swinþa- ‘strong, fast’ (OS swīð(i) ‘strong’, OHG swind- in names, OFri. swithe ‘very’, MoWFri. swīd ‘magnificent’, OE swīþ ‘strong’, swīþe ‘fast’, Goth. swinþs ‘strong’) is attested with a nasal in MoDu. gezwind ‘fast’, but without a nasal in a number of different forms. In names, it occurs in the persons Engel-suit (Ghent, 840–77) versus Ger-, Rad-, Ric-, Thiod-suinda (all 9th c.), in Suitburgis (Ghent, 10th c. copy 11th c.), Sidewijf (12th c.), Edelswijd (Meesen, WFla., 1185), Ricswiit (Assendelft, 12th c.). The adverb suitho ‘very’ in the Wachtendonck Psalter probably indicates /swīþo/; note that this text possesses a few other instances of nasal loss before *þ* (see below). In Middle Dutch, swide ‘big, strong’ is attested in Melis Stoke’s *Chronicle* from the early fourteenth century and in several texts from the fifteenth century of Hollandish and northeastern provenance. An adjective zwijdig ‘manifold’ appears with some Hollandish literary authors of the seventeenth century. Although the word has vanished from the standard language, (traces of) *swīþ-* are still found in the dialects of Holland, Utrecht, Guelders and the northeast, e.g. swiet ‘extraordinary’ in and around Groningen, swiet ‘quick, well’ and zwijdig ‘manifold’ in the Zaanstreek (Boekenoogen 2004: 520), swit in Gelderland and Overijssel, and swīt, swīd, swīth ‘very’ in East Frisian (cf. WNT s.v. zwijd, de Grauw 1979–82 II: 315–6, Weijnen 2003 s.v. swied and zwie).

2. MDu. stide ‘strong, robust’ < PGm. *stinþja- (OE stīð ‘stiff’, OFri. stīth ‘strict’, ON stinnr, stīðr) also shows the nasal loss: Early MDu. stide (WFla. 1287, EHol.

---


100. The explanation of the Early Middle Dutch male name Suëder, zue(e)der in Holland from *swinþa-harja- (thus VMNW) seems uncertain in view of the vowel e.
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1276–1300, Melis Stoke, *Chronicle* ms. C). Late MDu. *stide* is only attested in Flemish and is continued by *stijde* ‘stiff’ in Modern Flemish dialects (see *WNT* s.v. *stijde*).

3. ‘Abominable’ is translated in the nominative plural by *farkutha* / *farkūþa* in one of the glosses to the Wachtendonck Psalter (901–1000, copy 1598). It represents the past participle of *fra-kunnan* (OHG *verchunnan* ‘to despair’, MHG *verkunnan* ‘to ignore’), cf. Goth. *frakunþs*, OE *forcūþ* ‘despised’. The simplex ODu. *kund*, MDu. *cont*, MoDu. *kond* ‘known’, however, never shows nasal loss in Dutch (as opposed to OS *cūþ*, OFri. *kūþ*). Of course, *n* may have been restored from the presents *kunnen* and *kennen*. De Grauwe (1979–82 I: 85–8) notes the rarity of nasal loss before *th* in Old Dutch (only in *sūthon* ‘South’, *swīþo* ‘very’, also *hlōtha* ‘praeda’) and signals the absence of the word family of *frakunnan* in Old Saxon. He proposes that *farkutha* was a direct loan from Old English. Yet both *sīþ-* and *swīþ-* are well attested in Dutch, so that the argument in favour of an Old English origin for *farkutha* is only based on the absence of *frakunnan* in Old Saxon. Since the verb is attested in High German, there is no need to exclude that it may have existed in Old Dutch, too.

4. West Germanic *munþa-* ‘mouth’ is attested as *mund*, *munt* in all literary attestations of Old Dutch. The feminine *munþō-* ‘opening, embouchure, estuary’ survives in ca. twenty-five Old Dutch toponyms indicating the ‘mouth’ of a river.\(^\text{101}\) In general, toponyms from Flanders, Zeeland and Holland show *mūtha* (sg.) or *mūthon* whereas toponyms further east have *munda*. Also, Rentenaar (2006: 202) observes that the earliest attestations of names in *-muiden* are generally a few centuries earlier than those in *monde: muiden* appears in names from the eight to tenth century but *monde* in such from the eleventh and twelfth century. Rentenaar infers that “This could certainly imply that the names in *-monde* first became productive in a period when Frankish came to play a more dominant role in the Netherlands and that names in *-muiden* originated from an older speech layer.”

To the first group belong Diksmuide in West Flanders (1089 *Dicasmutha*), *Olmeermuiden* in Antwerp (1119 copy ca. 1250 *Olmeremuthen*), *Maasmuiden* (772–76 copy 1170–75 *Masamuda*), Leimuiden (1001–1050 *Letthemutha*), and *Rijnsmuiden* (1101–50 *Rinesmuthon*) in South Holland, Muiden (1105 *Muthen*) and *Amuiden* (901–1000 *Amuthon*) in North Holland, *Hontemuiden* (1148 *Hontemuden*) in the westernmost part of North Brabant, and IJselmuiden (1133 *Islemuthen*) in Overijssel.

\(^\text{101}\) See Rentenaar 2006 for this toponym.
To the second group belong Rupelmonde (1171 Rupelmundam) and Dendermonde (1088 Thenremonde) in East Flanders, *Dubbelmond (1105 Duplamunde), *Giezenmond (1198 Gescemunde), and Ilsselmonde (1125–30 copy 1420 Islemunde) in South Holland, Egmond in North Holland (1167 Ekmunde), Lexmond in Utrecht (ca. 1180 Lakesmunde), and Gemond (698–99 copy 1191 Datmunda), *Markmond (1122–45 Markemunde), *Maasmond (1134 Masemunde), and *Werkenmond (1101–50 Wirkenemunde) in North Brabant. 102

These names, as far as they still existed after 1200, have kept their respective form, i.e. -muiden or -mond(e), until the present day. Names which can be added to the collection in the thirteenth century are Arnemuiden (1223 Arnemuda) 103 in Zealand and Muide (mude strate 1266–67) in Ghent. On the Hollandish appellative mui ‘depth between two sandbanks just off the coast through which tidal streams run’ from *mūde, see Bremmer 1993: 19–20. It also occurs in Groningen as moede, moe ‘natural seaward water-course in lands outside the seadikes’ and in Low German mûde ‘lock (in a river or canal), ‘discharging sluice’, ‘harbour’.

5. The words zuid ‘south’ (*sunþa-), zuider ‘southern’ (*sunþ(a)ra-) and zuiden ‘South’ (*sunþan-) show the most widespread loss of the nasal in Dutch. In fact, here the nasal is only preserved in a few toponyms: Zonderwijk in southeastern North Brabant (1240 Sonderwic), and probably also Zundert in western North Brabant, attested as Sunderda, Sunderde in the twelfth century, though there is an alternative etymology for this name (Van Berkel & Samplonius 2006: 527). All Dutch names and appellatives beside the ones mentioned have the form ODu. /su:þ-, MDu. suud-, MoDu. zuid-. Most of the Old Dutch attestations of suth- come from the western provinces: it occurs in glosses from French Flanders (Orosius glosses) and Holland/Utrecht (wind names), in the Leiden Willeram (from North Holland), and in toponyms with a first element suth- or suther- from the coastal provinces and Guelders. However, suthon /sūþōn/ ‘from the South’ also occurs in the Wachtendonck Psalter glosses, which are generally thought to reflect southeastern Low Franconian (cf. De Grauwe 1979–82 II: 260). In Early Middle Dutch, nearly all attestations of suut(-) are found in texts from Flanders or Holland, which is simply due to the preponderance of texts

102. For Lexmond, Taalmond and Zoolmond, see Blok 1965: 56. He dates the origin of these places to the eleventh century approximately. The town of Roermond in Limburg (1135–80 Roremunt) does not contain the word ‘mouth’, but ‘mound’, see Schrijnemakers 2014: 733–40.

103. The element Arne- has been regarded as an Old European hydronym (cognate with German Ahr, Italian Arno), but van Loon (2014: 223) suggests that it may be due to regular r-metathesis in an Old Dutch *Rinne-mūthon, with MDu. rinne, renne ‘canal, gutter’. Compare the French name Ramue for Arnemuiden (Guicciardini 1567).
from those regions in the corpus. The forms *sutlec ‘southerly’ and *sutwent ‘south wind’ in the Limburgian *Glossarium Bernense* (1240) leave no doubt about the reality of the nasal loss in the southeast. We cannot establish whether this Limburgian form has /u:/ or /y:/ on etymological grounds one would expect the former, but modern dialects have /zyːd/- with a front vowel. It may have been adopted from dialects to the west of Limburg, first of all, from Brabant.

6. Dutch *jeugd* ‘youth’ and *deugd* ‘virtue’ reflect PGm. *juwunþi- and *dugunþi-, respectively, and both have lost the nasal in an unstressed syllable. The former noun first developed into WGm. *jugunþi- (Kroonen 2011), whence OS juguð, MLG jöget, OFri. jogethe, OE geoguþ, MoE youth, all without n, versus OHG jugund, MoHG Jugend. Except for the oldest form iuginde (dat.sg.) in the Wachtendonck Psalter, all Dutch attestations confirm the northern n-loss: ODu. iugethet ‘rejuvenated’ (ca. 1100; Leiden Willeram), MDu. ioget (Limburg, 1240), DAT.SG. ijoegede (WBrab., 1265–70), iuget (EFla., 1290), Late MDu. jogheth, yoocht, MoDu. jeugd ‘youth’. In ‘virtue’, High German has kept the nasal (OHG tugunt, MoHG Tugend), Low German has both variants (MLG dogent, doget), whereas the northern languages have systematically denasalized the second syllable: OE duguð, OFri. dugethe, also ON dygð. Dutch again sides with the last group: ODu. dugath, dugeth ‘virtue’ (ca. 1100, Leiden Willeram; the NOM.ACC.SG. is unattested, the text alternates between dugath- and dugeth-), MDu. doget (Limburg, 1200), duget (Lower Rhine, 1270–90), DAT.PL. dogden (WBrab., 1265–70), EARLY MDU. sg. deucht, pl. deugden.

7. The extant Old Dutch texts contain no examples of nasal loss in the 3PL. PRES. *-anþ, which is reflected in Anglo-Frisian (OFri. -ath, OE -ad < *-ōð) and OS -ath. The only possible exception would be the WPs. gloss *aruethiat ‘they harass’ (in the Lipsius glosses), of which several editors, such as Quak (1981: 108) have suggested that it may have to be read as *aruethint. Quak (2004: 356) offers the alternative solution that *aruethiat represents – together with several other forms – Old Saxon influence on the language of the WPs., as shown by the preservation of suffixal j which is unusual for 10th-century Franconian but normal for Old Saxon. In that case, *aruethiat contains the regular OS PRES. PL. ending -iat(h) of jan-presents. The verb ‘to toil’ is attested both as a jan-present (Got. arbaidjan, OHG arbeiten) and an ō-present (ODu. 1SG. PRET. aruidoda, OS 1SG.PRES.SG. aruithon, OHG arbeitôn).
13.4 Interpretation

The evidence points to unrestricted nasal loss in the coastal dialects in the case of *Vns. Before *þ there is evidence for denasalization in unstressed *-un- in all dialects. In stressed syllables, n is preserved in ander, tand, gezin(de), kind, rind/rund and mond, but it has gone in coastal dialects in smieë/smoeë, stide, swijd, mutha/on (in toponyms), and nearly everywhere in zuid. There is further evidence for denasalization in the (glosses to the) Wachtendonck Psalter, but their geographic origin is uncertain. Since the preservation versus loss of nasals before fricatives cannot be explained by the quality of the preceding vowel, nor by the kind of words involved (such as nouns versus verbs), one of the few remaining options is to invoke syllable structure. This was done by van den Berg (1939). Comparing vijf < *fimf to ons, onze, he argued that the nasal-before-fricative was only lost if it was tautosyllabic with the preceding vowel, as in *fimf. According to this hypothesis, *uns developed into *ūs but inflected *unse regularly yielded onze. Subsequent analogical leveling would explain why not all the evidence agrees with this explanation. Although van den Berg surely overstretched his explanation by including the sequence *Vnx – in which the nasal is always lost in Dutch –, his solution is attractive for nasal loss before f, s and *þ. It is not immediately clear, however, that the details of van den Berg’s hypothesis are correct. Thus, mond versus muide(n) and kind versus stide at first sight show the retention of n before word-final obstruent and nasal loss in intervocalic *nþ, which is the opposite of what van den Berg proposed.

Table 33 contains a survey of the evidence discussed above, as far as it was not evidently open to analogical restoration of n as in jonst, kunst. The label ‘tautosyllabic nC in Old Dutch’ refers to the nominative and accusative form of nouns and adjectives.

The survey does not yield an immediate answer to our question, but it does provide certain clues. For instance, van den Berg’s explanation of nasal loss only in tautosyllabic position with the fricative is unlikely to be correct: the nasal was lost in muide, smieë/smoeë, stide, and uival, which never had tautosyllabic /nþ/ or /nl/, and retained in kind, mond, rund and tand. The latter forms could be explained from the oblique cases which had a syllable boundary between /n/ and /þ/, but this seems hardly likely for all of them. Also, with strong influence of the oblique, one might expect the consonant stem ‘tooth’ to have acquired i-mutation. The reverse explanation, viz. retention of the nasal in tautosyllabic /nþ/ and /ns/, is contradicted by the retained heterosyllabic nasal in ander and gezin, and requires analogical leveling to the oblique in boes, duist, goes, uis and zuid. It leaves vijf unexplained.

An alternative solution is to assume that denasalization was regular in all instances in the coastal dialects, and that it was due to influence from the Proto-Frisian substrate layer. The words with retained n would then be due to the later adoption of the core vocabulary from Franconian. Thus, kind, mond, rund, tand, ander would
have been introduced from the dominant central and eastern dialects, while nasal-less forms of the substrate language survive in toponyms, such as *-muide(n) and -zuid, and in words of low frequency, or which had no counterpart in Franconian: *stile, *swijd, *smieë. For the lexeme 'south', we would have to assume that it spread from the coastal area eastwards, maybe along with other terms of navigation, such as *vracht. The fact that *zonder- ‘southern’ was homonymous with *zonder ‘without’ may have played a role in its replacement by *zuid-. The sequence *mf, *nf may have been more liable to nasalization in general in Franconian. The general adoption of substrate forms for *ns as against *nþ might be connected to a difference in the target language (Franconian) which we cannot retrieve anymore: maybe Franconian had more nasalization in the former sequence than in the latter.

Table 33. Nasal loss before fricatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tautosyllabic nC in ODu.</th>
<th>Heterosyllabic nSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With nasal loss at least in some dialects:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ansu- ‘god’</td>
<td>*ans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bans, boes ‘cowshed’</td>
<td>*bans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deugd ‘virtue’</td>
<td>*dugunþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duist ‘dust’</td>
<td>*dunst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>farkutha ‘abominable’</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gans, goes ‘goose’</td>
<td>*gans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gezwind, zwijd ‘fast’</td>
<td>*swinþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jeugd ‘youth’</td>
<td>*jugunþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muide, Muiden, Monde ‘estuary’ etc.</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ons, uis ‘us’</td>
<td>*uns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smieë, smoeë ‘smooth’</td>
<td>– (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stide ‘strong’</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uival ‘poverty, illness’</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vijf ‘five’</td>
<td>*fimf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zacht ‘soft’</td>
<td>*samft-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zuid ‘south’</td>
<td>*sunþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With preservation of n in all dialects:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ander ‘other’</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gezin ‘family’</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind ‘child’</td>
<td>*kinþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kond ‘known’</td>
<td>*kunþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mond ‘mouth’</td>
<td>*munþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rund, rind ‘bovine’</td>
<td>*xrinþ, *xrunþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tand ‘tooth’</td>
<td>*tanþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wensch ‘wish’</td>
<td>*wunsk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the Early Proto-Frisian sound changes is the shift of *e to iu before *xx, *xs, *xt, and *rx (Bremmer 2009: 33–4), as in OFri. *fiuchta ‘fight’, *kniucht ‘knight’, *riucht ‘right’, *tiuche ‘team; parcel of land’. Old Frisian iu /iu/ of whatever origin yields a falling diphthong jo /jo/ or ju /jö/ in Modern West Frisian. The reflex jo is particularly frequent in front of velars, as in *wjok ‘wing’, *rjocht ‘right’, *njoggen ‘nine’, *sjonge ‘to sing’, while palatalization to /ö/ is favoured by a following dental consonant, witness *tsjuster ‘dark’, *tsjutsk (obs.) ‘German’, Sjurdsje (woman’s name) (Hoekstra 2001: 729). In southern dialects of Fryslân, fjö/ is also found before velars (Hof 1933: 238–42). For the latter reflex, we can posit a developmental sequence *iu > ju > jo > jö.

OFri. *tiuche mainly appears in field names, see Blok 1958 and Boekenoogen 2004: 527. The oldest attestations come from medieval East Frisia and are preserved in charters from the Werden monastery (tenth and eleventh century) in the form *tiochi, such as in *Notheringtiochi. In Late Old Frisian, such as the Landregister of Slochteren, from ca. 1460, the noun appears as *tiucha (Hofmann 1972–73: 59). Corresponding modern toponyms are Tjuche in Ostfriesland and Tjuchum, Tiuch in Groningen. A set of Latin dyke regulations from Fivelgo from 1317 mentions *tiuchga as, possibly, a ‘work team’ (Hofmann 1972–73: 64 and 1973: 9). In modern Groningen dialects, the word *tiucht ‘group, troup’ possibly continues this Old Frisian noun. The meaning of *tiuchga corresponds closely to that of MHG zeche ‘group of people with a common task’, MoHG Zeche ‘mine, pit’, MLG teche, teghe ‘parcel of a mine’ (see Hofmann 1972–73: 66–7, 1973: 5–7, 14–5). All the attested forms point to Old Frisian *tiuche or *tiuchga ‘team of people; parcel of land’ from *teuxja- ‘division, team’ according to Hofmann 1972–73 and 1973. Note that the stage jo seems to have been reached in the tenth century in this noun, though not in all dialects.


105. Other cognates are OE teoh(h) ‘company’, ON té n. ‘permission’ < *texwa-. Blok (1958) had reconstructed *teuxja- on account of the i-suffix in Old East Frisian and the i-mutation in modern dialects there. This reconstruction was followed by Gysseling (1962: 21), but Hofmann (1972–73) conclusively shows that only *teuxja can explain the attested forms. This must somehow have developed from PGm. *texwō-, cf. Kroonen 2013: 515.
The same toponym is attested in medieval Holland, where it must have been adopted from the erstwhile Frisian speakers. The phonetics clearly show this to be the case. In South Holland, Blok 1958 finds die *Langhe Tichte* in Oegstgeest (1387), and in Valkenburg *de Hoge tioch* (1484), *t Juch* (1496) and ’t Jocht (the present name). In North Holland, the word surfaces as *tuch* (Hargen, 1371), *tich* (Velzen, 13th c.), plural *tichen* (Rinnegom, 1358, Kennemerland, 14th c.), *Ticht* (Velzen, 1460), *tjuch* and *tuck* (Krommenie, 1665 and 1680). Note the presence of paragogic -t in various forms. The two South Hollandish names with the spellings io, jo show the lowering before velars which is also seen in East Frisian. In North Holland, no spelling with o is attested, and it is attractive to ascribe this absence to the later date of franconization of North Holland. In other words, in the eleventh century, South Holland was franconized when the local Frisian dialect still had /io/ or /jo/ in *tiocha* (or even *tiucha*). In contrast, the Frisian dialect of North Holland had already acquired /jö/ by the thirteenth century, where we only find ju, u and i. The Hollandish combination <ju> /jö/ can be due to the strong internal tendency to front /ɔ/ to /ö/ in western Dutch, which is conditioned, among other things, by a preceding j- (Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 94), compare Du. juk ‘yoke’, and jong ‘young’ beside juffrouw ‘miss’ < jonk-vrouwe. Blok (1958: 89) and Gysseling (1962: 21) explain the i in *tich(te) from unrounding in earlier */ty:x/ < *tiuch. This is in conflict with the relative chronology: unrounding of front rounded vowels in Frisian and in western Dutch is an early medieval change, which would not affect a word borrowed in or after the eleventh century. It seems more likely that Old Frisian *tiuch or *tioch was borrowed directly, not only as Hol. *tjoch, but also as *tich. In the latter form, the second element of the unfamiliar diphthong io was absorbed by the velar fricative.
The interpretation of the Dutch reflexes of WGm. *u and *o ranks as one of the most difficult chapters in Dutch historical phonology (Buccini 1995: 52). In the quotation given above, Goossens even calls the situation chaotic. This qualification is based on the following set of diverging reflexes in western dialects:

- ODu. *ü is reflected by the front rounded vowels /œ/ and /ø:/, such as in mug ‘midge’, sleutel ‘key’, but also by back vowels, as in dialectal mog and slotel for the same words. The latter forms show no trace of an i-mutation factor. Furthermore, the geographic extension of the back vowel reflexes differs per lexeme.
- ODu. *ü is reflected by an unrounded front vowel in a number of forms, for instance, in brig, breg ‘bridge’.
- ODu. *u and *o without i-mutation are reflected by back vowels (e.g., bos ‘bush’, joeng ‘young’) but also by the front rounded vowels /œ/ and /ø:/ (e.g., bus ‘bush’, vul ‘full’, dunder ‘thunder’, bleuzen ‘to blush’, beuter ‘butter’). Again, the geographic extension of the back vowel reflexes differs per lexeme.
- ODu. *u can also be reflected by i, most clearly in Flemish ip ‘up’.

An additional complication for comparative reconstruction is the merger, found in part of the Dutch dialects, of WGm. *u and *o in a single back vowel. At a later stage, it appears, this vowel often split in two allophones or even phonemes depending on the surrounding consonants. In a subset of Dutch dialects, the original distinction between *u and *o may have survived in the modern distinction between two short rounded back vowels (Goossens 2010).

The present chapter will investigate whether the regionally and temporally differentiated reflexes of WGm. *u and *o in coastal Dutch can be explained in a language contact scenario, as has been done by several authors, or by internal development. To
this aim, § 15.1 presents the research history and some preliminaries, § 15.2 discusses
the unrounding of *ü, and § 15.3 focuses on unconditioned fronting of *u and *o.

15.1 Research history and preliminaries

15.1.1 Research history

Goossens (1981) has established that there is a structural linguistic border between
coastal and inland Dutch as regards their pre-1200 vowel systems. Whereas inland
Dutch takes part in primary and secondary i-mutation to the same degree as the
dialects of Germany, coastal Dutch structurally ignores secondary i-mutation on
low and back vowels (*a, *ā, *u, *ū, *ō, *au). This conclusion was also reached by
Vereecken in 1938, though on the basis of a restricted number of forms with uncon-
tioned fronting to u and eu. Her findings are confirmed by Kloeke (1950: 73–100),
who shows that Afrikaans agrees with traditional South Hollandish dialects on a
number of accounts.

Taeldeman (1971) discusses many more forms in detail, in particular for
Flemish, but he arrives at the opposite conclusion. According to him, i-mutation
occurred in coastal Dutch, too. Due to the alleged low frequency of the phoneme /y/
at the Old Dutch stage (Taeldeman 1971: 170, 248), it would have been unrounded
to /i/ (as in the type stik, krepel) or backed to /o/. Taeldeman (1971: 250–5) argues
that we must first of all distinguish between PGm. *u which had remained a high
vowel in West Germanic, and PGm. *u which was lowered to *o under the influence
of a following mid or low vowel (a-mutation). For the former vowel, Taeldeman
assumes that unconditioned fronting to short rounded */y/ happened in the elev-
enth or early twelfth century, followed by lengthening and lowering to /ø:/ insofar
as the vowel stood in an open syllable.

Goossens 1981 (35–6) essentially returns to Vereecken’s view. His main argument
is the structure of the vowel system at large, viz. the general absence of secondary
i-mutation in Flanders, Zealand, and Holland as opposed to its presence in central
and eastern Dutch. Goossens arrives at the following, dialect-geographical results:

a. Words with u or eu in inland Dutch show i-mutation, that is, they go back to
   *ü;

b. Words with u or eu in coastal Dutch but a back vowel in inland Dutch go back
to *u;

c. For words reflecting *ü which have a front rounded vowel in coastal and in-
   land Dutch dialects as well as u or eu in Standard Dutch, it cannot be decided
whether the standard language adopted them from coastal or from inland
dialects.
Anthony Buccini (1989, 1992) connects Goossens’ findings with developing insights into language contact processes. He posits a transition from Ingvaenic to Franconian in the coastal zone, whereby native speakers of Ingvaenic took over Franconian speech, imposing on it some\textsuperscript{107} 107 stable elements from Ingvaenic, or, as I prefer to call it, Proto-Frisian (see Chapters 1 and 8 above). In particular, in order to explain the absence of secondary \textit{i}-mutation in western Dutch, Buccini assumes that there was a systematic difference between the unstressed vocalism of Proto-Frisian and that of Old Franconian. He then suggests that the phonological system of Proto-Frisian was imposed onto the Old Franconian lexicon when L1-speakers of Proto-Frisian learned to speak Franconian.

Buccini’s view provides the central working hypothesis for the present investigation. On the topic of the reflexes of WGm. *\textit{u} and *\textit{o}, Buccini (1995: 52–60) arrives at a detailed hypothesis of the different stages through which these vowels may have gone in the early stages of coastal and inland Dutch. I will summarize his main points.

Central to Buccini’s discussion is his preliminary claim that the allophonic distribution of WGm. /u/ and /o/ as a result of \textit{a}-mutation (which he also terms “raising/lowering umlaut”) shines through in the medieval and modern distribution of phonemes (1995: 23, 40–43; see also van Bree 2016: 249–50). In High German, *\textit{u} yielded [u] before \textit{u}, \textit{i}, \textit{j} in the next syllable and before clusters of nasal plus consonant (NC). In Anglo-Frisian, there were some additional environments which prevented \textit{a}-lowering and thus retained the allophone [u], especially a following single \textit{m} or \textit{n} (e.g., OE \textit{þunor} ‘thunder’, \textit{sumer} ‘summer’) and a preceding labial consonant (OE \textit{ful} ‘full’, \textit{wulf} ‘wolf’). This yields the following contrast in Anglo-Frisian (Buccini 1995: 23):

\begin{itemize}
  \item */u/ in the environments CuCi, CuCj, CuCu, CuNCV, CunV, CumV, C_{lab}uC
  \item */o/ in the environments CoCa, CoCo, CoCe
\end{itemize}

Hence, there were significant differences in the distribution of /u/ and /o/ between the two varieties which came into contact in the Low Countries. Old Franconian would have had a system similar to that of High German, whereas Proto-Frisian would have had the Anglo-Frisian distribution.

Some criticism of this proposal is in order. Buccini contrasts an Anglo-Frisian distribution of *\textit{u} and *\textit{o} to a High German one, but in his effort to schematize the differences, the High German dialects are treated too much as a monolith. On p. 22–23, he correctly observes that the high reflex *\textit{u} is conditioned by the

\textsuperscript{107} Buccini has focused on phonological issues. As part of the imposition of stable elements, one might also expect syntactic and lexical influence, but see § 8.2.1 on this topic.
environments *CuCu, *CuCi, *CuCj and *CuNCV, and the mid reflex *o by *CuCa, *CuCo and *CuCe both in Anglo-Frisian and in High German. But he then implies that the environments *CumV, *CunV and *C_{lab}uC blocked a-mutation only in Anglo-Frisian: OE sumer, thuner, hunig, wunat, butere, ful, fugel, wulf, fulk (row iv in Tables 32 and 33). Yet – as Buccini is clearly aware – there are exceptions to this distribution in German, especially in Franconian (Franck 1909: 31–5). For instance, Old Franconian has instances of fugal, fugel- ‘bird’, a word for which modern eastern Dutch dialects also show lengthening of *u rather than *o in open syllable (see, for instance, FAND II: 110–111 on vogel). Other words showing Old Franconian /u/ rather than /o/ which are relevant to our discussion are wulf (frequently beside wolf), buc beside boc ‘he-goat’, fruma ‘gain’, and sumar ‘summer’. Thus, it seems better not to assume a strict split in the distribution of *u and *o between Anglo-Frisian and Continental West Germanic, but a gradual increase of a-mutation as we go from the North Sea to the Alps. Since we know so little about Old Dutch itself, we must keep an open mind about the possible realization of the short back vowel in the contact variety that became western Dutch. It is quite possible that Old Dutch had *u rather than *o in the environments *CumV, *CunV and *C_{lab}uC, and was, in this respect, closer to Anglo-Frisian than to High German.

Obviously, paradigmatic analogy is another factor which must have influenced the distribution of *u and *o. Thus, Old High German shows a nominative gold ‘gold’ with an ins.sg. goldu instead of *guldu, a present sg. kan ‘can’ with a preterite konda rather than (rare) kunda (analogical to dorfta, torsta?), etc. (Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 §32).

For approximately the year 700, Buccini (p. 54) posits the following comparison between “coastal Ingvaeonic” (our Proto-Frisian) and “Frankish” (our Old Franconian). In Proto-Frisian, according to Buccini, i-mutation had already run its course, and the allophones u and o were distributed as in Anglo-Frisian; but in Old Franconian, there was no (phonological) i-mutation yet, so that [o] had a wider distribution. In Table 34, the variety resulting from the language contact process is termed “Old Dutch”. It basically contains the same vowels as Old Franconian, although Buccini allows for the possibility that Old Dutch had adopted PFri. /y/ and /u/ before nasals and labials:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-Frisian</th>
<th>Old Dutch</th>
<th>Old Franconian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>y (+ i-mutation)</td>
<td>u (and y?)</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u (+ u, NC)</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u (+ N, labial, l)</td>
<td>o (and u?)</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o (+ a-mutation)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34. Short *u ca. 700 CE (adopted from Buccini 1995: 54 with modifications)
For the period around 900, Buccini (1995: 55) posits the application of secondary i-mutation in Old Franconian (*u > *y), and, at the same time, the unrounding of (some instances of) earlier *y in Proto-Frisian. In other words, the first row of forms of the previous table is split in two, which yields the following five sets:

Table 35. Short *u ca. 900 CE (adopted from Buccini 1995: 54 with modifications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-Frisian</th>
<th>ODu.</th>
<th>OFra.</th>
<th>MoDu. examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. i (+ i-mut. &amp; unrounding)</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>brug, mug, stuk, kreupel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. y (+ i-mut.)</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>vullen, gulden, dun, sleutel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. u (+ u, NC)</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>gebonden, hond, tong, zoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. u (+ N, labial, l)</td>
<td>o (/ u)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>donder, zomer, wolf, bok, vogel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. o (+ a-mut.)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>god, volgen, bos, voor, open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35 represents the adoption of OFra. /y/ and /u/ into coastal Old Dutch as /u/. Old Franconian /o/ was adopted as /o/, though it may have been adopted as /u/ in contexts in which Proto-Frisian had [u]. For the Late Old Dutch variety which became Old Flemish (and at a stage predating open syllable lengthening), Buccini then proposes unconditioned fronting of /u/ to /y/ except where /u/ was conditioned by a following cluster nC (compare Taeldeman 1971: 223, who shows that fronting was blocked in West Flemish in particular before NC: moend ‘mouth’, doenker ‘dark’).

This scenario can be contrasted with Old Brabantish, which to a large extent preserved the Old Franconian distribution:

Table 36. Short *u ca. 1100 CE (adopted from Buccini 1995: 55 with modifications)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proto-Frisian</th>
<th>Old Flemish</th>
<th>Old Brabantish</th>
<th>MoDu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. i (+ i-mut. &amp; unrounding)</td>
<td>u &gt; y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>æ, ø:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. y (+ i-mut.)</td>
<td>u &gt; y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>æ, ø:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. u (+ u, NC)</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ë, ø:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. u (+ N, labial, l)</td>
<td>o / u &gt; y</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ë, ø:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. o (+ a-mut.)</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ë, ø:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buccini (1995: 56) regards the occasional unrounded reflexes in words of row (i) of Table 36 as “lexical Ingvaenisms”, which managed somehow to enter Old Flemish from coastal Ingvaenic. As we will see below, this view may not be tenable.

Furthermore, Buccini points to exceptional words such as koning ‘king’, molen ‘mill’, slotel ‘key’ (StDu. sleutel). These had secondary i-mutation in Old Franconian but they seem to have had a back vowel /u/, liable to unconditioned fronting, in western Old Dutch. Buccini (p. 58) assumes that there was an “elevated variety of Old Dutch” which did not join in the unconditioned fronting (or only reluctantly did so). Faced with the problem of locating such an elevated variety, which
apparently played an important role in the incipient stages of written Dutch, he suggests East Flanders as its epicentre. To my mind, the existence of a different sociolinguistic stratum which could explain the aberrant forms ascribes our problem to the unknowable, apart from the question of whether the scenario is likely in itself. It has not been clearly established that forms like *koning, molen and *slotel are really different in their dialect-geographical behaviour throughout the centuries than words which show the fronted vowel *eu. It is hazardous to rely heavily on the forms of standardized written Dutch, as these are generally known to have various sources and do not necessarily reflect the vernacular reality of any given period.

A competing theory is that of van Loon (2014: 56–8, 140–2, 166–73, 204–8). He dismisses the view advocated by Goossens, viz. that i-mutation of *a was primary whereas i-mutation of *u was secondary, and that the latter would not have taken place in western Dutch. In van Loon’s view, short *u was subject to i-mutation to the same extent as *a, with this difference that its effects do not show up in the Old Dutch spelling. Accordingly, he rejects (on p. 165) Buccini’s theory about a possible Ingvaenic substrate in coastal Dutch, though the only argument he brings is irrelevant. Van Loon remarks that the west retains the suffixes /-kin/ and /-in/ with a high vowel until the fifteenth century (mannekijn ‘small man’, Lammin ‘little Lambert’) but did not adopt an i-mutated stressed vowel. If anything, such forms rather confirm Buccini’s view, but since these suffixes were productive (and had full versus reduced variants, depending on the number of syllables in the word), it is fairer to say that the forms cannot be used to prove or disprove earlier phonetic changes.

According to van Loon, there are two main reasons why we find less i-mutated forms in western Dutch than in the centre and east of the Low Countries: (1) Based on a number of Old Dutch toponyms, he argues that i-mutation factors were reduced to schwa sooner in the west, viz. before 900, than in the east. This would explain the absence of i-mutation on long vowels in western Dutch (p. 163). (2) Analogical leveling reduced the number of alternating paradigms to a larger degree in the west than in inland Dutch, thus removing a number of i-mutated forms (p. 159). Van Loon also supposes that i-mutated /y/ often became [o], particularly before /-r/, for instance, in *borstel (English bristle), *schort ‘apron’ (G. Schürze), storten ‘to dump’. In other dialects, such as North Hollandish, it would be the

108. Van Loon (p. 142) argues that Goossens’ view is based on the graphic absence of i-mutation in the case of /u/ as opposed to /a/, which is true as regards the research history but not as regards Goossens’ own analysis, which is based on structural argumentation. Van Loon makes the mistake of taking written evidence at face value himself when he regards central and eastern Middle Dutch forms such as monster ‘minster’, monten ‘coins’, molder ‘miller’ as evidence for a back vowel: it is generally thought that these words had a front rounded vowel, but the dialects in which we find them did not systematically distinguish front rounded vowels from back vowels in writing (cf. § 15.1.5).
following velar consonants which caused backing of *u to o, as in dialectal bokken ‘to stoop’, rokken ‘to jerk’, mogge ‘midge’.

Like others, van Loon assumes a process of unconditioned fronting of *u to explain western, fronted forms such as lucht ‘air’, turf ‘peat’, etc., which never had an i-mutation factor. Like Buccini 1995 (and as summarized above), he also assumes that the fronting took place only in words which retained high /u/ and not in words where the vowel was lowered to /o/ in Late Old Dutch. Finally, like others, he links the high frequency of (inferred) retained *u in coastal Dutch to the more frequent occurrence of /u/ in Old English and Old Saxon versus /o/ in Old High German in a number of words, especially near labial consonants (e.g., wulf, veugel, etc.), pointing among other things to <u> in the Wachtendonck Psalter (genuman ‘taken’, stuppot ‘stopped’, uulcon ‘clouds’, fuluwonon ‘to stay’; 2014: 58).

Unlike his predecessors, van Loon suggests that the unconditioned fronting of *u regularly depended on the presence of Old Dutch u-vocalism in the next syllable (p. 170). In this way, OS sunu ‘son’, hmutu ‘nut’ would directly explain western zeun, neut, and the nominative singular of ō-stems, which ends in -u in Old English as opposed to -a in Old High German, would account for words such as nunne ‘nun’, tubbe ‘tub’, tunne ‘ton’, wulle ‘wool’, zeug ‘sow’. Moreover, the variation between Flemish zomer but Hollandish zeumer would be the result of paradigmatic variants, witness OHG sumar, sumur. This is a radically different theory, and van Loon himself mentions a number of reasons why it is problematic, of which the chronology (final -u may been reduced to schwa as early as the ninth century in Flanders) and the phonetics (how can final -u cause vowel fronting?) are the most obvious ones. A different reason for unconditioned fronting is given on p. 207–8, viz. the fact that old *u is lowered to a mid vowel, usually spelled <o>, in most of Dutch. Since the lowered vowel would (threaten to) merge with earlier /o/ from a-mutation of *u, van Loon suggests that some words with old /u/ would have resorted to fronting “om een te grote lexicale belasting van het foneem /o/ of om homoniemen te vermijden”109 (p. 207). This preventive fronting would then have to be dated before open syllable lengthening, which reduced the number of words with short vowels. Whereas this motivation for fronting would be more easy to understand in typological terms, it has the disadvantage that it does not explain why certain lexemes were fronted whereas others were not. In his final paragraph on this subject, van Loon assumes a two-step development, phased in time: in the ninth to tenth century, u-mutation would have caused the first wave of fronting of *u; in the eleventh to twelfth century, the general tendency to lower /u/ to /o/ would have pushed another set of words with /u/ to be fronted to /y/.

109. “in order to avoid a too large lexical load of the phoneme /o/ or to avoid homonyms”.
The unrounding of *\(\ddot{u}\) in the type brigghe, stik is linked by van Loon (p. 168–73) to the first round of unconditioned fronting of *\(u\), etc., mainly because of the concurring isoglosses between both phenomena, and because the unmutated vowels are rarely unrounded. The many words which were fronted from *\(u\) to /\(j/\) in coastal Dutch would have pushed the earlier, \(i\)-mutated words such as *\(brygge\) into unrounding. Apart from the doubts which van Loon himself expresses at this scenario, it may be said in advance of our discussion of the evidence that he does not address the specific restriction of the coastal unrounding to the \(ja\)- and \(j\(\ddot{o}\)-stems.

For the western forms with an unexpected back vowel, such as koning, molen, slotel, which have \(i\)-mutation in the east, van Loon (p. 209–10) proposes that they are due to hypercorrection and arose in the sixteenth and seventeenth century as a result of dialect mixture, particularly in Holland. The vowel \(eu\) would have been regarded as “ongepast” [“unfitting”] for the higher registers, and was replaced – sometimes regularly, as in \(zoon\) for ‘son’, sometimes hypercorrectly, as in koning, molen, slotel – by a back vowel. This view seems unlikely in view of the spread of the oo-forms (e.g., slotel is found in French and West Flanders), and because \(eu\)’s of a different provenance (as in steunen, reus with *\(e\), *\(i\), or loanwords such as kleur) do not change to oo.

I have summarized the main thrust of Schrijver’s theories (2014) on the development of the Dutch vowel systems in §5. He explicitly regards the unconditioned fronting of *\(u\) to /\(j/\) in Flemish as the reflex of a language shift from northwestern Gallo-Romance, or a pre-stage of Old Picardian, to Old Franconian. Since, in his reconstruction, Old Picardian had short /\(j/\), /\(o/\), and /\(u/\), but lacked /\(u/\), he assumes that the speakers of Gallo-Romance identified Germanic /\(u/\) with their /\(j/\). Although his theory is very vague on the distributional details, in particular as regards the developments of short vowels and their chronology, and therefore not very attractive at first sight, the basic idea of a Romance substrate underneath, or Romance adstrate influence onto, southern Dutch seems a plausible option.

In summary, the two main explanatory theories that we can distinguish are between a substrate scenario (Proto-Frisian in the case of Buccini, Gallo-Romance in the case of Schijver) and a native development (in the view of van Loon). All scholars agree on the importance attached to the – first allophonic, then phonemic – distinction between *\(u\) and *\(o\) in the West Germanic dialects, with *\(u\) yielding the proper environment for the unconditioned fronting to short *\(u\) and long \(eu\) in western Dutch. The distribution of *\(u\) in the early-medieval western Low Countries would be more of the Anglo-Frisian and Old Low Franconian kind (e.g., *\(u\) after labials and before single nasal consonants) than of the High German kind. The influence of \(i\)-mutation is judged differently by different scholars.
15.1.2 On the presence vs. absence of an i-mutation factor

Seen from the viewpoint of the lexicon as a whole, the presence or absence of an i-mutation in West Germanic lexemes was not a binary phenomenon but a scalar one. Many stems had an i-mutation factor in all or most forms of their paradigm. Such was the case, for instance, in masculine and neuter ja-stems, feminine i(n)-stems, in adjectives of appurtenance in *-ina-, (deverbal) nouns in *-ila-, and in the present tense of jan-stem verbs. Such words generally have i-mutation in eastern Dutch.

But in other stem types there was more fluctuation between the presence or absence of i-mutation. In nominal i-stems, word-final *-i was apocopated at an early stage of Old Germanic (post-dating the Early Runic period), after a heavy syllable but not after a light syllable. This led to paradigms in which i-mutation affected only part of the forms, viz. those forms in which a posttonic i had been retained: generally, these were the oblique case forms (genitive, dative) and the plural. Also, the inflexional type which arose by phonetic development after heavy root syllables was often extended to short-syllable stems (Klein 2004, Boutkan 1995: 64–6). Instances from Old High German are: sg. gast, slag, ins. gestiu, pl. gasti, slegi, dat. gestim (m.); nom.acc.sg. anst, stat, gen.dat. ensti, steti, nom.acc.pl. ensti, steti (f.). Due to these developments, i-stems with a heavy base have for a large part ended up without i-mutation in the eastern dialects, with some exceptions. Another complication is that u-stems have partly gone over into the i-stem inflexion, particularly in the plural.

15.1.3 On the allophones *u and *o

WGm. *u and *o were allophones of the same vowel /u/, with *o arising through a-mutation or “lowering mutation” (Buccini 1995, van Loon 2014: 58). In Standard Dutch, both vowels have merged. Therefore we find Dutch vos, hond, bot, krom, gebonden and bok, wolf, kop, vol with the same vowel, but German /u/ in Fuchs, Hund, Butt, krumm, gebunden versus /ɔ/ in Bock, Wolf, Kopf, voll. It is unclear what the exact distribution of *u and *o in Old Low Franconian was. Old Saxon shows u rather than o when the stressed vowel is followed by nC (hund ‘hundred’), a single m (sumar ‘summer’) or n (wunon ‘to live’), or if it is preceded by a labial consonant (ful ‘full’, wulf ‘wolf’), cf. Gallée 1993: 57–60. Some u-forms may be due to paradigmatic alternations. Similar conditions may probably be assumed for Old Franconian, as has been done by Buccini 1995.

It is well known that some Dutch dialects possess an opposition between two short rounded back vowels, such as between /u/ and /ɔ/, or between /o/ and /ɒ/, which in traditional Dutch linguistics are written as ò versus ò. It is unclear in which
dialects this opposition directly continues the West Germanic allophony, and in which dialects, on the contrary, the extant opposition arose at some later stage by a split of an earlier unitary phoneme /o/. Furthermore, it is also possible that some of the words in õ and ø directly continue the inherited allophones *u and *o, whereas others obey to a conditioning which arose at a later stage (Goossens 2008: 96–7, 2010). Weijnen (1991 Map 98) finds that, in general, eastern Dutch and North Hollandish dialects still possess two different short back vowels. For Limburg, one might compare the Middle Dutch spellings and suggest that the modern distinction continues the inherited opposition between *u and *o. The same problem applies, mutatis mutandis, to *u versus *o in open syllable.

For our purposes, it is less important whether the old distinction is continued in central and eastern Dutch since we are interested in coastal Dutch. Especially in view of the occurrence of unconditioned fronting, we will concentrate on the distinction between u and o in western dialects.

15.1.4 On closed and open syllables

Any stressed short vowel in open syllable in Late Old Dutch was susceptible to open syllable lengthening. Hence, there are a number of stems ending in a single consonant for which some forms of the paradigm qualified for lengthening whereas others did not (compare for general discussions Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 30–1, van Loon 2014: 208–13). The ensuing alternations between short and long stem vowels were preserved in the standard language in a number of nouns (weg, pl. wegen 'road, roads', schip, pl. schepen 'ship, ships'; similarly the lengthened vowel was preserved in the plural of the nouns dag ‘day’, god ‘god’, hol ‘hole’, slot ‘lock’, stad ‘town’, vat ‘barrel’, and others). In some other cases, the short and long variants were petrified as different nouns (staf ‘staff’ vs. staaf ‘bar’, ven ‘lake on the moor’ vs. veen ‘moor’). Mostly, however, the alternation was leveled towards one of the two variants. In adjectives, the short vowel was usually generalized: glad ‘slippery’, smal ‘narrow’, vlot ‘floating, quick’. In j-verbs, an alternation arose between forms continuing the j- endings (which geminated the preceding consonant, which then blocked lengthening) and others which reflect i-endings (in 2SG., 3SG.PRES., 2PL.). For instance, compare Early MDu. seghes, seghet ‘you say, he says’ from *sagis, -t but ic seghe ‘I say’ from *saggju. This alternation was usually leveled towards the short-vowel forms in Modern Dutch, thus zeggen ‘to say’. Most of the jan-presents with a root vowel *u before a single consonant joined the short-vowel class, but a number of verbs generalized the lengthened vowel, e.g. gebeuren ‘to happen’ < *burjan-, deuwen ‘to resound’ (but Early MDu. thunnen) < *dunjan-, jeuken ‘to itch’ (but also WFle. jukken) < *jukjan-. 
15.1.5 On the graphemics of rounded vowels

The modern standard language unambiguously distinguishes between the spelling <u> for the front rounded vowel /œ/ and <o> for /ɔ/ (when writing dialects, <o> can also be used for short /o/, /u/). For the lengthened counterparts /ø/ and /o./, the spellings <eu> respectively <oo>, in open syllable <o>, are used.

This system only established itself in the course of the sixteenth century. In Old Dutch, there was no graphic indication for the fronting of the rounded back vowels. Hence, it can never be excluded that ODu. <u> represents fronted [γ] = /γ/ or [œ] = /œ/, or that <o> represents a rounded mid front vowel.

In Middle Dutch, the situation is not uniform either. In western dialects, short <u> is generally assumed to reflect a front rounded vowel /γ/ or /œ/, whereas <o> indicates a back vowel; cf. Van Loey 1980: 29–31. Goossens (1997: 165) hypothesizes that it was the lack of phonemic short /u/ in western Middle Dutch which cleared the way for using <u> for a front vowel. In Limburg, Cleves/Guelders, the northeastern dialects, and in many parts of Brabant, a different system applied. These dialects possessed two different short back vowels, for instance, high-mid /υ/ and mid-low /ɔ/. They therefore retained the difference between <u> and <o> for the back vowels. As a consequence, the same graphemes <u> and <o> also had to be used for the two front vowel phonemes /γ/ and /œ/, cf. van Loey 1980: 30, Goossens 1997: 167. This situation can still clearly be seen in the Limburgian Glossarium Bernense from 1240, but also in many Brabantish texts until ca. 1550.

In principle, therefore, we cannot rely on central and eastern <o> and <u> for the distinction of short front rounded vowels. Investigations of separate towns and regions can sometimes shed some light on central and eastern Dutch. For Venlo between 1320 and 1543, van der Meer (1949: 194, 201) claims that <o> is much more common than <u> for unmutated *u, whereas the reverse holds for *ü, for which <u> would be the most commonly used spelling. Unfortunately, he does not give a full statistical overview of his data. Note, also, that the distribution of front and back vowels for separate items may have changed its dialect geography over the last 800 years, as van der Meer himself surmises for the preposition om, um.

For long vowels, the same basic situation holds, but there are more uncertainties. Depending on the exact period (digraphs become more frequent as time progresses), on closed vs. open syllable (because long vowels take digraphs sooner in closed syllables than in open ones), and on the region, the four main graphemes used for /ø:/ (of whatever etymological source) in Early Middle Dutch are <o>, <oe>, <u> and <ue>. Central and eastern dialects show a preference for the first two of these variants. In the course of Late Middle Dutch, <ue> indicating /ø:/ slowly gets replaced by <eu>. But – at least in central and eastern dialects – the same four graphemes can also be used for long back vowels, which may continue
lengthened *u or *o as well as the old long vowels *ū, *ō, and *au. The only positive evidence for front vowels in Middle Dutch comes from Flemish (and, to a less extent, Hollandish), where <u> and <ue> usually refer to /y:/ and /œ:/ but not to back vowels (due to the correlation with fronted short *u > /y/, /œ/). Thus, if a word with lengthened *ū is well represented by western spellings <u>, <ue>, we may decide that it had a front vowel; but the spellings in central and eastern Dutch cannot by themselves inform us about the back or front quality of the vowel.

15.2 Unrounding of *ū

In spite of the general absence of secondary i-mutation in coastal Dutch, a number of words presuppose a stage with a front rounded vowel *ū. These words dialectally show an unrounded vowel, as in brigge ‘bridge’, pet ‘pit’, evel ‘evil’, etc. The unrounded forms are particularly frequent in Flemish documents from all periods. In other western regions, unrounding seems to have been characteristic of lower registers after 1600. For instance, in the seventeenth century, stik ‘piece’ is used by peasants in the plays of Bredero, and is given for the lower class speech of The Hague in the eighteenth century. In general, the unrounded vowel is prevalingly mid-to-high i in Flanders and Zealand, but mid-to-low e in Holland; but there is no absolute geographic distinction. For instance, the Katwijk dialect (de Vink 2004: 73) has krik and stik, but pet, bregge and regge.

The loss of rounding has been variously explained. Heeroma (1935: 86) assumes that i-mutation of *u did not occur in the coastal dialects, and that /y/ was therefore wholly isolated in the vowel system. When inland Dutch started to impose its dialect on the coastal regions (which in Heeroma’s view were not of Anglo-Frisian stock, but simply a different kind of West Germanic called Ingvaeionic), the coastal dialect “haastte zich” [“hastened”] to eliminate this unusual sound from its phonological system by unrounding it to i or e. As Heeroma concedes, it remains to be seen why it was only a small subset of the words containing *ū (brigge, pit, evel, etc.) which admitted the umlauted vowel /y/ in the coastal dialects in the first place.

A similar view is expressed by Taeldeman 1971, who assumes that /y/ was simply very rare in the Old Dutch system of Flemish, and was therefore eliminated. Taeldeman (1971: 243–50) posits the following relative chronology: 1. i-mutation, 2. unrounding (in part of the forms), depalatalization (in some others), 3. unconditioned fronting of (part of the words having) *u (between 1050 and 1200), 4. open syllable lengthening. As we have seen above, the idea that i-mutation generally applied in Old Flemish has become untenable since Goossens 1981. It follows that the unrounded forms cannot be explained in the way envisaged by Taeldeman.
The order of developments 2 and 3 in Taeldeman’s chronology is reversed by van Loon (2014: 169), who argues that the rise of unconditioned /y/ from *u in the Ingvaeonic dialects pushed the *ü from i-mutation towards an unrounded position, where it merged with *i.

Buccini (1995: 56) regards the unrounded forms such as brigge, pit and evel as “individual words which were somehow transferred from coastal Ingvaeonic to Old Flemish”, that is, as exceptions to the rule that the Old Flemish vocabulary in principle represents the vocabulary of Old Franconian, as adopted by the Proto-Frisian substrate of Flanders. The unrounded words would be Proto-Frisian words which managed to survive the language shift to Franconian.

Prior to the discussion of the evidence for unrounding in western Dutch, I must explain that Dutch linguistics distinguishes two historically and geographically different types of unrounding. The first type may be termed sporadic unrounding: lexically determined cases of unrounding which are shared by a greater number of (medieval and/or modern) dialects of Flanders, Zeeland, Holland. Examples are words such as brig(ge), breg(ge) ‘bridge’, knekel ‘bone’, hid(e)n ‘to hide’. The second type is the productive unrounding of rounded front vowels which a number of modern dialects and dialect areas exhibit. Data from such productively unrounding dialects cannot be used to prove the existence of a medieval process of unrounding due to language contact. Taeldeman (1994: 155) provides a survey of the southern Dutch areas with productive unrounding, which I reproduce in Map 14. He distinguishes areas where the unrounding is still quite alive (group a) from areas where the unrounding has ceased to be productive (group b):

Group a:  
- a1. A relatively large area in Belgian Limburg (incl. Hasselt).  
- a2. Leuven and a Central Brabantish area around it.  
- a3. An area on both sides of the river Dender (incl. Aalst), on the border of East Flanders and South Brabant.  
- a4. The towns of Maldegem and Kleit in northern East Flanders.  
- a5. Knesselare, south of Kleit (unrounding only of *ü).

Group b:  
- b1. The town of Boom (prov. Antwerp) and its surroundings.  
- b2. Temse and southern Sint Niklaas (in eastern East Flanders).  
- b3. The town of Dendermonde (in Map 14, it is the northern tip of the unrounding area of Aalst).  
- b4+b5. Lemeke, Oosteeklo, Ursel (northern East Flanders) (unrounding only of *ü).  

From the Netherlands we may add  
- c. The town of Egmond-aan-Zee in North Holland and the island of Vlieland.
Map 14. Productively unrounding areas in modern, southern Dutch dialects. From Taeldeman 1994: 155. The indication “matig regressief” [“moderately regressive”] refers to group (a) in the text, the term “sterk regressief” [“strongly regressive”] to group (b).

The geographic spread of the unrounding areas of southern Brabant plus the Dender area, and the fact that the unrounding is a recessive feature, suggest that the area which unrounded rounded front vowels used to be larger. In any case, that is how Goossens (1962, 1992b) interprets the presence of unrounding in regions in a semicircle to the west, north and east of Brussels, and its absence from the capital itself. It can be surmised that unrounding of front vowels remained a feature of lower registers, as is also suggested by its nearly complete absence from older, written sources. Still, sporadic early indications for unrounding exist. For instance, the town of Leuven almost certainly had unrounded its front vowels by the fourteenth century (Van Loey 1960: 145).

For our purposes, the productively unrounding areas have a twofold importance. Firstly, the fact that Brabant already knew such unroundings in the fourteenth century means that instances of unrounding in written texts from the area, or by a hand of unknown provenance, could reflect a productively unrounding dialect. In other words, not all medieval instances of unrounding are connected with the divide between coastal and inland Dutch. Secondly, when investigating the spread of reflexes of WGm. *ü in modern dialects, we must always factor out the evidence of these productively unrounding areas.

Below, the evidence for unrounding will be discussed in four subsections. First is the unrounding of *ü in closed syllable (the main type breg, pit, etc.) in § 15.2.1. This is followed by § 15.2.2 on words in which *ü (allegedly) stood before rC,
because this sequence shows deviating developments in Middle Dutch which must be taken into account. In § 15.2.3, unrounding in open syllable will be reviewed, while § 15.2.4 turns to the remaining forms for which unrounding has been claimed but must be dismissed.

15.2.1 Unrounding in closed syllable

Earlier collections of unrounded forms can be found in Franck 1910: 42f., van Loey 1980: 18–9 (for Middle Dutch), Jacobs 1911: 153–6 (for Middle Flemish), Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 50–2 (for Dutch in general), and van Bree 2016: 254. None of these are exhaustive. The same is true for the present collection, but it does try to incorporate more evidence than its precursors. The main features to which I will pay attention are: the West Germanic etymology, the quality of the stressed vowel, the presence or absence of unstressed -e, the consonant(s) between the stressed and unstressed syllable, and the dialect geography. The evidence appears in alphabetical order of the Modern Dutch entries.

1. *brug*, *brigge*, *breg* ‘bridge’ < WGm. *bruggjō*–111 f. (OFri. *bregge*, *brigge*, OS *brug-*gia, OHG *brucka*, MoHG Brücke, OE *brycg*).

Unrounding is already attested in four Old Flemish place names near Bruges, viz. Eienbrugge (*Heienbriga*, 1187), Hooghebrugge (*Hoghbriggam*, 1129), Kortebrugge (*Cortabriga*, 1113), and Winebrugge (*UUeinabriga*, *Weinabrigga*, *Weinbrigga*, all 1089). The spelling -briga may have been influenced by Celtic place-names in -briga, but even so, the identification presupposes vernacular /i/ in the first place. The city of Bruges is attested 82 times between 840 and 1153 (*TW*, digital edition). It always has <u> except for *Brycge* and *Bricge* in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle of the eleventh century, which clearly has the Old English rounded vowel (y) and its unrounding (i).112

In Early Middle Dutch, <u> is attested in all regions.113 Unrounded <e> only occurs in western Holland, <i> in Holland, Zealand, and part of the Flemish forms. Mooijaart (1992: 107–8 and maps 17+18) finds a proportional difference between

---

110. The forms *ber* ‘well’, *berste* ‘breast’, *sperte* ‘bar’, *sterte* ‘throat’, *versch* ‘frog’, *verst* ‘frost’, *vert* ‘rotten’ cannot be used as they arose from the regular metathesis of rV to Vr before dental consonants. The vowel in such sequences often displays a- and e-reflexes even without mutation factor; cf. van Loon 2014: 228–30.

111. Proto-Germanic *brugjō-* arose from a contamination of nom.sg. *brugi* < PGm. *bruwī* and oblique *bruwjō-* (Kroonen 2011), cf. ON *brú* ‘bridge’ < *brúwō*.

112. See Miedema 1979 for the English and Frisian evidence for unrounding to brigge, bregge.

113. Berteloot 1984a, Map 49.
brugge as an appellative (56% unrounding in East Flanders) as against an element in place-names (only 21% unrounded forms in East Flanders). For both usages, East Flanders has a higher number of unrounded forms than West Flanders, and the city of Bruges hardly ever shows unrounding. I agree with Mooijaart that the latter fact must be ascribed to conservative spelling in charters and maybe to the influence of the Latin and Old French spelling of the name of Bruges.

The final schwa of ‘bridge’ is retained in all forms in the thirteenth century, with two exceptions. An apocopated form appears in the name Brigdamme (Zealand, 1292), Bricdamme (Hol., 1291), on the island of Walcheren. The diminutive is attested in Ghent in ant bruxkin ‘at the little bridge’ (1300, CG 2453) and an tolne brichkin bider oestbrighen, ‘at the little toll bridge by the main bridge’ (1300, CG 2454). These represent two competing diminutives in *-kin. Bruxkin /brøkskin/ has the productive insertion of s between the stem-final velar and the suffix, whereas brichkin /brɪxkin/ has -kin suffixed directly to unrounded brigh-. Syncope of internal schwa in trisyllabic *bröggekin and *brigggekin is unremarkable in the thirteenth century, so that these forms do not contradict the evidence of the simplex.

The presence of i in Flanders and Zealand versus e in Holland is confirmed by the later stages of Dutch. In the corpora of CRM14 and MNW, brig(h)e is found in medieval accounts and law texts from the towns of Heinkenszand (in Zealand, 1312), Middelburg (1364/65), Dordrecht (1371, 1399), Zierikzee and Den Briel (on the island of Voorne, South Holland). The variant breg(ge) is frequent in Hollandish and Zealandish charters from the Late Middle Ages (see MNW and Heeroma 1935: 12), e.g., Alkmaar bregge, Haarlem bregghe (1493), Leiden bregghe (throughout the 14th c.), Rotterdam breggelt ‘bridge toll’, bregmester ‘bridge master’ (1408–14), and Schiedam bregge. In the seventeenth century, Huygens uses bregge (pl. breggens) in his Korenbloemen. In toponyms, we have die Horenbregghe near Den Haag, and Terbregghe near Rotterdam (1524).

In modern dialects, unrounded brigge, bregge is restricted in Flanders to the westernmost dialects of French Flanders (Verstegen 1943: 303, Ryckeboer 1977: 66, 1979: 141). In mid-twentieth century Zealand, brigge only occurred on the former island of Schouwen (WZD 140). A single occurrence of brig ‘little wooden bridge’ is given for Ouddorp on Goeree (Verstegen 1943: 303). For northern South Holland, Heeroma 1935 notes bregge in the coastal villages of Scheveningen, Katwijk and Noordwijk, and breg or brèèg in North Holland. The GTRP data still show breg in large parts of North Holland (FAND Map 117).

Family names confirm the geographic picture seen so far. In all regions, <u> prevails: Bruggeman (Flanders, Overijssel, Goedereede), Brugman (pas-sim), Brug(ge)mans (Brabant, Limburg), Bruggink (eastern Dutch), Van de(r/n) Brug (northern Dutch), Verbrugg(h)e (Flanders), Van der Bruggen, Verbruggen (Brabant). Unrounded forms characterize the coastal areas. The surnames
Vanderbrigghe and Verbrigghe are mainly found in southern West Flanders. In Holland, Briggeman, sometimes Breggeman, is concentrated on the South Holland island of Voorne. The syncopated variant Bregman is found in larger concentrations in several different municipalities, viz. Rijnwoude (east of Leiden), Zevenhuizen (north of Rotterdam), Drechtland and Beemster (both in North Holland). The name Van der Breggen is found in South Holland. Thus, we again roughly find brig- in the southern coastal dialects but breg- in Holland.

2. Dubbel, a hydronym in South Holland on the Island of Dordrecht. Probably, the river represented a delta stream which emptied into the Old Meuse near Dordrecht. The etymology is uncertain. The name occurs as ODu. Duble in two documents from 1064 (copy middle 12th c.) and 1101, and in the place-name Duplamonde (1105) ‘Mouth of the Dupla’. If <p> is original, the voicing found in the other attestations remains unexplained. It seems more likely that <b> is old. Formally, the name could represent a diminutive of WGM. *dubbo/an-, found as Early MDu. dobbe (hydronym near Leiden, 1280–87) ‘stagnant water, pool, low-lying land’, see EWN s.v. dobbe. Yet the river Dubbel – as it is reconstructed by historical geographers – seems to have been a natural and sinuous stream, which does not match the meaning of dobbe. Maybe the river was derived from the verb PGM. *duppōn-, *dubbōn- ‘to dip’ as reconstructed by Kroonen (2013: 109–10), whence MDu. dubben ‘to submerge; dig out’; compare also PGM. *dūban- ‘to dive’ (ON dúfa, OE dūfan ‘to dive’, MLG bedūven ‘to become overwhelmed’). If so, the river may have been called ‘the one that submerges’, viz. by frequently flooding the land.

In the thirteenth century, we find the name with <u> in ter Dubbelen ward ‘towards the Dubbel’ (Dordrecht, 1281–82) and with unrounding to <i> in the local surname Clays vander dibble (Dordrecht, 1285–86).

Attestations of Dubbelmonde and Dubbeldam from 1200 to 1421, the year when the village and the Grote Waard area in which it was situated were inundated during the notorious Saint-Elizabeth’s flood, have been collected by ’t Jong & Dorst 2009: 51–71. A Latin text from 1227 mentions Sigerus de Dublemunde, another one from 1274–75 writes Dubbelmonde. The latter form is the usual one in Middle Dutch texts from the fourteenth century. Unrounded Dibbelmonde appears in a text of 1304, and a curious form Dubbelinde once in a count’s charter of 1313. After 1350, the name Dubbelmonde disappears from the sources.114

As to the name in -dam, it is first attested in a 1310 charter where Dubbeldam is an appellative: al onse visscherie van Wolbrandskerke toten Dubbeldamme ‘all our fishing grounds from Wolbrandchurch to the dam in the Dubbel’. In 1318 there is another attestation with the definite article, but in 1359, in ambocht

114. With the exception of one document from 1390 issued by the duke Albrecht.
van Dubbeldam, the appellative has lost the article and has become a name. When the inundated area was reclaimed around 1560, the area southeast of Dordrecht was named Dubbeldam in recognition of the former settlement. We occasionally find unrounding to Dibbeldam in marriage records and local wills from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The chronology of the attestations confirms what we could suspect on extra-linguistic grounds, viz. that Dubbeldam is the later name, which was coined when the river Dubbel was dammed in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century. Logically, the name Dubbelmonde then lost its relation to reality and disappeared from usage.

Unrounding is attested for all three names, first in 1285 for the river name itself. The Old Dutch suffix vowel a in Duplamonde suggests that the name did not contain an i-mutation factor. Such a trigger could only have been suffixal *j, but a noun *dubljō- is unlikely to have existed because of the unusual suffix combination. Hence, I suppose that the hydronym originally had a back vowel which was fronted in Hollandish like other words with unmutated *u and *o. It was then unrounded in local speech. However, a preform *dubbilō/ an- with early syncope of the posttonic vowel cannot be excluded. In that case, i-mutation would be expected, unless the word was an inner-Dutch derivative of unmutated *dubbō/an-.


Early Middle Dutch has dunne and the derivatives dunleke ‘thinly’, dunheit ‘thinness’ in Brabant, Limburg and the Lower Rhine area. The verb ‘to thin’ is spelled donn in Glossarium Bernense (Limburg, 1240), probably for /dönn-/. In Holland, there is only one attestation of the adjective, viz. dinne, whereas in Flanders all 46 tokens have unrounded dinne. In Late Middle Dutch, dinne is general in Flanders and also occurs with some (western) Brabantish authors, such as Lodewijk van Velthem and Anna Bijns (MNW). In Modern Dutch literary texts, din- is restricted to Flanders and Zealand (WNT). Kiliaan (1599), though from western Brabant, makes no mention of a variant din(ne).

In modern Flemish, denne or dinne is restricted to French Flanders and the larger part of West Flanders, with the exception of its southeastern corner (Verstegen 1943: 302 and Map 4, Taeldeman 1982: 294, FAND I, Map 121). Dinne also occurs in Zealand on Walcheren and South Beveland, and in Ouddorp on Goedereede (GRTP database). Strikingly, Zeeuws Flanders does not have unrounding. Note that Zealandish also has donne (WZD), for which see § 15.3.2, B.7 on deun, doon ‘tight, close’.

4. dunken, denken ‘to seem, appear; believe’ < PGm. *þunkjan- (OFri. thinza, OE þyncan, OS thunkian, OHG dunken; ON þykkja, Got. þugkjan).
The verb mainly appears in the infinitive and the third person singular. The
i-mutation factor was limited to the present tense. In Old Dutch, an unrounded
form thikket is found once in the Leiden Willeram (ca. 1100), as against thunket
three times in the same paragraph of the same text. Sanders (1974: 248, 307)
regards this as one of the cases in which the copyist of the Leiden Willeram first
introduced his own native form (here unrounded thikket) and then reverted to
more slavishly copying his model (which had High German thunket). In the
thirteenth century, Brabant and Limburg have <u> in all instances, but Zealand
and Flanders only use <i>. The verb has thereby merged with denken ‘to think’,
which is here often realized as dinken (Mooijaart 1992: 108 and Map 19). In
Holland, dinken and dinket (both occurring once) and denket (three instances)
are found beside a majority of u-forms. Rounded donk- occurs several times in
Holland and Utrecht in the Middle Ages. The distinction between unrounding
throughout in Flanders and the retention of u in Holland is preserved in Late
Middle and Modern Dutch (see WNT). Because of the merger with denken, the
forms in dink- cannot be used as evidence for unrounding in western Dutch.

5. grupper, greppe and gruppel, greppel ‘trench, ditch’ < *grupjō- f. and *gruppilō- f.
(MLG grupp ‘gutter’).

The jō-stem is attested with e and i-vocalism in Late MDu. greppe and
gripppe in Flanders, and as grep, grip in Holland in the seventeenth century. In
modern dialects we find grep(he), grip(he) in Flanders and Zealand (WVD,
WZD). Since Middle Low German only has gruppe, the u of which is confirmed
by grubbe < *grubjō-, it seems likely that western greppe and grippe are due
to unrounding. The l-diminutive is attested in gruppele ‘trench(es)’ in 1245
(Slicher van Bath 1948: 52), much later in unrounded grippel (1578; Zealand/
Holland, WNT s.v. afdelven), greppel, and later still, in the 19th c., as gruppel.
Modern dialects of Zealand and Flanders have greppel, grippe.

The noun grebbe ‘trench, ditch’ probably represents *grubjō- and is there-fore irrelevant for the present question. Old Dutch gribba ‘trench, ditch’, attested
twice in North Holland in the twelfth century (Fontes Egmundenses, 1105–20),
may either be identical with grebbe (in which case the vowel i is surprising), or
it is an unrounded variant of *grubjō-, the source of grub(b) ‘trench’ which is
mentioned by Kiliaan and found in eastern Dutch.

6. hul, hil ‘hill’ < WGM. *xulli- m. (MLG hull, MoWF hel, OE hyll, ME hulle, hil)
< PGm. *xulli- (Kroonen 2013: xxxv).

The word is well attested in Old Dutch toponyms. The western ones show unrounding: Wadhil (county of Thérouanne, 1066), de Hillo (northern
France, ca. 1120), Hil (1169, copy ca. 1275), de Hilla (WFla., ca. 1120), Hil, pl.

115. See Miedema 1979 for the English and Frisian evidence for unrounding to hil(l), hel(l).
The Dawn of Dutch

*Hils* (WFla., 1177), *Collaertshille* (WFla., 1149), *Wolfs hil* = *Wuluishil* (Zealand, 1188, 1195–96). The easternmost unrounded form is *Hyllé* (1159), *Hille* (1164, 1186) ‘Hil’ in the province of Antwerp, near Turnhout. Three field names in Gelderland have <u>, viz. *Hulle* and the plurals *Grodenhullen* and *Curtehullen* (all in the village of Gent in Guelders, 1200).

Map 15. *Vanhille* in Belgium

Between 1200 and 1300, the toponym is only attested in coastal dialects. West Flanders and Zealand have only *hil(le)*, Bruges also spells *(h)yl*, as do the (northern-erwestern) East Flemish towns of Maldegem and Evergem. A toponym *coit hil* is situated near Oudenaarde in the southwest of East Flanders. Also in Oudenaerde, ‘hill-pit’ is attested once as *hilleputte* (1272–91) and once as *helleputte* (1291). East Flanders and the West Flemish town of Kortrijk have *hul(le)*. 116 In all of Flanders, the nom.acc.sg. has usually lost final -e, witness *die hyl, die hil, brame*

---

116. Compare Marynissen 1995: 195. Zevergem and Dordrecht in addition show a shift of gender to the feminine: *van dere hulle, van ere hulle*. The reality of this shift is confirmed by the surname *van der Hulle*, concentrated on the Zealandish island of Schouwen-Duiveland.
hil, hul, camackers hul, jeghen den hul, etc. Endingless forms have also entered the dative singular: up eenen ul, up ten hil. Forms in -e are either dative singular or nominative/accusative plurals: ten hille, van den hille, te padden hille, van stalhille, toete hulle, van den hulle, pl. die ulle. The alternative plural hils with its Flemish, productive s-plural (cf. Marynissen 1995: 216) is found in toponyms. It too presupposes apocope to hil in the singular. The forms in the literary text of van Maerlant’s Rijmbijbel also show e-apocope in the singular (dat.sg. up eenen ul) or are compatible with it (nom. and acc.pl. ulle); but the text does not have the West Flemish i-vocalism. An attestation from South Holland has up den sant hil ‘on the Sand Hill’ (Monster, 1298–99).

Map 16. Vanhulle in Belgium

In Late Middle and Early Modern Dutch, hil, pl. hille(n) is the usual form found in Flanders, Zeeland and Holland. Kiliaan only mentions hille, hil, and on one occasion calls it antiquated. The lexeme has been replaced by heuvel

117. A possible exception occurs in a Bruges text from 1283: boesthalf an een stic lands heet die hille ‘east of a piece of land called die hille’. But die hille may also be plural.
in the standard language but *hil* survives in toponyms, as in various names in Westland (south of The Hague), *Piershil* ‘Peter’s hill’ in Hoekse Waard (1514 *Piershille*), *de Witte Hul* near Hilversum, and *Piershil, Ruigenhil, Hooghullen, de Vrakhil* on Walcheren. The word also occurs in several family names. Compare maps 15 to 18 of the names *Vanhille, Vanhulle* (both concentrated in West Flanders; situation in 1998), *van den Hil* (southern South Holland, situation in 2005) and *van den Hul* (Gelderland, Overijssel, situation in 2005).

According to WVD I.1: 37–8, *(h)il, (h)ul* is still used for an elevation in a field in northern West Flanders and *passim* in East Flanders, but the dictionary does not give the distribution of the vocalism. Verstegen (1943: 303) mentions unrounded variants in Oostende, De Panne and Wingene in West Flanders.

Map 17. *Van den Hil* in the Netherlands
7. *kruk, krik* ‘crutch, doorknob’, orig. ‘piece of wood with a crossbar’, ‘support’ < PGm. *krukjō- ‘staff with a curve’ f. (OS krukka, OHG krucka, MoHG Krücke, OE cryc, crycc; OSwe. krukkia).

The crutch used to be a symbol of authority, hence the oldest attestations involve names for officials: ODu. cricwardre ‘crutch-warden’ (abl.sg. in Latin context; Bruges, 1193), Early MDu. cric-houdere ‘crutch-holder’ = ‘sheriff’ in Bruges and its direct surroundings. The name crickeman ‘Krikkeman’ (WFla., 1294) retains internal schwa. The simplex cricke f. appears once in the West Flemish Rijmbijbel (1285) and as the surname of Colijn Cric(k) (Dordrecht, 1286–87). In later medieval texts, cricke is usual for Flanders and crucke for Brabant. In North Holland, kreckstoel ‘chair without back rest’ is found (Egmond, 1485; Boekenoogen 2004: 270). Kiliaan (1599) refers under krick, kriecke to krucke, which appears to have been the normal word for him. The
unrounded front vowels cited by Kiliaan may be from unrounding dialects in Brabant or East Flanders, since we also find *cruycke* ‘crutch’ with a long vowel (in Antwerps Liedboeck), of which *kriecke* would be the unrounded counterpart.

In Modern Dutch, *krik(ke)* is still found in dialects of Flanders (Taeldeman 1979: 58). Verstegen 1943: 304 mentions Oostende, Kanegem, Marke and Beigem as places which have unrounding. They might point to an erstwhile larger unrounding area. *Krik(ke)* also occurs in Zealand, on the islands of South Holland and in Vlaardingen, Scheveningen and Katwijk (Heeroma 1935: 35–72). *Krek* is the traditional word in North Holland (Boekenoogen 2004: 270, Heeroma 1935).

8. *kunne, kinne* ‘gender, generation’ < PGm. *kunja-*. (OS kunni, MLG künne, OHG kunni, OFri. kënn, OE cynn, MoE kin, ON kyn, Goth. kuni ‘ancestors, kin’).

ODu. *cunni* (WPs.) ‘kin’, generation’ has the inherited neuter gender. Its paradigm would have yielded *i*-mutation regularly in all case forms, but in Middle Dutch, we find *kunne* (Limburg, 1240; Lower Rhine, 1250; probably with /ü/1) next to *konne* with /õ/ (WBrab., 1265–70). The o-vocalism is ascribed by EWN to analogy with the verb *connen* ‘to be able’ which seems plausible enough. The usual post-1300 forms of ‘kin’ are *konne* (mainly in western dialects) and *kunne* (in all dialects, including the eastern ones where it presupposes *i*-mutation of *u*). The noun has acquired feminine gender because of the ending -e. Kiliaan calls both *konne* and *kunne* antiquated, and in the seventeenth century *konne* has disappeared from the literary language. Unrounded variants are very rare: they can be found in the expression *kint ende kinne* ‘child and kin’ (MNW) which survives in West Flemish *kin noch ken* ‘neither kith nor kin’ (de Bo 1892: 448).

9. **-melde, moude**

The place *UUarmelde* in the Utrecht Register of Goods (918–48 copy end of 11th c.) is interpreted as the earliest attestation of the place which is later called *Warmunde* (1063 copy beginning 12th c.), *Warmund* (1201) and *Warmond*, *Wermond* (from the 13th c.), viz. Warmond to the north of Leiden. Gysseling (apud Foerste 1959) and Foerste (1959: 140–4) interpret *Warmelde* as containing an unrounded form of WGm. *muldjō-* ‘oblong vessel; dip in the dunes’. The variant *muldō-*, without mutation factor is more original within Germanic, and is reflected in MDu. *moude* ‘trough, vessel; skull’, MoDu. *mou(we)* (in toponyms, cf. Boekenoogen 2004: 337), MHG *mulde*, MLG *molde*, *moll*, MoE *mould* ‘id.’, ON *-moldi* ‘hill’ (*-muldan-).* Old Frisian has *i*-mutation in *meldke* ‘skull’.

The meaning ‘dip in the dunes’ derives from metaphoric usage of *muld(j)ō-* as ‘low-lying piece of land’ and is confirmed by dialectal *moele* ‘low-lying, wet or marshy plot of land; hollow or depression in a field or meadow’ in southeast
Flanders (WVD). A parallel semantic shift can be observed for the lexeme *trog ‘trough’, used both as ‘trough’ and as ‘low-lying piece of land’ throughout southern Flanders (WVD). Foerste explains the replacement of *melde by *munde in Warmond from a conscious renaming, and identifies the replacing lexeme as PGm. *mundu- ‘protection; protected low-lying area’. This replacement may have happened in the process of franconization of the Rhine delta in South Holland in the eleventh century. Foerste (p. 140) also argues that the same Franconian suffix may have been used in the toponym Hoymunde (1216) ‘Heimond’ near Naaldwijk in the dunes of South Holland. Near Dunkirk in French Flanders, a toponym Hoymilla (1067 copy 1294), Hoymila (1183 copy 1369) ‘Hooimille’ is attested, which Gysseling explains as containing an assimilated form of *muldjō-. For an explanation of the first member Hoy-, see § 12.2.4.

10. mug, mig, meg ‘mosquito, midge’ < WGm. *muggjō- (OS muggia, OHG mucka, MoHG Mücke, MoWF mich, OE mycg(e)) from PGm. *muwi, *muwjō-, cf. MoSwe. mygg(a), ON my. For the rise of g, see Kroonen 2011.

Old Dutch only has the name Walterus Muggo. The simplex MDu. mugge, MoDu. mug is attested from the second half of the fourteenth century. Unrounded forms were usual in traditional dialects of North Holland (mig, Boekenoogen 2004: 337, Heeroma 1935: 35–72). In the late twentieth century, according to the GTRP database, mig was still alive in West Friesland. Heeroma (1935) did not find unrounded variants in South Holland, nor are unrounded variants attested in modern dialects of Zealand or Flanders.118 Most of the traditional dialects south of the Old Rhine retain final -e in mugge, muhhe, mogge. In large parts of Flanders and West Brabant, a variant with a sibilant, such as meuzie, is used for ‘midge’ (see § 15.1.3). The absence of unrounded forms in the south as opposed to North Holland, together with the presence of the heteronym meuzie in Flanders, suggest that mugge was more recently imported into Flemish.

11. munt ‘coin’, a loanword from Lat. monēta as WGm. *munitō- (OS munita, OHG muniz, munizza, OFri. mente, menote, menete, munte, OE mynet, MoE mint).

The feminine noun is attested once in Old Dutch as *muniton (Prudentius glosses, 950–1000), and in Middle Dutch generally as mu(e)nte or mo(e)nte, including in Flanders. A single, apparently unrounded instance mienten pl. is found in a document from Mechelen (WBrab.) from 1297. Since all other West Brabantish documents of the thirteenth century, including those from Mechelen, spell <u>, the hapax mienten cannot be regarded as an indication

118. Except, of course, in dialects which have systematic unrounding anyway, cf. Taeldeman 1979: 58 for Flanders.
for a larger unrounding area. Still, unrounded *dinne* and *stik* are also found in western Brabant, and *pit for put* in the name *Jan van Coelpitte* is also from Mechelen (Berteloot 1984a: 63). In modern dialects, sporadic unrounding of the vowel in ‘coin’ to /æ/ is found in French and West Flanders (GTRP database). Whether this unrounding is old is hard to say; it could be due to labial dissimilation after *m*.

12. *put, pit* ‘pit, well’ < WGm. *puttja-* m. (OS *putti*, OHG *pfuzzi*, pfuzzu, MoHG *Pfütze* ‘pool, puddle’, OFri. *pett*, OE *pytt* ‘hole, pit’), a loanword from Lat. *puteus*. ODu. *pute* is attested in the Wachtendonck Psalter. Furthermore, the noun features in a number of toponyms, such as *Putheim* (855 copy 891–910), *Putten* ‘Putten’ in Guelders, *Putthem* ‘Pittem’ (WFla., 1145) and *Stemput* ‘Estaimpuis’ (Hainaut, 1112 copy end 12th c.). Along the coast, these toponyms often have unrounding: *Pichen* (1139), *Pihem* (1192 copy ca. 1215) ‘Pihem’ (near Saint-Omer, France), *Grinberti Pit* ‘Grimberghespit’ (1139), *Colpith* (1186 copy 1775) ‘Colpith’ (near Saint-Omer), *Rorikspit* (NHol., 1091–1100 copy 1191–1210). The town of Petten in North Holland has no unrounding in the oldest attestation *Pathem* if this stands for *Puthem* (918–48 copy end 11th c.). But <e> shows up in most of the subsequent forms: *Petheim* (1001–50), *Pethem*, and modern *Petten*.

For the Early Middle Dutch distribution of *i* versus *u*, see Berteloot 1984a, Map 50. The simplex *put* and the verb *putten* ‘to pit’ have <u> in all central and eastern dialects, and also in the south of East Flanders (Oudenaerde, Velzeke). Ghent has mostly *i* but also *u*, and in Holland, we also find both *pit* and *putte*. The island of Putten in South Holland always has *u*. The vowel distribution is the same for derivatives (e.g. *clempittere* ‘who digs a clay pit’) and compounds (*clempu/itte* ‘clay pit’, etc.). The only real exception is *Jan van Coelpitte* in a document from Mechelen (WBrab., 1276–1300; CG p. 2866), see above on *minten* for *munten* in Mechelen. Berteloot 1984a notes that it was the same scribe nr. 37 which wrote *i* beside usual *u*.

As for the inflexion, the nom.acc.sg. is generally apocopated *pit* in Maerlant’s *Rijmbijbel* as well as in charters from Bruges. Similarly there is an acc.sg. *pit* in a Hollandish document from Haastrecht (1289, *ghebracht in haren pit* ‘brought in her pit’). The forms *pitte* and *pitten* are dative singular or plural forms. The nom.pl. *pits* is once attested in *potters pits* ‘potter’s pits’ (Bruges, 1285); compare the plurals *hils* ‘hills’ and *stiks* ‘pieces’. In contrast, unapocopated *putte* in Brabant and Limburg is also used for the nominative and accusative singular. In compounds, as in simplexes, the usual form for the nom.acc.sg. is *pit*: *den groedepit* (Ghent, 1280–81), *oest pit* (Maldegem, 1294–1300). Unapocopated *pitte* does occur in a nominative/accusative context in names, though an interpretation as a plural is sometimes possible: *i.*
tic merschs dat heet cleenpitte ‘one piece of moorland called cleenpitte’ (Ghent, 1280), die steenpitte (Bruges, 1284).

Kiliaan (1599) mentions pette and pet as Hollandish variants and pit for Flanders. This distribution of unrounding is confirmed by later sources. Heeroma (1935: 35–72) found pet throughout North and South Holland. The GRTP database has pit next to pet on the islands of South Holland and Zealand and pet in French Flanders and West Flanders; see FAND Map 112. For Flanders see also Verstegen 1943: 302 + Map 3, showing that pit is typical of French Flanders and most of West Flanders except its southeastern corner. The same distribution of i versus e is found for dun and rug.

13. rug, rig, reg ‘back, ridge’ < PGM. *xrugja- m. (OS hruggi, OHG hrukki, rucki, MoHG Rücken, OFri. hreg, MoWF rêch, rich, OE hrycg, MoE ridge; ON hryggr). The noun appears in the Wachtendonck Psalter as rugki (nom.sg.), ruggi (dat. sg.) and rugis (gen.sg.). The toponym Kromb-rugge ‘curved ridge’ (near Merelbeke, East Flanders) appears with unrounding in some of its forms: Crumbrigga (988 falsum ca. 1000), Crumbricga (1026–50), Crumbrigham (966 falsum 990–1035), Crumbrigga (977).

In Early Middle Dutch, the same place appears in the dative van crumbrigge in a document from Ghent (1298) and van crombrugghe in Oudenaerde (1291). The simplex is attested thirty-five times in Early Middle Dutch, mostly in literary sources. Texts from Brabant, Limburg and the Cleves/Guelders area have rucge, rugghe, as does the one attestation from Ghent. In West Flanders, Bruges has only ric / -k/, also in the adverbial expression over ric ‘to the back’. The remaining West Flemish attestations come from Der Natuere Bloeme and Rijmbijbel, which have both ric (once rije), rigge and ruc, rug(ge). The participle ‘backed’ is attested twice in Maerlant’s Der Natuere Bloeme D (WFla., 1287) as gherigghet and yrurgt.

As to apocope of -e, the forms ric, rieg, rije and rig are found as nom.sg., dat.sg., and acc.sg. in Maerlant’s texts, while rigge is dat.sg. or dat.pl. and acc.sg. The same texts have gen.sg. rux / röks/, dat.sg. ruc / rök/ but also rugg(h)e. Two more compounds of Maerlant’s are rigbeen ‘backbone’ and riglanghe ‘backward’. Thus, it appears that the original form in West Flemish, and maybe also in East Flemish, was *rigge, with a geminate velar plosive. It had already been apocopated to nom.acc.sg. rik in the thirteenth century. The variants with u in van Maerlant’s literary works must then stem from more eastern dialects, or from a more recent layer of the language.

In Late Middle Dutch, rec is attested for ‘back’ in Haarlem (Keurboeken), regge in the Cartularium from Egmond (fifteenth century; Boekenoogen 2004: 437), and rig in Brielle (Heeroma 1935: 12). Ric(k) is normal for Flanders.

The distribution of variants in modern dialects is given by TNZN, map 4.3, and
ANKO I: 78–80; see also Heeroma 1935: 35–72 for Holland, and Verstegen 1943: 302 + Map 5 for Flanders. Rek (in French Flanders) and rik prevail in the southern coastal dialects, which here include French Flanders, most of West Flanders, the west of Zeeuws Vlaanderen, and all of the remaining Zeeland and the islands of South Holland. Regge in Terhei, Scheveningen, Katwijk, Noordwijk and Aalsmeer forms the connection to North Holland which has reg.¹¹⁹ Rugge (in Flanders) and rug (elsewhere) are the main rounded variants to the east of the coastal dialects.

14. schutte, -skitte, schette ‘barrier’ < *skutjō- (MoWFri. sket ‘fence’).

A water mill near Ghent is called Clapeskitte ‘clap-barrier’ in 1162 (copy 12th c.). This may contain an unrounded variant -skitte of MDu. (water)schutter. ‘shutting off, barrier, dam’ (Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 52). In 1298, the toponym scittingh(e)werf occurs in three documents from Bruges; schitting is probably the unrounded variant of schutting ‘fence’ or ‘lockage’. No other unrounded instances are found in literary Dutch. Modern West Flemish schette ‘slat, strip of wood for making a fence or a barrier’ (de Bo 1892: 857, MNW s.v. schet; not mentioned in WZD) could represent the unrounded, coastal Dutch reflex of *skutjō-, and is thus interpreted by Vercouillie 1925: 301. As ‘hurdle of the stable door’, schet(te) is virtually restricted to West Flanders, cf. WVD I.2: 372–3 with map. The vowel e instead of i is surprising but can be explained from the (West) Flemish tendency to lower short i before many consonants (Taeldeman 1979: 57). Compare, for instance, the surnames Desmidt and Desmedt ‘Smith’ (De Smit and De Smet would yield a similar picture):

15. stuk, stik ‘piece’ < PGM. *stukja- n. (OS stkki, MLG stücke, OHG stucki, MoHG Stück, MoWF stik, OE styce, MoE stich; ON stykki).

The unrounded reflex stic is attested four times in field names from West Flanders in the twelfth century: Dilentstic (1162 copy ca. 1225), Gerlentstic (1177), and two others (see ONW). Dozens of other field names follow in the thirteenth century, all with stic and all from Bruges or adjacent towns such as Maldegem (VMNW). The simplex is attested nearly 2000 times in Early Middle Dutch – half of those tokens in Bruges. Unrounded forms are the rule in all of West and East Flanders, Zealand (though Zierikzee has u more often than i), and Holland (here u-forms also occur). Furthermore, stick is also found in Utrecht (once) and in the west of Brabant, in particular, in Mechelen, Willebroek and Antwerp. Compare

¹¹⁹ Note that fricativization of intervocalic gg apparently postdates e-apocope in Flemish, but predates it in North Holland. The apocope phenomena are not the same, however: in Flanders, -e was only lost in words of the type rik, pit etc. here discussed, while all other words retain final schwa (see Taeldeman 1979). In Holland, final schwa was regularly lost, and in North Holland this happened before intervocalic d was syncopated.

The usual inflexion in Flanders and Holland is NOM.ACC.SG. stic, DAT.SG. sticke, NOM.PL. sticke, ACC.PL. sticke(n), DAT.PL. sticken. The NOM.PL. also occurs as stics, sticx, stix (Bruges), and the NOM.PL. as sticker (Bruges, 1294). These endings were added to the singular stick after apocope of -e, providing the noun with the productive Flemish plural in -s (Marynissen 1995: 239–42; see also s.v. hil and pit above for other nouns taking this ending) or with the neuter plural ending -er. Exceptions without apocope are rare: NOM.ACC.SG. een sticke lands (Bruges, 1291), Solin raet emit contra henrico de art. i. sticke lande in sloterhege ‘Solin Raad bought from Henrik van der Aard one piece of land in Sloterhege’ (Ghent, 1224–27). The latter attestation is more than half a century older than most of the others. The dative singular is endingless in van enen stic houds ‘of a piece of wood’ (1286, Dordrecht) as against an enen sticke ‘in one go’, van enen sticke lynen ‘of a piece of linnen’ also in Dordrecht. Does van enen stic have apocope before the following vowel in [h]ouds? Among the u-dialects, apocope is not unknown in the southeast: en stuk vlesg ‘a piece of meat’ (Moraalboek, Cleves/Guelders, 1270–90), dat stuc lants (Limb., 1280–90). Yet the usual flexion in the thirteenth century is still NOM.ACC.DAT.SG. stucke, NOM.ACC.PL. stucke(n), DAT.PL. stucken. Boekenoogen (2004: 518) mention a NOM.ACC. form sticke for North Holland, and Heeroma finds medieval sticke(n) in Hoorn, Edam, Amsterdam, Haarlem, Leiden, Schiedam, Dordrecht, Middelburg, and in Steenbergen in western North Brabant.

Kiliaan (1599) knows stick as a Flemish and Hollandish variant of stuck. In literary texts from Flanders and Holland until the seventeenth century, stick is still found. In modern dialects, stik, stek occurs in all of North Holland (Boekenoogen 2004: 518, GTRP) and in conservative dialects of South Holland (Heeroma 1935: 35–72, GTRP). In Zealandish and in Flemish, stek, stik is still the normal form in the twentieth century, see WZD 938, Verstegen 1943: 300 + Map 1, and the GTRP database (FAND Map 116).


In Middle and Modern Dutch, tocht is realized with a back vowel o or its dialectal fronting u, on which see § 15.2. Generally, tocht(e) is also found in the coastal dialects. In the modern language, a semantic differentiation arose between tocht ‘journey, draught’ and tucht ‘discipline’, the latter with a moral and religious connotation.

The only unrounded variant that occurs is the noun ticht ‘current which can sometimes be observed at open sea’ (WNT), which must be a semantic
specialization of tocht, tucht ‘draught’. WNT gives only two attestations: from Nicolaas Witsen’s Scheepsbouw (Amsterdam, 1671) and from Johannes de Laet’s Historie ofte iaerlijck verhael van de verrichtinghen der geoctroyeerde West-Indische Compagnie (Leiden, 1644). This would point to the dialect of Holland, but of course the lexeme may have existed in Zealand or Flanders and disappeared later on.

17. unsel, ensel, unster, enster, etc. ‘steelyard’ (MLG unsel, unseler, unsener, MHG unzer, MoWF ingster) < Late ODu. *ünser < Latin *unciale and Late ODu. *ünser < Latin *uncius. For the basis, compare Du. ons ‘ounce’ from Lat. uncia with Romance palatalization of Latin c.

The oldest attestation is einser in a Bruges document from 1281/82. It can have ei- < e- before nC, pointing to *enser with unrounding of *ü. Modern Dutch shows a wide array of variants, collected in WNT s.v. einsel, unsel and unster. The form unster has arisen in the oblique cases *unsr- of unser. Kiliaan (1599) already mentions a number of unrounded variants of the word. He terms enster, ensser, entster, unster Frisian forms for unsel ‘scales’. He regards aeyssel and eydsel as Flemish for unsel, and onghsel as another variant for unsel. Furthermore, Kiliaan gives unster, unser, unssel, and enssel as four words for ‘bending scales’, and Wssel (prob. *uussel) is glossed as unsel. Thus, unsel seems to have been the least marked form to Kiliaan. If eydsel is a mistake for *eynsel, of which aeyssel could render another variant pronunciation, this would be an unrounded variant of StDu. unster which is also found in modern dialects. Thus, the oldest forms which the pre-1600 evidence allow us to reconstruct are Late ODu. *ünser and *ünssel.

Both of them also suffice to explain the modern dialectal forms. There is no unrounding in North Holland: onzer, onster, earlier also onsel (Boekenoogen 2004: 357). A front rounded vowel occurs in Zealand proper (mostly ulster, but unsel in Zuid-Beveland, Land van Axel, Land van Waas), but unrounded forms are found in Zeeuws Flanders: ingsel (western ZVla.), essele (Westdorpe), and uisel (Land van Hulst) (WZD 1010). West Flemish has ensel, einsel, insel (de Bo 1892: 267). The rounded diphthong in uister (West Brab.) and uisel (Antw.) may be due to rounding of earlier ei and hence be equated with “ui₂” (see § 19.5). Note that the simplex ons ‘ounce’ has no unrounding, so in theory the rounded vowel could have been restored in u/onsel any time.

18. vrucht, vrecht ‘fright’ < *furxti- (OS forhta, MLG vruchte, OHG for(a)hta, MoHG Furcht, OFri. fruchte, OE fyrtu, fryhto, Goth. faurhtei).

Du. vrucht(e) ‘fear’, vruchten ‘to fear’ and their derivatives nearly always have <o> or <u> in all periods. Two exceptions are mentioned by MNW: (1) Vrecht is certified by the rhyme with knecht in the text Van den seven vroeden van binnen
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Rome, line 909–10 in the edition Stallaert 1889: Hi ne hief thovet op ende sach den knecht / Die vrese hadde ende vrecht ‘He [sc. the boar] did not lift up his head nor see the lad / who was in fear and fright’. The text is characterized as Brabantish by De Neef 1897: 5, though we must note some Flemish features such as stik and pit. De Neef (p. 16) considers that vrecht either shows i-mutation plus unrounding, or scribal perseveration of vre- from the preceding word and synonym vrese.

(2) The adjective vrechtig in Die Rose by Heinric van Aken, line 2133, occurs in ms. B as a variant of warachtig. It is generally assumed that Heinric wrote in Brabantish dialect, and for Die Rose the investigation of Coun (1994: 210–15) confirms that the original text probably fit the dialect of South Brabant much better than that of Flanders. Still, Coun also notes that (the copyists of) the mss. A and B have sometimes introduced more westerly (= Flemish) features, such as bat for bet. Thus, though neither vrecht nor vrechtig are sure cases of early unrounding of *ü, they could be just that.

19. wens ‘wish’ < *wunska- (MLG wunsch, OHG wunc, OE wůsc, ON ósk), wensen ‘to wish’ < *wunskjan- (OHG wunsken, MoHG wünschen, OE wûscan, ON ýskja).

The noun is attested as wensch in Early Middle Dutch in Flanders and Brabant and once as winsch in Cleves/Guelders. The verb appears as wenschen in West Brabant, but a derived frequentative wonsenen features in the Glossarium Bernense (Limb., 1240). After 1300, we similarly find e or i in the noun in Flanders, Holland and Brabant, but also wonsch in Holland and in northeastern texts (MNW). Teuthonista (1477) has wunsch, Plantin and Kiliaan know both wensch and wunsch. For ‘to wish’, the same distribution between e/i and o/u is found.

In modern dialects, a rounded vowel /ø/ or /œ/ occurs in the verb in three small eastern areas, according to the GTRP data: in Twente (/vœskɔn/ etc.), in southeastern Limburg (/vœnsã/), and in the southern border area between Brabant and Limburg (/vœnsã/), see Map 19. Of course, it cannot be excluded that some of these dialects have /o/ or /œ/ from a late rounding of /e/ after w (as in Limburgian zjwömme from zwemmen ‘to swim’), but the geographic distribution (on the periphery of the post-1500 centres of innovation) suggests that these areas may well preserve an archaism, viz. the expected reflex of *wunskjan.

The cognate forms from other West Germanic languages leave little doubt that the verb had an i-mutation factor whereas the noun did not. It follows that wonsch is the expected reflex in the noun, whereas the verb would have been *wünschen in Late Old Dutch. The e of wensch is then best explained from unrounding of *ü (Franck 1910: 42, van Haeringen 1936: 192). The noun wensch must have got its vowel from the verb (just like, vice versa, the verb wonschen
in some eastern dialects adopted the vowel of the noun). The e in *wensch* and *wenschen* in the thirteenth century is found much further east than in other words with unrounding of *ü*, and also the reflex *i* is conspicuously rare in the oldest phases, unlike in the type *pit*, *pet*. Possibly, then, *wenschen* lost its rounded vowel by dissimilation with initial *w-*, that is, *[wœ-] > [wɛ-]*. Note that the combination *wu-/wœ-/*, wherever it now occurs in the standard language, has developed from MDu. *we-*(before certain consonants, such as *l*) or *wo-*(from unconditioned palatalization). Thus, [wœ-] must have been a rare or inexistnet combination in Late Old Dutch, which was susceptible to unrounding.

Map 19. Front rounded vowel in *wensen* according to the GTRP database

20. *zonde, zunde, MDu. sende* 'sin' < PGm. *sundjō-* f. 'being guilty' (OS *sundia*, MLG *sünde*, OHG *sunta*, MoHG *Sünde*, OFri. *sende, sinde*). Paradigmatic alternation is expected to have occurred in Late ODu. between nom.sg. *sundi > *sundi > *sund* (no *i*-mutation factor after a heavy syllable) and the oblique cases with *sundjō-* (with *i*-mutation factor). Apparently, the forms without mutation factor won out in the literary language, contrary to what happened in German and Old Frisian.

In the literary Old Dutch texts we find a strong feminine *sundo* (WPs.), *sunda* (LW), later *sunde*. The derived adjective is *sundig*. In Early Middle Dutch, the simplex is always spelled with a back vowel <o> in Flanders. Brabant and Limburg usually spell <u>, which can render both /u/ and /ũ/. In the texts from Brabant, <o>
is found nearly as often as <u>. In the derivatives and compounds with sonde/sunde, including sundere ‘sinner’, the same geographic distribution of u and o returns. In the Late Middle Dutch texts from Flanders, o remains the main variant (MNW), but in Brabant, sunde is still frequent in the period when the spelling <u> (in closed syllable) is used only for a front vowel; this suggests that sunde had a front vowel. MNW has a separate entry sende ‘sin’ based on a few attestations sende and sinde in Late Middle Dutch texts, particularly from Brabant. In the vocabularies, we find sunde in Teuthonista (1477), and Kiliaan (1599) s.v. sunde refers to sonde.

In the modern standard, zonde has escaped regular e-apocope because of the conservative influence of religious language, but in dialects, apocope is the rule. Many dialects have fronted [œ]-vocalism. The GTRP data show a front rounded vowel in Groningen, Drente, Overijssel and Gelderland versus a low back vowel in Holland, Zealand and Utrecht. In Flanders, the back vowel is exceptionless. Throughout southern and eastern dialects, there is a formal and semantic difference between zonde ‘sin’, which was probably borrowed from the standard language, and dialectal zund(e), zun, in unrounding dialects zin ‘a pity’. For instance, in Dieren (Gelderland) we have een zonde ‘a sin’ with /ɔ/ but ‘t is suànt ‘it’s a pity’ with /œ/. In central and southern Limburg, only front rounded vowels were provided by the informants. I did not find any certain remains of the Middle Dutch unrounded forms sende, sine.

The area with /œ/ in ‘sin’ is not the same area as where the unconditioned fronting of *u is usually found. Hence, we must assume that the eastern (and central) dialects of Old Dutch generalized the i-mutated reflex of *sundjó- throughout the paradigm, whereas the coastal dialects generalized the unmutated variant *sund-, making the result indistinguishable from a hypothetic preform *sundó-. It should therefore be investigated whether MDu. sende, sine is not from productively unrounding areas in Brabant, such as Leuven.

21. zulle, zille ‘threshold, sill’ < WGM. *suljō- f. (MoWFri. sille, OE syl(łe), MoE sill, MoLG süll) next to *swallja- (OHG swelli n., swella, MoHG Schwelle).

Van Ginneken 1933 assumes that zulle reflects *swelle < *swallja- with a similar contraction of the sequence CwiC to CuC as in zuster ‘sister’ < *swester and zulk ‘such’ < *swilk-. Yet for zulle, this etymology is contradicted by the distribution of the variants, as pointed out by WNT and the extant etymological dictionaries of Dutch. Whereas zuster has u already in all Early Middle Dutch forms, including those of Flanders, and while zulk is still realized as swilk in thirteenth-century Bruges, we find no trace of we or wi in zulle. The distribution of unrounded sille, zille exactly matches that of other words with *ü in closed syllable.

In Early Middle Dutch, only West Flemish forms of the acc.sg. sille, zille are attested. Later in Middle Dutch, sille is still found in Flanders versus zulle, oversulle ‘lintel’ in Brabant, though sille is not unknown in Flemish texts
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(MNW, WNT). Kiliaan (1599) has sille and sulle, but calls the former specifically Flemish. Van Ginneken (1933: 53) has mapped the words for ‘threshold’ in Dutch dialects of the early twentieth century. He depicts a continuous zelle-zille-zulle area in French and West Flanders, with inroads into East Flanders; a small zul-area in the south of Belgian Limburg; and zul(le) in parts of eastern Gelderland, Overijssel and in Drente. In expressions, zul was also preserved locally in North Brabant. In view of the front rounded vowel in eastern dialects, it seems likely that zulle represents late ODu. *sülle.

22. zal, zel, pl. zullen, zellen ‘shall, will’ < PGm. sg. *skal, pl. *skul-

The Old Dutch inflexion is relatively straightforward as regards its vocalism: sg. s(c)al, s(c)alt, (s)cal, 1pl.+3pl. s(c)ule/on, 2pl. sculed, scult. In the thirteenth century, we find much more variation within paradigms and between regions; see Franck 1910: 139, van Loey 1976: 88, 90–1, Berteloot 1984a, maps 8, 58, 59, Mooijaart 1992, Tables 3a–d, and VMNW s.v. sullen. In the singular, the most frequent vocalism is /a/ in sal, salts, but sel also occurs. In the plural of the present and in the infinitive, the back rounded vowel of solen, sollen competes with <ue> = /ø:/ in suelen, with <oe> in soel(l)en – in at least part of the forms <oe> must also represent /ø:/ –, and with unrounded /e/ and /e:/ in sel(l)en. The spelling with single <o> in sol(l)en normally renders /o/ or /ø:/, but it can in some dialects also represent /ö/ or /ø:/.

VMNW observes that an alternation between forms with and without i-mutation (MDu. sullen vs. sollen) is found in all of Dutch and German. The dictionary proposes to explain the mutated forms from the subjunctive of the preterito-present, which ended in WGm. *-i. The short vowel in Middle Dutch and MHG zullen, sollen is explained from the reduction of the ending -en to -n in unstressed (auxiliary) position, which would have blocked open syllable lengthening. This solution is possible but not compelling, since we cannot be sure that the alleged reduction of the ending, as reconstructed for this purpose by VMNW, really took place. Alternatively, the short vowel in zullen was imported from the 2pl. ‘you shall’, a very frequent form (gi sult/selt, beside solet/selet), and from the sg. forms sal, salt, sal (thus Franck 1910: 82). Franck (p. 139) stresses the importance of the second person singular of this verb, in its original form salt > sout and in its subsequent replacements saelt, selt, sult. The regular outcome of *süllen was Dutch /zöllen/, of which coastal zellen and zillen seem to be the unrounded variants (but see below for a different explanation). VMNW summarizes the main developments as follows: 1. *s(k)ulan- > MDu. solen; 2. *s(k)ülan- > suelen, soelen, solen, with unrounding selen; 3. *s(k)uln- /s(k)ohn- > sollen; 4. *s(k)ül-/s(k)öhn- > sullen, with unrounding sellen.

Geographically, Early MDu. 1sg.+3sg. sel is restricted to texts from Holland and Utrecht and to one document from Cleves which is addressed to the count of Holland (Heeroma 1935, Map 22; Berteloot 1984a: 50). In all of
these places, *sel competes with *sal. In the more extensive CRM14 material, the regional character of *sg. *sel is even more clear: it is the usual form in North and South Holland and Utrecht, whereas Zealand has only *sal. This distribution is still found by and large in modern dialects, cf. Weijnen (1972, 1991: 4, 245). Weijnen 1972 suggests an Ingvaeonic origin of *sel, which is quite conceivable: the *e in the *sg. *sel could have arisen from fronting of *sal, as found in many North Hollandish words with *a, cf. §11. Alternatively, *sel could be interpreted as pretonic vowel reduction in the auxiliary verb form.

In the plural and the infinitive, *e has a different regional distribution. The variants *s/zolen, *s/zoeelen are not frequent but can be found in most regions. If anything, Holland, Brabant and the southeastern dialects have these forms more frequently than Flanders and Zealand. Whether *s/zo(e)len has a back or front vowel is uncertain. With <u> in open syllable, the spellings *s/zule(n) and *s/zuele(n), probably for long /ø:/, are very rare. In Flanders and Zealand, *s/zullen is the usual form, whereas <o> and <oe> are almost absent there.

Unrounded *s/zelen occurs in all regions but is particularly frequent in South and West Brabant and in East Flanders, and to some extent also in Holland. *Zelen also occurs in Bruges. Unrounded *s/zellen is only found in Holland, Utrecht and the city of Breda, and furthermore once each in Antwerp and Mechelen. This variant is absent from Flanders and Zealand and from the southeastern dialects. Maybe *sell(e)n was formed by analogy with the *sg. *sel, found in the same area. The information given by van Loey 1976: 90–1 on the development in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries is also relevant. In both Flanders and Brabant, forms with a long vowel in open syllable, viz. *su(e)len in West Flanders, *selen in East Flanders and West Brabant, *so(e)len in East Brabant, are gradually being replaced by forms with a short vowel. Until the early fifteenth century, for instance, *selen is the predominant form throughout Brabant (beside *soelen in North Brabant) as against *soelen and *suelen in Limburg and *soelen in northeastern dialects; see CRM14 for additional attestations.

As to the unrounding, this yields the following scenario. The spread of front rounded vowels (/ø:/, /ö/) and their unrounded counterparts does not correspond geographically to what is normally found for *brug/*brigge, etc. Firstly, rounded and unrounded variants co-occur in several dialects to a larger extent than is usual. Secondly, unrounding is found further east than in other words. Thirdly, unrounding is spectacularly less frequent in West Flanders than in East Flanders, Brabant and Holland. This situation is nearly the reverse of the usual distribution of unrounded and rounded reflexes of *ü. All these facts suggest that there were at least two independent foci of unrounding in this verb. One area of innovation would have comprised at least Brabant and East Flanders, which unrounded the lengthened vowel /ö:/ to /e:/ in *selen, *sel(e)t. Another area, mainly limited to Holland and Utrecht, unrounded the short
rounded vowel of *sullen to *sellen, possibly under the influence of sg. *sel from *sal. Altogether, then, the unroundings in this verb may have been due to its use as an unstressed auxiliary.

23. zult(e), zilt(e) ‘brawn, headcheese; brine’ < *sultjō-120 ‘salt water’ (OS sulta, MLG sulte ‘salt water, salt meat’, OHG sulza ‘salt walter’, MoHG Sülze).

The usual forms of the noun are ODu. sulton (DAT.sg.) ‘salty ground’, MDu. sulte, suit ‘salt meat’, MoDu. zult. Reinterpreted as an adjective, it occurs as zult ‘salty’ first in 1591, and is subsequently replaced by zilt (first in 1624, then from 1700 on). Unrounded forms appear in West Flemish from an early date: MDu. sklute ‘salty food’ (Yperman, WFla., 1351), zelte ‘saliferous moor’ (WFla., 1510), zilte ‘saliferous ground, brine, saltiness’ (from 1560, western Dutch). Modern Zealandish has zilte ‘saltiness; eczema’, West Flemish zilte, zelte ‘nitric acid on walls; itch, scab’, which arose by metaphor from ‘salt crust’. In northern West Flanders zilte ‘brawn’ survives. The derived verb zulten ‘to pickle’ corresponds with Zealandish zilten.

15.2.2 Flemish unrounding before rC

A subcategory of forms which have been adduced as further evidence for old un-rounding consists of seven121 etyma with *u̯r before another consonant: borstel ‘brush’, dorst ‘thirst’, horst ‘elevation’, mergen ‘to enjoy’, murw ‘weak’, storten ‘to pour, shed’, wortel ‘root, carrot’. Five of them show medieval Flemish forms in <e>.

The modern dialects tend towards a reflex /œ/ of *u before rC in large parts of southern Dutch, which is mainly due to a recent fronting before rC. Taeldeman (1971: 210–34 and Map 10–3) has shown that the unconditioned fronting of *u to /œ/ was more widespread in Flanders before r plus dental obstruents than before r plus labials or velars. Unlike Taeldeman, I think that i-mutation factors were of no influence on the modern distribution; especially the relic area of dorst in French Flanders informs this view. But I do agree with Taeldeman that we must assume at least two different centres of unconditioned fronting before rC: one in Brabant and the other in West Flanders. The question then follows whether the sporadic medieval e-forms, which I will present below, arose before 1200. If they did, they

120. In contrast to Kroonen (2013: 491), I do not think that a separate PGm. ADJ. *sult-ja- ‘salty’ must be reconstructed. Zilt is mainly used for sea water, sweat, and tears, that is, for naturally salty liquids. The noun zulde, zilte was probably reinterpreted as an adjective in certain collocations, such as compounds (e.g., *zilte-golven ‘salt water waves’ → ‘salty waves’) or appositions (e.g., *zilte, tranen ‘saltiness, [that is] tears’ → ‘the salty tears’.

121. I did not carry out an exhaustive search.
may be interpreted as the only remnants of an Old Flemish unrounding of *ü which was later superseded by forms with a rounded vowel. If, on the contrary, derst for ‘thirst’ and similar forms do not predate Early Middle Dutch, they probably represent early instances of the unrounding of the vowel /œ/ which arose throughout Flanders from unconditioned fronting of *u.

1. borstel ‘brush’ represents WGM. *burstila- (ME bristel, bröstel, brestel, MoE bristle), derived from WGM. *bursti- (OHG burst f., OE byrst ‘brush’), cf. EWAhD II: 471–2.

Early MDu. burstel ‘bristly hair, quill’ is only attested in the West Flemish plural burstelen (5x)\(^{122}\) and the Adj. gheburstelt ‘bristly’; in this region, unconditioned fronting of *u to /œ/ is regularly found before rC. All Late Middle Dutch and Modern Dutch forms have o or u. The modern dialects of North Brabant, Limburg and Groningen generally have a back vowel, see Map 20. Hence, the noun must be reconstructed without i-mutation factor for Dutch.\(^{123}\) The fronting in Flanders, southern Brabant and in northeastern dialects must be more recent, cf. FAND I: 260 and Map 125.

Map 20. Front vowel reflexes in borstel (GTRP database)

122. The entry berstel in MNW must be disregarded: the passages quoted there have u in the oldest ms. D (see VMNW).

123. The absence of i-mutation before the suffix *-ila- is unexpected: probably, borstel restored the unmutated back vowel from the simplex borst.
2. dorst ‘thirst’ continues PGm. *þursti- (OS thurst, OHG durst, thurst, MoWFri. toarst, InsNFri. tast, sarst [< *thirst], OE thurst, ðyrst, MoSwe. törst, Got. þaurstei), dorsten ‘to thirst’ goes back to *þursten- (OS þurstan, OE ðyrstan, ON þyrsta). Old Dutch has a dat.sg. thursti (WPs.).

In Early Middle Dutch, dorst is the most common variant in Limburg, Brabant and East Flanders, but in West Flanders durst is more frequent. Unrounded derst is found in Van Maelrant’s Rijmbijbel, and darst next to derst in Der Natueren Bloeme D.\(^{124}\) The verb dorsten is attested in the thirteenth century, viz. ten times with o in Brabant and Limburg and once with u in West Flanders. In Late Middle Dutch, derst remains a Flemish variant of dorst, found more frequently in the noun than in the verb. In modern dialects (see Taeldeman 1979: 60, FAND Map 124), fronting to /œ/ is found in Antwerp, South Brabant, East and West Flanders, but not in North Brabant, Limburg or French Flanders. The lack of fronting in Limburg and North Brabant shows that in those dialects, i-mutation did not apply. The back vowel in French Flanders confirms the suspicion that Flemish /œ/ where we have it is due to unconditioned fronting of *u.

3. The toponym MoDu. horst ‘elevation’ is never certainly attested with i-mutation. We find horst, hurst in Old Dutch toponyms, the only exception being in Bochursti (806 copy 10th c.); and MDu. horst, hoerst, hurst. EWN gives as competing reconstructions *hursti- and *hursta-. The i-stem is probably informed by OE hyrst next to hurst, but OS horst and MoHG Horst show no trace of i-mutation. The Early Middle Flemish toponym he(e)rst refers to a sandy region in the north of East Flanders, near Boekhoute. It is possible that this form represents an unrounded variant of unattested *hürst < *hursti-, but the absence of other traces in Dutch and German renders this uncertain. Alternatively, we are dealing with an ablaut variant with WGm. *e or *a. Compare the word harst(e), herst(e) ’roast’, particularly from the ribs (OHG harst). For a ‘sandy ridge’ as is De Heerst, this would be an acceptable metaphorical explanation. Gysseling (1966c: 151) also mentions two toponyms Herst from Calais (1282, 1298).

4. mergen ‘to enjoy oneself, to relax’. This verb and its derivatives (perfective vermergen; merchte ‘mirth’, mergelijc ‘merry’) are only attested in Middle Dutch. Probably, an adj. *merge formed the basis of the Dutch word family. Cognates of putative *merge only occur in English, viz. OE myri(g)e, MoE merry < adj. *murgja-, OE myrgan, noun mirth < *murgiþō-. These may be derived from PGm. *murgu- ‘short’, although the semantics are unclear (Heidermanns 1993: 416). Formally, the replacement of an u-stem adjective by a ja-stem has parallels in Germanic, cf. WGm. *punja- << *punnu- ‘thin’. The few thirteenth-century forms are all from West Flanders and all have e. In Late Middle Dutch, (ver)mergen

\(^{124}\) The a arose from West Flemish lowering of erC to arC, see van Loey 1980: 9, Berteloot 1984a, Map 21.
is also predominantly found in Flemish literary texts. Furthermore, we once find *vermorgen* in the Lancelot Romance, and a few times *vermorgen* with rounded vowel in literary texts from Holland. The word is not attested after 1500.

These data agree well with an Old Dutch stem form *murg-* which was fronted and unrounded in Flemish, but not in Holland or in the interior dialects.

5. *murw* ‘weak, bland’ < *murwja-* beside *merw* < *marwa-*<ref>. West Flemish has a rounded vowel in the thirteenth century in the surname *moref*, *muerf*, but unrounded *e* in *meru ey* ‘a raw egg’. Literary texts from East Brabant have *morwe*, *morf*, and the Limburgian Glossarium Bernense (1240) has *merue* but *moruleke* ‘weakly’. A few Late Middle Dutch texts also have *meru*. Most texts in most dialects until 1600 have *moru*, *morwe*, whereas *murwe* first appears in 1530 (*WNT* s.v. *pingel* II). Modern West Flemish also has a variant *merf* (de Bo 1892: 600). The *e*-forms could continue *marwa-* with raising of *a* before *rw* (as in *verwe*, MoDu. *verf* ‘paint’ < *farwa-*), or they could reflect unrounding. As the *e*-vocalism is also found in Limburg, it cannot be due to a coastal Dutch development. Maybe the vowel *ü* was unrounded between the surrounding labials *m_w* (cf. *wünsken* > *wensen* ‘to wish’)?

6. *storten* < *sturtjan-* ‘to shed, throw, fall’ (OHG *sturzen*, MoHG *stürzen*, MLG *storten*, OFri. *stirta*). The Early Middle Dutch forms have <o> or <u> in all southern dialects, with a marked preference for <u> in West Flanders in the thirteenth century. In Late Middle Dutch, *storten* is the usual form, also in Holland. A few cases of *sterten* occur in Middle Dutch: *Dat hi doot ter erde sterte* (*Grimbergsche Oorlog*), and *sterten* in an account from Aardenburg (North Flanders). No unrounded forms were found in Modern Dutch.


In the simplex *wurti-*, absence of *i*-mutation is expected in the endingless forms of the singular, and the back vowel has apparently been generalized in Middle Dutch. In Old Dutch, however, the Leiden Willeram has *salfwerz* ‘herbal ointment’ for *salbwurz* of the High German model. Since other instances of *wurti-* further on in the manuscript have the High German form -uurz ‘herb, plant’ (Nom.pl. *arzatwurze*, pl. *stankwurze*), Sanders 1974: 248 thinks that *salfwerz* is a possible instance of the Egmond scribe’s own dialect. This would then be either Old Frisian (with unrounding as in OFri. *wirtel*) or coastal Dutch, with the same unrounding brought about by the language contact process with Franconian. Yet in view of the High German affricate -z/-ts/, *salfwerz* would at the most be a hybrid form. The other Old Dutch attestations (WPs. pl. *Uurti*, -e, and the toponym *Wurtelam, Wortele* in the province of Antwerp < *wurti-lauxa*) do not inform us about *i*-mutation. The noun is attested in Early MDu. Nom.sg.
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sanwort, ACC.pl. worte (Cleves/Guelders, 1250), the stem *wurtjō- in schelworte ‘greater celandine, chelidonium maius’ (WFla., 1226–50).

The compound *wurti-walu- is usually reflected by Early MDu. wortele f. or wortel m., but this is only attested in literary texts. The vowels *u and e are both once attested in West Flemish. In the fourteenth century, documents from Ypres yield the compound wertelvast ‘rooted’ (1329, also 1361, 1363, 1388–89).

For modern dialects, see FAND Map 126. Fronted /œ/ is found in the provinces of Antwerp, South Brabant, and in parts of East Flanders, but hardly in the northeastern dialects. Furthermore, /œ/ features in some places of French Flanders, and unrounded /æ/ in Poperinge and Nieuwkerke in West Flanders. For ‘root (of a tree)’, WVD has traces of unrounding from West Flanders (wertel, wettel de Bo 1892, wettel Poperinge, wirtel Ghent), whereas weuttel ‘carrots’ is given as a frequent plural in West and East Flanders.

Interpretation
The noun dorst shows that unrounding to e can occur in Flemish in a word which certainly did not have an i-mutated stressed vowel in the Old Dutch period, even if the West Germanic preform was an i-stem. Derst must therefore represent unrounding of the vowel /œ/ which arose from unconditioned fronting of *u in Flemish. The same explanation must therefore be allowed for sterten and wertel, although an i-mutated vowel cannot be excluded for certain. For wertel, as for merf and mergen, unrounding is nearly in all cases restricted to Flanders, it is of a relatively sporadic nature, and it may have been caused by labial dissimilation after w- and m-. Only LW salfwerz might be an older, Hollandish case of unrounding, but its status is difficult to judge because of High German -z. Finally, unrounded herstel does not exist and herst may have a different etymology.

15.2.3 Unrounding in open syllable


1. deuvel ‘dowel’ < *dubila- (MLG dövel ‘peg, nail’, OHG tubili, MoHG Dübel, Döbel, ME dowel).

   Early MoDu. duevel, deuvel, also doordeuvelt ‘pierced with dowels’. A West Flemish variant is deugel (WVD). Unrounding is attested in Early MoDu. deur-develt ‘pierced with dowels’ (1584, North Holland; WNT s.v. doordeuveld),

125. Jacobs 1911: 147; Compilatiecorpus Historisch Nederlands 1.0 (www.diachronie.nl).
and in modern dialects: degel (Beernem, WFla.), devel (Ekelsbeke, FFla.). Since this unrounding is only sporadically attested, we cannot be sure that it goes back to the Old Dutch period.

2. *deuvi̯k* ‘plug in the vent of a barrel, dowel’ < *dubika*- (MLG *dovicke*, MoWFri. *douk*). The oldest attestation acc.pl. *doeveke*, probably /dø:vεkə/ (Brussels, 1365) was unearthed by van Loey (1951).126 The word is more frequently attested after 1600 (WNT). Usually it has the form *deuvi̯c(k) or duevick*, also in Hollandish farces, but unrounded forms are sporadically found. WNT mentions *devick* in Pieter van Godewijck’s play *Wittebroods-kindere van Bedorve Jongelingen* (Dordrecht, 1641). *Devick* also occurs in the farce *van een boer die in een calfsvel benaeyt was* ‘About a farmer who was sown into a calf’s skin’, printed in Amsterdam ca. 1615. A compound *devic-lecker* ‘who licks the dowel (of a barrel) is used of an alcoholic in an anonymous poem called *Van den abt van Amfria*, printed in Antwerp in 1647 but going back to ca. 1600. Its dialect cannot be exactly determined but is western Dutch. Samuel Ampzing’s *Taelbericht* from 1628 has *scheeps-devick* for ‘rowlock’; Ampzing was born and died in Haarlem. In 1836, Hoeufft mentions *devik* as a dialect word for ‘rowlock’ in Breda, but Cornelissen & Vervliet (1899–1906) give *deuvik* for the dialect of Antwerp. Hence, it is conceivable that unrounded *devik* spread as a technical term mainly in northwestern Dutch.


In Early Middle Dutch, unrounded *evel* occurs in Flanders, West Brabant, Zealand, and Holland, as against rounded *ovel* /ø:vel/ in East Brabant and in the southeast, and *oevel* in the fourteenth century in Drente (also with front vowel, cf. *euvel* in modern dialects of Groningen and Drente).127 *Evel* is the literary standard form in Late Middle Dutch, and Kiliaan, too, treats *evel* as the unmarked form. All Hollandish authors of the seventeenth century also use *evel*, but *euvel* became the written norm. Its *eu* could be due to recent rounding of earlier *evel*, since rounding of lengthened *e* before *v* is often found in Dutch, e.g. in *zeven* ‘seven’. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the competing spelling *oevel* for /ø:vel/ or /u:vel/ is sometimes found, e.g. in Kiliaan’s dictionary (who refers to *evel*) and in Hollandish literature (e.g. Bredero, Hooft).

126. According to Claes (1974: 186), Kiliaan got his form *doeui̯ck* from the 1594 Low German *Nomenclator Latino-Saxonicus* by Chytraeus, which is also mentioned as the only source for the Middle Low German word by Schiller & Lübben 1875–81. It follows that the spelling *dovicke* in Schiller & Lübben is regularized, and that Kiliaan’s word must not be counted for Dutch.

127. As shown by the charters edited on www.cartago.nl. Northeastern Late MDu. *oevelgang* ‘transfer of property to the legitimate heir, in exchange for life-long care’ must be based on a conscious translation of Old Frisian *evelgung*, whereby *evel*- was replaced by *ovel*- (Löfstedt 1963–65: 327).
EWN interprets oevel as a hypercorrect form of Hollandish which represents a reaction to the perceived low-register quality of the eu in euvel. This is ad hoc, but I do not see a better alternative.

4. MDu. hepe, MoDu. heup ‘hip’ < *xupi- (MLG hüp, OHG huf, OE hype, Goth. hups). Unrounded hepe is attested in Melis Stoke’s rhyming chronicle of Holland and in a manuscript of Yperman’s Cyrurgie (1365–85, WFla.). Other Middle Dutch forms are hoep /ho.p/ ‘backbone’ (Limburg, 1240), and hope, heupe (in Flanders). Kiliaan has heupe, Modern Zealandish eupe (WZD). In western Flemish, unrounded (h)epe still occurs, though WVD does not tell us exactly where it is used.

5. heuvel ‘hill’ < *xubila- (MLG hovel, OHG hubil, MHG hübel) is never found with (old) unrounding in modern dialects. Variants are hovel and huffel. One unrounded instance occurs in Middle Dutch in Van Maerlant’s Troyen: Hy viel daer aen een hevele ‘He fell there at a hill’, where hevele translates Old French moncel. The word is not ascertained by the rhyme, however, as the preceding line ends in vele ‘many’, which cannot normally rhyme with hevele.

6. keuken ‘kitchen’ < *kukīnō-. An unrounded variant is attested in a document from Ghent (1376): vort zullen zij behouden de kekene ende eene scaperade ‘further they will keep the kitchen and one cupboard’ (CRM14). In a very similar formulation from a year later, 1377, we read de kokene ende eene scaperade.

7. knekel ‘bone (of a skeleton), verkneukelen ‘to gloat over’ < *knukila- ‘little bone’ (MLG knökel, MoHG knöchel, ME knokel, ON knykill).

The noun is attested without i-mutation as knokel, with i-mutation as kneukel, and with unrounding as knekel. The oldest attested form is MDu. cnokel ‘joint, knuckle’ (knoyckel in Teuthonista, knokel in the Prose Reynaert, 1479). Kiliaan (1599) has knokel, also meaning ‘vertebra’. Note that the o-vocalism may in theory be analogical after knook ‘bone’ (< *knuka-). MoDu. kneukel ‘knuckle; bone in one’s finger’ is not infrequent in Early Modern Dutch literature from Flanders, Zealand and Holland, the earliest attestation being the plural cnueckelen in Everaert (1538) from Bruges. By extension, kneukel can also mean ‘lout’, thus still in Schuermans 1865. Unrounded knekel first appears in western Dutch in compounds such as knekelvat ‘ossuary’ (Tengnagel, 1640) and knekelhuys ‘charnel house’ (Sprankhuisen, 1647). Thus, it is possible that knekel is an unrounded form of kneukel which was restricted to colloquial registers.


The oldest attested form is the toponym Crepelfliet (1101–1200 copy ca. 1420) from North Holland, near Schoorl. In Early Middle Dutch, the Bruges documents have seven times crepel, while Van Maerlant’s Rhyming Bible has creupel. In the city of Mechelen, cropel (4x) occurs as a surname alternating
Chapter 15. WGM. *u and *o in coastal Dutch

with creupel and cru pel (both once); hence, it was probably pronounced as /kro.pel/. Cre pel remains in Middle Dutch Flemish texts, and vercrepelt ‘crippled’ is found, e.g., in a text from Gouda (1480). The spelling cropel also occurs, and it cannot always be determined whether it renders /o./ or /ø./; but <oo> in croopel (Brabant, 1401–50) is probably a back vowel. The spellings <eu> and <ue> are strikingly rare in Late Middle Dutch. Kiliaan regards kre pel as a Flemish, Hollandish and Frisian form of kreupel, but s.v. kreupel he refers to kropel, which he seems to have preferred. Thus, for Middle Dutch we may regard krepel as native to the coastal provinces, and kreupel as a Brabantish form which occurred next to kropel.

Map 21 reproduces map V from ANKO, vol. I, which represents the modern dialect forms of ‘cripple’. The slashes indicate a rounded vowel in kreupel, kruppel, whereas the dots represent unrounded krepel, kreppel, etc. Western Flanders, Zealand and South Holland quite consistently have unrounding, and the Vecht area north of Utrecht also displays a rather high number of unrounded forms. The unrounding instances on the East Flemish–Brabantish border and in Limburg belong to productively unrounding dialects. Together with the Middle Dutch evidence, this firmly establishes krepel as a coastal Dutch form, against kreupel in the interior. No o-forms are found: unlike what we observe in molen or koning, the o-variants seem to have been replaced by eu in Modern Dutch.

Map 21. kreupel in modern dialects (from ANKO I, map V)
9. meuzie, mezie ‘midge’ < *musjô-. The word is restricted to southern and western dialects. A rounded vowel appears in MDu. moesie (West Limburg, 1291–1300), plur. muesien (WFla., 1285, 1287), unrounding in West Flemish messien (Rhyming Bible, 1285). Probably, a stressed vowel /ɔ:/ is rendered in Late MDu. mosiën (Ruusbroeck), meusiën (Holland, 1477), mosie (Voc.Cop.), and in Early MoDu. meuziën (Ghent, 1566), meusie, mosie ‘midge’ (Kiliaan, 1599). Van Ginneken et al. (1938: 336) show that me(u)zie occurs in modern dialects in the southern half of East Flanders and in adjacent parts of eastern West Flanders and southwestern Brabant. Most dialects appear to have eu, with unrounded mees in western South Brabant, and mezie in West Flanders. With an additional suffix, meuzik appears here and there in the northwest of North Brabant, and unrounded mêêzik, miezik ‘thrips’ on Goeree-Overflakkee (WZD). De Bo has meuze next to meze (but from which localities?). Thus, the only certainly old unrounded form is messien in the Rhyming Bible, with a short vowel in a closed syllable.

10. peluw ‘bolster, pillow’ < Lat. pulvīnus (OS pulwi, OHG pfulwī n., pfulwo m., MoHG Pfühl, OE pyle, MoWF pel). An early, unrounded form is pelu in a Flemish charter from 1163. In the thirteenth century, West Flanders has unrounded pelew as a surname, Ghent has rounding in the verb form peulwet ‘provides with a pillow’, and Limburg has pulwe and pulewe. The later Middle Dutch texts have either a form with w-suffix, such as poluw, peluw, or without it, such as poele, peul. The vowel spellings (pool-, poel-, puel-) do not bring certainty about the pronunciation; in particular, pol(u)w- may reflect /o:/ or /ø:/; Kiliaan (1599) has hooftpoluwe ‘head pillow’ with /o/, but we also find the variants pulwe, peluwe, puluwe, pole, polue. This shows that o-vocalism was linguistically real at least in Brabant. Peulen and peuluwen occur in Holland in the seventeenth century, and peul(e) remains in modern Hollandish dialects. Unrounded peluw only appears as a literary form in the nineteenth century. The compound windpeluw refers to a heavy beam under the roof of a windmill. According to WNT it can be found as -peuluw and -peuling in North Holland, peul(e) in Groningen, Zealand and South Holland, and -pulm in southern Dutch (also pulf). Dialectally, -peluw features in western Zeeuws Vlaanderen (WNT s.v. molenaar, p. 56) and on Overflakkee in hōotpeele ‘head pillow’ (Landheer 1951: 18).

11. Rupelmonde (1171 Rupelmundam, 1187 Rupelmunda, 13th c. Rupelmonde), a town in East Flanders, southwest of Antwerp, is sometimes found with unrounding, viz. in Ripelmunda (1187, French charter), Ripelmonde and Repelmonde (1340, no source; Gysseling 1960a), broeder Willems van Replemonde (1359), Wilhelmus de Repelmonde (1360), Guilielmus de Replemonde (1364). Other sources of the fifteenth and sixteenth century equally write Repelmonde, but also Reppelmonde,
Ripplemonde, Ripelmonde (14th-15th c.), Rypelmonde and Rippermonde (17th c.). The town is now pronounced as [ˈrɛpəlmont] (Debrabandere et al. 2010: 218), which shows that the spellings with <ij, y> are secondary and do not reflect the local pronunciation (Roelandts 1950: 169). Roelandts also shows that the river itself was usually called Rupene from the twelfth to the fourteenth century, and subsequently appears as Ruijpel (1477), Ruijpe (1531), Ruype (1561), Ruepele (ca. 1571) in texts from Brussels. A nearby polder is called Rupenbroc in the thirteenth and fourteenth century, also Ruperbroc and Rupembroc, and regularly Ruypenbroek in the seventeenth century.

These data point to an original long vowel in *Rūp-. The l-suffix can be explained in two ways: either there were two Old Dutch variants of the name, viz. *Rūpene and *Rūpele, or *Rūpen-mundō dissimilated to *Rūpel-. The long vowel of *Rūp- was sometimes shortened before the cluster -pl-, and both variants could be unrounded.

12. MDu. resel, ruesel, MoDu. reuzel ‘lard’ < *rusila- (OS rusal, rusli ‘fat’, OE rysel, MoWF riezel, rizel).

The earliest attestations are ruesel (Holland, 1461) and pl. resels (Holland, 1465–85), roesel (Teuthonista, 1477). Kiliaan s.v. rosel, reusel refers to russel, which he glosses as ‘fat of an animal’, together with the variant ruetsel. Reus/zel is nearly the only form in the seventeenth-century literature from Holland and further east. The dictionary of Katwijk (Overdiep 1949) has “rezel or reuzel” for certain fish entrails. Weijnen 1963 mentions reezel for Katwijk (from the dialect enquiry by Te Winkel in 1895), Rijnsburg and Texel, and riezel for Terschelling. In the twentieth century, WZD has no unrounded forms anymore. For Assendelft in North Holland, Boekenoogen 2004 gives rezel.

13. MDu. snedel, sno(e)del ‘mean’ < *snudila- or *snaudila- (cf. MHG besnoten ‘tight, meagre’, ON snōðinn ‘bald’, OE be-snyðdān ‘to bereave’ with *u; MDu. snode ‘bad, poorly’, MHG snæde ‘id.’, ON snauðr ‘poor, bereft’ with *au).

Early MDu. snoedel ‘foolish’ (EBrab., 1276–1300), Late MDu. snodel, snuedel ‘poor wretch, fool’. Possibly, the adjective is part of the toponym snodel-wiic = (van) snedelwike in South Holland (thirteenth century). Dirck Potter (SHol., ca. 1470–90) has two clearly unrounded instances of snedel ‘foolish’, both rhyming with edel ‘noble’. In modern dialects, a form snoedel ‘simpleton, soul’ is mentioned for the town of St.Truiden in the nineteenth century, Schuermans (1865) has sneul ‘wick of a candle as it falls down by the side of a candle’, also called dief ‘thief’; this may be the same word in origin.

14. veulen, volen ‘foal’ < WGM. *fulina- (OS fulin, MLG völlen, OHG fulin, MoHG Füllen), beside the variant *fulan- (MDu. vole, Hol. vool, OFri. fola, MoWFri. fôle, E foal).
The usually Middle Dutch forms are *voelen*, *volijn*, *volen*. Unrounding is attested in MDu. *velene* ‘foals’ (Reis van Jan van Mandeville, fol. 128ra., Holl. 1462). The diminutive appears in Early Middle Dutch in unrounded form as *velken* (nom.pl.) in Bruges in 1300 versus the rounded vowel in the surnames *volekin* (Ghent, 1292) and *vollekin* (Breda, 1291). The attestation *veelken* from 1534 (WNT s.v. Veulen) is of uncertain origin and cannot be used. The unrounded instances in southern Dutch on Map 1.5 of TNZN all belong to productively unrounding dialects.

15. MDu. *volik*, *velik* ‘foal’ < *fulika*- (OHG *fulihha*, MHG *vülhe*). The Middle Dutch words mostly indicate a male foal, whereas the German ones refer to a female. Originally, the word must have referred to both genders. The suffix appears als -*ik* and -*ing*. MNW provides the following, western attestations: *vooilinc* (Die Rose by Hein van Aken, Brabant), *van een grisen volike* ’of a grey foal’ (Holland, 1345), *volke* (dat.sg.; Nispen, NWBrab., 1421), *vulc* (Holland, 1444). Unrounded variants occur in the same Hollandish accounts between 1343 and 1346 in which *volike* is used, viz. *van een zwarte velike* and *van een zwart velike*, *van een roden velic volen*. With a short vowel before *lk*, unrounded *vilke* (nom.) is attested in an account from Zealand from the fourteenth century (MNW). In Merula’s Wildernissen (1605, Holland), we find *vilck*. De Bo (1892) has *vilke*, *vulke* in particular for a ‘female foal’, which he locates particularly in Veurne-Ambacht (southern West Flanders). In subsequent dialect enquiries, the word does not show up anymore in Flemish. The distribution of the variants may be explained from different developments in masculine *fulika*- and feminine *fulikó-, with syncope in the latter but not in the former. If that is correct, Early MDu. m. *vülik* beside f. *vülke* would have developed into rounded *volik* beside *volke*, *vulke*, or, with unrounding, *velik* beside *vilke*.

16. *vleugel*, *vlogel*, *vlegel* ‘wing’ < WGm. *flugila*- (MLG *vlōgel*, MHG *vlügel*, MoHG Flügel). The unrounding is not frequent but sufficiently attested: *an beyden zijden van den wangen of vlegelen van der brugge* ’on both sides of the cheeks or wings of the bridge’ (Leiden, 1450–1500), *aen de vleghele van der poorten* ’on the wings of the gate’ (Antwerp, 1404), *vleugel ofte vlegel* ’wing’ (Plantin, 1573), *vleghel* ’wing’ (Smijters, Epitheta, 1620); see MNW and WNT. The verb *vleugelen* is quite frequent in Early Modern Dutch in the meaning ’to fetter, tie the hands behind the back’. It occurs with unrounding in *ghevleghelt* in Spel van Sinnen op dwerck der Apostelen (1592). The spellings <*o*> and <*oe*> are ambiguous in Middle Dutch, but a back vowel <*o(o)> is often found in literature of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, e.g., Plantin *vleugel oft vlogel* ’vleugel or vlogel’ (1573), *vloghelen* but also *vloegehelen* ’wings’ (Deux Aes Bible, 1562), Vondel (passim), and others. In modern dialects, East Flanders has *vleugel* (and dissimilated *vleuger*, WVD). Brabant and Limburg generally have an *i*-mutated vowel.
15.2.4 Alleged evidence to be dismissed

1. *homp* ‘lump, small height’ < WGM. *xumpa-. This word was taken into consideration by Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 51) because of the place name *Impe* in East Flanders (near Aalst), spelled *Himpe* in 1123. Yet the name is now explained as having a suffix *-apa ‘water’, see ONW. Also, besides *Himpe* in 1123 there are seven other attestations between 1108 and 1222 without *h-: Impa, Impes (TW, digital edition). It is true that Modern Westerlauwers Frisian has a variant *himpe* beside *hompe* for ‘hump’, but there are no other Dutch forms which point to an *i*-mutation factor.

2. *Keulen* ‘Cologne’ (< *Kolonia) is usually Early MDu. *Colne* (Limburg, Holland, West Flanders) and once *Coelna* (WBrab., 1292). An apparently unrounded instance *Kelne* appears in a document from Bruges (1285) which mentions a certain *Peter van kelne*. Of course, it cannot be regarded as certain that *kelne* indeed refers to the city of Cologne.

3. *knuppel, knippel* ‘cudgel’; *cluppel, clippel, cleppel* ‘cudgel, stick’, from *kluppila- and possibly *klapila-. MDu. *cluppel, cloppel* ‘cudgel’ (first attested in 1315–35; MNW) was derived from the verb *kloppen* ‘to knock’, and can be compared with MHG *klüpfel, klopfel* ‘clapper, cudgel’, MLG *kluppel*. Dissimilation of the first *l* led to modern *knuppel*, first attested in 1607. Verstegen (1943: 301 + Map 2) has shown that unrounded forms of the shape *kli/eppel, kni/eppel, kli/epper*, etc., are found in modern dialects in all of Flanders and Zealand, in most of South Brabant and in (northern) parts of the province of Antwerp. Heeroma (1935: 35–72) found that *kneppel* was also widespread in South and North Holland. See also FAND I, Map 114.

The counterparts of *cluppel* with *i* and *e* are also attested from the early fourteenth century: *clippel* (from 1303), *cleppel* (from 1324, MNW). Whether they arose by unrounding in *cluppel* remains uncertain. The main objection to this solution is that *clippel* is not only attested in western dialects but also in eastern Brabant. *Clippel and cleppel* may alternatively belong to *klepel* ‘clapper’ (of a clock), with introduction of *pp* from the verb *clappen* ‘to clap’. From *cli/eppel, the nouns *kneppel* (1470–90; MNW) and *knippel* (1481; MNW) ‘cudgel’ may have been derived by means of the same dissimilation which is responsible for *knuppel*. The later date of attestation of *kne/ippel* would support this hypothesis.

---

128. The same dissimilation may have happened independently in Old West Frisian and MoWF *kneppel* ‘cudgel’ to the verb *kleppa* ‘to resound’.

Old Dutch *luttel* as an appellative is only attested in texts with a German background, viz. the Leiden Willeram and the Middle Franconian Rhyming Bible. Here, the word has a dental affricate /-ts-/ in all cases. In toponyms, the adjective appears as *litlon-* in *Litlongest* ‘Luttelgeest’ (SHol., 918–948 copy 11th c.) and as *lettel-* in *Lettelhouthem* ‘Letterhoutem’ (EFla., 1187). Berteloot 1984a, Map 54, provides a geographic survey of the vowel variation in the thirteenth century. The spelling <u> appears in Limburg and East and Central Brabant (including Antwerp), in East Holland, and in a few East and West Flemish documents. *Lettel* occurs in all of Flanders and South Brabant and in most of Zealand. *Littel* is only attested three times, once in Holland, once in Biezelinge on South Beveland (Zealand), and once in Aardenburg (northern Flanders). Mooijaart (1992: 105) gives two reasons why the vowel distribution suggests that these forms do not reflect *ü*: 1. The unrounding area includes South Brabant; 2. The unrounded vowel is e in Zealand and Flanders in a majority of cases, whereas those regions have i in words such as *brigge* ‘bridge’, *pit* ‘pit’ and *rik* ‘back’.

The Late Middle Dutch situation is not completely clear. *Lettel* and *luttel* are the main variants, but *litel* and *littel* are also found in a number of texts, as is *letter*. In CRM14, *littel* appears in Zealand in Sint Laurens (1348) and Middelburg (1363), and in Hoorn in North Holland (1396). In modern dialects, West Flemish *lijter* ‘little’ and *een lijfje* ‘a little’ (de Bo 1892: 560) point to *līt-.

The West Germanic variant *luttika-* is first attested in the Wachtendonck Psalter: nom.pl. *luctika* (*luttika*), gen.pl. *lutticoro*, dat.pl. *luticon*. In two twelfth-century toponyms from Gelderland, *Luttkien* appears as an adjective. In North Holland, the village *Luttickoisthusen* (1292), literally ‘Little-East-Houses’, is the only Early Middle Dutch attestation of *luttik*. In Late Middle Dutch and Early Modern Dutch, *luttik* is the usual northern Dutch counterpart of southern *luttel, lettel*, in particular in northeastern dialects and in North Holland. The diminutive *luttekin* has become *lutke* and then *lutje* by palatalization in *tk*, see WNT s.v. *lutje*. Unrounding is found in Littekensant (Egmond, 1304), Litticke Uythorne (Uitgeest, 1353), and Littikenmade (Castricum, 1396). In

---

129. The sporadic variants *letter* (Gentbrugge, Sint-Pieters-Leeuw), *nettel* (Ninove) and *lutter* (Mechelen) are probably due to l-dissimilation.
South Holland, *lut tik* and *lut tel* seem both to have been in use, compare the hydronym *Lutteke Rijn* at Koudekerke, east of Leiden. No unrounded forms appear in the northern dialects. Since *lut tik* was also the normal form of the adjective in Frisian, this may have supported the survival of *lut tik* in North Holland (cf. Boekenoogen 2004: 312).

If southern *let tel* does not contain unrounded *ü*, chances are that the occasional variant *lit tel* does not either, and both contain WGM. *i*. Since some Flemish variants require a preform *lit-* and the existence of *lit tila-* would be unsurprising. In the same way that *lutt-* must ultimately go back to a stem *lüt-* (cf. EWN and previous dictionaries), *litt-* will go back to *lit-*. Taeldeman (1979: 57) points to a number of words in WGM. *i* which have a reflex e in most Flemish dialects, such as *smid*, *distel*, *blind*, *likken*, *timmeren*, and others. The pair *lit tel* > *let tel* could well belong to this group of words.

5. Mel- ‘mill’? Pijnenburg (1989: 154) adduces the forms *meln a re* and *mellen* from a 1293 Calais document as evidence for unrounding in *mulin-* ‘mill’ and *mulinārja- ‘miller’. Yet VMNW interprets these words differently as *meln a re* ‘who mends’ and a verb *mellen* ‘to mend’.

6. Flemish *nese* ‘nose’ can be interpreted as a reflex of *nasi*. Standard Dutch has *neus*, and since most eastern and northeastern dialects also have /ø:/, it seems most likely that *neus* reflects *nusi-*. The exact preforms of ‘nose’ in Dutch are difficult to establish. On the one hand, most Germanic languages point to PGM. *nasō- and *nusō- (Kroonen 2013: 383). The former is reflected in Early Middle Dutch *nase* in Limburg and once in West Flanders (*Der Natueren Bloeme D*). Furthermore we find Early MDu. *nese* in East Brabant, Ghent and West Flanders, and *nose*, *noese*, *nøyse*, *noose* in Antwerp and Bruges. The latter form was probably pronounced as /nø:ze/, since Bruges also once has * nues*; but we cannot be sure: it may also have been /no:zel/. Western Dutch *eu* and *oo* can both go back to either *nusi* or *nusō*. Flemish *nese* could be due to unrounding of /ø:/, but *nese* in East Brabant can only represent *nasi*. Therefore, it seems safer to assume the same preform *nasi* for Flemish *nese*. The assumption of old dual forms *nasi* and *nusi* (as per EWN) would suffice to explain Dutch *nese* and *neuze*, but the absence of i-mutation elsewhere in Germanic calls for caution. Possibly, the inherited root noun (PGM. *nōs-, *nas-*) was remade into a *u*-stem (instead of an *ō*-stem) in Old Franconian, which was then remade into an *i*-stem in some Dutch dialects. Alternatively, the ending *-i* was adopted from the word for ‘nostrils’, PGM. *nustrī*, which probably was an old dual (Kroonen 2013: 383).

7. *op*, *up*, *ip* ‘up’ < PGM. *upp(a/e*) (Kroonen 2013: 120–21). This word did not contain an i-mutation factor. Therefore, its vocalism continues *u* in closed
syllable. However, in the eastern half of West Flanders, ‘up’ has the unrounded reflex *ip; see Verstegen 1943: 303 + Map 6, Taeldeman 1971: 193–7, 232–3, 261 Map 4, FAND I, map 92. Taeldeman (1971: 195 and 233) assumes that *up shared the unconditioned fronting of *u to *ũ, which he dates to the ninth – tenth centuries. Around the same time, according to him, the word would also have taken part in the Flemish unrounding of *ũ to i, but this seems unlikely for chronological reasons: ‘up’ would have undergone unconditioned fronting earlier than all other words in *u which have /œ/ in Middle or Modern Dutch. Additional doubts arise from the absence of Middle Dutch attestations of unrounded ip.

Still, the core of Taeldeman’s view may be correct, viz. that op /ɔp/ underwent unconditioned fronting to up /œp/ in West Flanders but not in French Flanders. This geographic distribution of u vs. o is quite frequently found, see Taeldeman. The unrounding to /i/ in eastern West Flanders and the western-most strip of East Flanders is more likely to post-date the medieval period. Phonetically, the unrounding of vowels before a labial consonant is a trivial development. Schoppe ‘spade’ is found as schippe in about the same area where we find ip ‘up’, and, as I will argue below, they probably underwent the same development. Note, furthermore, that the unrounding in wertel < wurtel ‘carrot’ is also found in central Flanders.

8. rund, rind, rend ‘bovine’ < *xrinþaz- n., *xrunþa- (OS hrith, OHG (h)rind, OFri. hrither, OE hriðer < *xrinþaz-; MLG runt, ront, OE hrýðer < PGm. *xrunþa-).

Two Old Dutch toponyms from East Flanders probably contain this etymon: Rondeslo ‘Ronsele’ (1105) and Hrintsalis (639 copy 941), Hrintsale (802 copy 941) ‘Rindsele’. In Early Middle Dutch, there are eleven attestations of the simplex ‘bovine’ plus nine compound forms such as rindsvleesch ‘beef’. All have e- or i-vocalism. The southeast (Cleves/Guelders dat.sg. rinde, Glossarium Bernense rendes strote, rensborst) and Holland (Dordrecht rentvlesch ‘beef’, rinsbuk ‘cow’s belly’, chancery toponyms rintvelt, rintvene) vacillate between e and i. In West Brabant (render) and in Ghent (sg. rent, pl. rend(e)re), only e-vocalism is found. VMNW s.v. rint ‘bovine’ and EWN s.v. rund argue that Flanders and Holland have unrounded *ũ whereas West Brabant and the southeast continue WGm. *i. Although it is theoretically possible, this distinction seems artificial: it would be more economical to assume a single preform *xrinþa- for all of these forms.

The lowering of *i to e in front of nasal plus consonant is widespread in Middle Dutch. Van Loey (1980: 18) considers it to be most frequent in East Flanders and Limburg, but it is also well known in Brabant. Hence, rend- can easily represent earlier *rind-. Two additional arguments can be mustered against Flemish and Hollandish rend being a reflex of *ũ. Firstly, unrounding in
coastal dialects is usually matched by an i-mutated /y/ or /œ/ in Brabant and the east, but this is not the case for ‘bovine’. Secondly, the Old Flemish place-name Hrintsale looks genuinely old because of the absence of i-mutation in -sale < *sali. That is, the name might indeed belong to the seventh century. At such an early date, the i in the first syllable can hardly be due to unrounding of *ü.

Forms with a rounded vowel first appear in Late Middle Dutch, particularly in Utrecht and the northeast (MNW). For charters from Holland and Utrecht before 1500, Heeroma (1935: 25 and Map 10) has found that rint (or rent) featured in the western cities (Alkmaar, Haarlem, Leiden, Delft, Brielle, Dordrecht) whereas runt was found in the east of North Holland (Enkhuizen, Hoorn, Amsterdam) and in the province of Utrecht. This matches the fact that, in Middle Low German, ront and runt are characteristic of the western areas (Schiller & Lübben 1875–81: 532) which border on eastern Dutch. In Dutch, the western provinces and Brabant stick to rent during this period. Kiliaan (1599) has both rind and rund, but the compounds show that rind was the unmarked form for him. By the seventeenth century, rund has become the only variant in northern Dutch texts.

This leaves the question of how rund in Holland and Utrecht is to be explained. Its attestations start too early and too far west to explain it from the introduction of the northeastern Dutch and Low German variant. Van Loey 1980: 22 mentions that MDu. e is often rounded to u before lC but in some cases also before nt, most notably in sunte ‘saint’. Indeed, the data from the VMNW (see also Map 46 in Berteloot 1984a and Mooijaart 1992: 91–3) confirm this view. Sente ‘saint’, which was borrowed from Old French with /ɛ/, yields sinte and sente in most dialects, but sunte is found beside sente in some towns in central, southern and southeastern areas: in Utrecht and Arkel, in Cleves, in Kortenberg, Rumst, and Brussels (South Brabant), and in Maastricht. Breda has one instance of zonte. This spread confirms that runt may well be due to rounding of rent in the dialects of Utrecht and other central areas. The absence of runt from the thirteenth-century material may be due to the fact that the word does not occur in official documents from Brabant or further east in that century.

In modern dialects, a mid-to-low front vowel can still be found in two main southern areas, see Map 22: in central and eastern Limburg, where the realizations /ɪ/ and /ɛ/ connect to Ripuarian; and in East Flanders, particularly in its northern half, which has /ɛ/ or /æ/. The unrounding in southeast Flemish dialects is of the productive type.

130. Vrunt ‘friend’ is a different case. OS friund, OHG friunt would yield a front rounded /y:/ in eastern Middle Dutch, of which vrunt may represent shortening before nt. See § 19.4 on this noun.
Map 22. Front unrounded vowels (/ɪ/, /ɛ/, /ɛ/, /æ/) in ‘rund’ according to GTRP

9. **schoppe, schuppe, schippe ’spade’** < *skupjó- and *skuppó- (MLG schüppe, MoLG Schuppe, Schüppe, MoHG Schippe, dial. Schüppe)

   Late MDu. sc(h)uppe, sc(h)up is found in Holland and Utrecht, *schup in Teuthonista* (1477), *scop ‘scoop’ in Edam (1491–1500). For Kiliaan (1599), *schuppe* is the normal word whereas he calls *schoppe* Flemish and Hollandish. From 1600, *schup* starts to be replaced by *schop* in the literary language of Holland. For the distribution in the modern dialects, see Taeldeman (1971: 193–97, 232–33, Map 4), de Schutter & Taeldeman (1972: 35–37, for *schop* in the meaning ‘baker’s peel’), and FAND I, map 115. Here I provide three separate maps based on the GTRP dataset. Map 23 shows that the front rounded vowels /œ/ or /ø/ are common in eastern and central Dutch, as well as in East Flanders. The back vowels /o/, /ɔ/, /u/ in *schop(pe)* can be found on Map 24. Zealand, Holland and western North Brabant generally have *schop(pe)*, and a back vowel is also found in central parts of Limburg. In the southwest, French Flanders has /o/ and southwestern West Flanders has fronted /œ/.

131. The long /o:/ found in central parts of Limburg points to *f. *sköpó-, whence Standard Dutch schoep ‘paddle, blade’.
Map 25 displays unrounded *i or e. This is found in Frisian (MoWF *skeppe), and in the productively unrounding areas in West Limburg and along the Dender. More unexpectedly, unrounded *schippe is common in parts of West Flanders.

The presence of the front vowel throughout Brabant and East Flanders and in all eastern dialects decidedly points to a preform *skupjō-, beside which umlautless *skuppō- may also have existed (witness the o-forms in Groningen and Limburg). Under the hypothesis that secondary i-mutation was lost in the west due to language contact, it is ultimately impossible to tell whether coastal Dutch *schoppe represents WGM. *skuppō- or *skuppjō-.

Interpretation of *op and *schop
The similar etymology and behaviour of *op ‘up’ and *schop in Flanders justifies a joint discussion of unrounded *ip and *schip. The West Flemish area with *op, *up, *ip, and *schoppe, *shuppe, *shippe can be viewed in two ways. One solution is that *schippe goes back to *skupjō- and is due to the early unrounding of ODu. *ü in Flanders. Yet the structural difference between *schippe and the other old cases of unrounding is striking: *brigge, *dinne, *pit etc. are always found with unrounding in
French Flanders, but further to the east they have ceded to u or o in varying degrees. That is not the distribution found for ip and schippe. Also, ip does not continue an i-mutated vowel.

A different hypothesis is therefore more likely, viz. that schippe goes back to schoppe just like ip must go back to op. We can assume that all of coastal Dutch had umlautless schoppe and op, which underwent unconditioned fronting to schuppe and up in West Flanders. This regional distribution is unsurprising, see the maps in Taeldeman 1971. The areas with schippe and ip must be due to a more recent, incidental unrounding of schuppe. It was caused by the following bilabial consonant p, in other words, schippe and ip result from dissimilation of the rounded vowel u before the bilabial stop.

Map 24. schop, back vowels
The relative chronology $o > u > i$ is reflected in the geographic distribution of the variants. Maps 26 and 27 show the distribution of $/ɔ/$, $/œ/$ in indigo, and $/i/$ in yellow for ‘up’ and ‘spade’ (disregard the word for ‘spade’ on Map 26 and the word for ‘up’ on Map 27).

A possible third case resembling the unrounding in $op$ and $schop$ is $tobbe$ ‘tub’. Middle Dutch mostly has $tobbe$ but sometimes $tubbe$, e.g. in the accounts of Zealand. Modern Dutch generally displays $tob(\text{be})$, but in West Flemish we find $tubbe$ beside $tibbe$ (de Bo), East Flemish $tobbe$. The geographic distribution is unknown to me, but in view of the position before $bb$, the unrounding of $u$ to $i$ can be compared with that in $schop > schup > schip$ ‘spade’. The word is absent from modern Zealandish (WZD).
10. *schuld* ‘guilt, debt’ < *skuldi*. In Early Middle Dutch, VMNW claims the existence of one unrounded instance among dozens of tokens of *schuld, scout*, viz. in the acc.sg. *ouer scelde* in Ghent (1281). It occurs in the concluding line of a series of names together with the amount of money these persons have promised to Saint Jacob’s brotherhood: *ende men es [sculde] .xx. sol. ouer scelde darof weet willem cabus de rekenighe*. Yet instead of *ouer scelde* ‘on debt’, *ouer scelde* is almost certainly to be read as ‘across the Scheldt’, as it is in other
instances in the Ghent documents. Hence the passage means: ‘and [those from] across the Scheldt they owe 20 sol. [to us]; Willem Cabus knows the account thereof.’ A possible unrounded instance is Flemish *sceldeh* ‘obliged’ (Lancelot Romance, line 10701, early 14th century). Modern dialects (except the regularly unrounding ones) show no unrounding in *schuld* according to the GTRP database.

11. Middle Dutch *selen* ‘shall’ in South Brabant and East Flanders has been interpreted above as the result of unrounding of *sülen* due to unstressed usage (§ 15.1.1, nr. 21).

12. The town of *Ukkel*, now a part of Brussels, is spelled *Uccla* in the twelfth century, *Ucle, Uclo* in the early thirteenth, and occurs as *dat. sg. uckele* in local texts from the last quarter of the same century. The lemma *Ukkel* in VMNW contains a number of surnames *van ikele, van iekele, van ycle, van icle* in texts from Brussels (1276) and in obituaries from Antwerp (1248–71), to which *de ycla* (ibidem, 1301–10) may be added. The dictionary interprets the toponym in these surnames as the unrounded variant of *Ukkel*, but the main argument seems to be the absence of a good alternative identification of the toponym.

The identification of *i(e)kel(e)* as Ukkel is problematic for linguistic and philological reasons. Linguistically, the short vowel in *van uckele* disagrees with the long vowel in *i(e)kele*. Also, since Ukkel is written with a short /œ/ in all well identified tokens until 1300, the existence of a variant *i(e)kel(e)* at the same time and in texts from the same area seems unlikely.

Philologically, the context in which unrounded *van iekele* occurs does not force us to assume identification with Ukkel, since the other surnames in the same context come from all over Brabant. Thus, *iek(e)le* in doc. 182 from CG (Brussels, 1276) occurs in connection with the town of Lier, southeast of Antwerp: *een ander guet … dat hi hilt te erue van arnoude van liere, dien men heeckt van iekele* ‘another good … which he holds in inheritance from Arnoud of Lier, who is called of Iekele’. The same document mentions Heinric *van ikele* within an enumeration of noblemen from all over Brabant, including a few towns outside of it (Zottegem, Wesemael). The Antwerp Obituaries (1248–71) a few times mention *ycla* as the place of origin of deceased women: *Elyzabeth de ycla, lijsbethen van ycle, ver alyen van ycle, Ogerden van Icle*. In principle, *ycle* could have been used to spell rounded /y-/; though this is infrequent. In any case, it seems to be a different name from *i(e)kel(e)*.

13. *vont, vunt* ‘baptismal font’ < WGM. *funtō- f. and *funti- (cf. MLG *funte, vunte, vonte f.; OFri. *funt, font; OE *font) is a loanword from Latin *föns, fontem*. Middle Dutch normally has *vunte, vonte*. Kiliaan (1599) knows both *vonte* and *vunte*. According to WNT, u-vocalism (meaning short /ö/) is found in modern dialects
particularly in Groningen and in southern Dutch, including Zealand (WZD). *RhWb* mentions *vont* with a front rounded vowel for Cleves and Rees, and it also occurs as ‘well, source’ in toponyms around Duisburg. This area borders on the East Limburgian area with front vowel in *vunt* and *doopfunt* as attested in the older dialect enquiries *SGV* and *RND*, indicated on Map 28. These forms clearly point to the existence of an *i*-mutated form *fünte*.

The same preform is also required by the unrounding to *i* in Limburgian. The oldest Dutch attestation of ‘baptisterium’ is *vinte* in the Glossarium Bernense (1240). Since unrounding does not otherwise occur in medieval Limburgian, *VMNW* considers *vinte* to have come from a Flemish original, but this is unnecessary in view of the supporting evidence from later Limburgian sources. We find *vander heyligher vinten* ‘of the holy font’ in the diary of Christiaan Munters, chaplain of Kuringen near Hasselt, in entry from November, 1537 (Grauwels 1972: 63), and *om … een geconsacreerde vinte te setten* ‘to place a consecrated font’ in the local archives from 1608 of the village of Wijchmaal in northern Belgian Limburg (Molemans 1979: 274). Therefore, *vinte* must be accepted as a real Limburgian form. Unrounding is also quite well attested in the dialect material of *SGV* and *RND*, where unrounded *vint, vintj, vink* occur in northern and central Limburg and in one relic instance in Sluizen near Tongeren, as indicated on the map. These are areas without productive unrounding of *ü*, so that *vint* can be directly compared with the 1240 attestation *vinte*. Since the vowel is preceded by the labial *v-, unrounding here is reminiscent of the unrounding of *ü* in ‘wish’ and ‘to wish’ (see 15.2.1, nr. 19).

![Map 28](image)

Map 28. ‘Font’ in Limburg according to the data from *SGV* and *RND*. Circles: front rounded vocalism; squares: front unrounded vocalism.

14. The verb form *wende* ‘lived’, attested once in Ghent (1270–91), was explained by Pijnenburg (1989: 154) as a case of unrounding, but *VMNW* regards it as a scribal error for *woende* /wo:ndə/. 
Table 37. Unrounding in closed syllable, survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>etymon</th>
<th>WGM.; MDu. gender</th>
<th>attestations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brug</td>
<td>*brugjō- F.</td>
<td>brigge (Fla.), bregge &gt; breg (Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubbel</td>
<td>*dublo- *dubbilô-</td>
<td>dibble, Dibbel-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dun</td>
<td>*þunni-</td>
<td>dinne (CDu.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dunken</td>
<td>*punkjan</td>
<td>dinken (Fla.Zea.), di/unken &gt;&gt; donken (Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gruppe</td>
<td>*grupjô- F.</td>
<td>greppe(le), grippe(le) (Fla. Zea. Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hul</td>
<td>*xulja- M.</td>
<td>hil, pl. -s (Fla.), hil (Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kruk</td>
<td>*krukjô- F.</td>
<td>cricke, Crick, kri/ek (Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunne</td>
<td>*kunja- N. &gt;&gt; F.</td>
<td>kinne (Fla.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mulde</td>
<td>*muldjô- F.</td>
<td>-melde, -milla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mug</td>
<td>*mugjô- F.</td>
<td>mig, meg (NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>munt</td>
<td>*munitô F.</td>
<td>minten (Mechelen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put</td>
<td>*putja- M.</td>
<td>pit, pl. -s (Fla.), pet (Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rug</td>
<td>*xrugja- M.</td>
<td>ric (Fla.), rig (Zea.), regge (ZH), rec (NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schutte(n)</td>
<td>*skatjô- F., -jan-</td>
<td>-skitte (Fla.), schette (WFla.), Schittingh- (Fla.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stuk</td>
<td>*stukja- N.</td>
<td>stik, pl. -s/-er (Fla.), stik (Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tocht</td>
<td>*tuxtî- F.</td>
<td>ticht (Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsel</td>
<td>*unciale</td>
<td>einser, aeyssel, enssel (Fla.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrucht</td>
<td>*furxtî- F.</td>
<td>vrecht (Brab.?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wens(en)</td>
<td><em>wienska-,</em>-jan-</td>
<td>wensch (Fla.Brab.), winsch (Lower Rhine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zonde</td>
<td>*sundi/-jô- F.</td>
<td>sende, sinde (Brab.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zulle</td>
<td>*suljô- F.</td>
<td>sille (WFla.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zullen</td>
<td>*skul-i</td>
<td>selen (EFla.Brab.Hol.), sellen (Hol.Utr.; maybe because of sg. sel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zult</td>
<td>*sult-jô- F.</td>
<td>zilte, zelte (WFla. Zeal.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.2.5 Summary and interpretation

a. In closed syllable

Table 37 provides a survey of the evidence in closed syllable from 15.2.1. If we are stricter about the evidence that is relevant for unrounding of ODu. *ü in coastal Dutch, some forms can be excluded. For instance, wensen may be due to unrounding of earlier [ö] after a bilabial consonant, Dubbel(monde, -dam) did not contain an i-mutation factor, munt is only rarely found with unrounding, etc.

Table 38 groups the remaining fourteen items forms according to their morphology. There are eight feminine jô-stems, one ja-stem adjective, and five masculine or neuter ja-stem nouns. It is immediately clear that the second syllable is retained in the Early Middle Dutch and modern Flemish unrounded forms in the
feminine jō-stems (brigge, grippe, krikke, -skitte, sille, zilte) and in the ADJ. dinne. The noun mig, meg is only attested in North Holland, in dialects which apocopated -e in the modern period in all of the lexicon. Hence mig, meg do not contradict the possibility that Middle Dutch had *migge.

By contrast, apocope has already taken place in the ja-stems hil, pit, rik, and stik. The noun kinne is only an apparent exception, since it has become feminine: with its -e it thus behaved just like the feminine jō-stems. The ADJ. dinne is the only one of its kind.

Table 38. Unrounding in closed syllable, morphology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>etymon</th>
<th>WGm. stem type</th>
<th>attestations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brug</td>
<td>*brugjō-</td>
<td>brigge (Fla.), bregge &gt; breg (Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gruppe</td>
<td>*grupjō-</td>
<td>greppe(le), grippe(le)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kruk</td>
<td>*krukjō-</td>
<td>krikke (Fla.), kri/ek (Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mulde</td>
<td>*muldjō-</td>
<td>-melde, -milla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mug</td>
<td>*mugjō-</td>
<td>mig, meg (NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schutte(n)</td>
<td>*skutjō-</td>
<td>-skitte, schette (Fla.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zulle</td>
<td>*suljō-</td>
<td>sille (WFla.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zult</td>
<td>*sultjō-</td>
<td>zilte, zelte (WFla. Zeal.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dun</td>
<td>*þunja- ADJ.</td>
<td>dinne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hul</td>
<td>*xulja-</td>
<td>hil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunne</td>
<td>*kunja-</td>
<td>kinne (Fla.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put</td>
<td>*putja-</td>
<td>pit, pl. -s (Fla.), pet (Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rug</td>
<td>*xrugja-</td>
<td>rik (Fla.), regge (ZH), rek (NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stuk</td>
<td>*stukja-</td>
<td>stik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This distribution can hardly be coincidental. Note, first of all, that a lexical solution is out of the question, pace Buccini 1995: 56, who regards the unrounded forms as “lexical Ingvaeonisms”. It would be an extreme coincidence if, of all the Old Franconian words with /ü/, only nominal jō-stems and ja-stems would have been replaced by their Proto-Frisian counterpart whereas all other words would have been adopted without change from Old Franconian. The words in the table above do not form a natural semantic class of the kind which one might expect to show up in a substratum layer (cf. van Bree & Versloot 2008). Versloot (2014a: 35) additionally points to the d- of dinne which does not correspond with the t- which this word has developed in Frisian.

Since the dialects to the east of Flanders regularly retain -e in MDu. hulle, putte, rugge, stukke, it follows that apocope in hil, pit, rik, stik took place within Flemish. Was the final syllable lost for phonetic reasons or due to analogy? An analogical origin might be envisaged in view of the gender difference. Word-final -e was characteristic of the large group of feminine (j)ō-stems, whereas a zero ending in
the nominative and accusative was a feature of masculine and neuter a-stems. As there was no phonetic apocope of Early MDu. -e in Flemish (Marynissen 2004), this gender distinction has survived and become productive in Flemish dialects to the present day (cf. de Wulf & Taeldeman 2010). One might therefore hypothesize that the masculines and neuters *hille, *pitte, *rigge, *stikke analogically replaced the ending *-e by zero. However, this is in conflict with the evidence of some of the other neuter ja-stems in Flemish sources of the thirteenth century, which retain -e in the nom.acc.sg.: bedde ‘bed’, beelde ‘image’, blecke ‘bleaching agent’, bunre a land measure, ende ‘end’, e/arve ‘(inherited) property’, here ‘army’, cäse ‘cheese’, mudde ‘sack’, nutte ‘useful’, rike ‘realm’. Only Flemish nom.acc.sg. net ‘net’ < *natja- (versus Limburg, Brabant nette) and acc.sg. rec ‘rack’ < *rakja- (otherwise recke) also have a zero ending. This situation renders an analogical explanation of the apocope in hil, pit, rik, stik, net, rek unattractive: we would not understand why it did not apply in bedde and other nouns.

Thus, there may be a phonetic reason for the difference between hil and bedde, and this is indeed what previous scholars have already assumed. Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 51) note that most of the words with unrounding of *ü are monosyllables with a stem-final geminate which arose by j-gemination. They argue that “het schijnt, dat deze soort van consonant het best de mouillering vasthield”. In other words, the palatality of the stem-final consonant would have influenced the outcome of apocope. This does not yet explain the restriction of apocope to masculines and neuters, but it is not difficult to find a link.

In masculine and neuter words such as hil < *hüll < *xuljaz and stik < *stükk < *stukja, the final syllable was lost in West Germanic, but not before the stem-final consonant was geminated. Kortlandt (1992, 1993) and Boutkan (1995: 209–13) reconstruct an intermediate stage with a palatalized geminate, i.e. *hull’, *stukk’. On the strength of Old High German forms such as nom.acc.sg.n. peti, beti ‘bed’, weti ‘deposit, security’ (Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 §201 Anm.4), Kortlandt and Boutkan assume that the palatalized geminates developed (or analogically acquired)

132. WGM. *biliþja-.

133. Masculine ja-stems nearly all have the suffix -ere < *-arja-. These generally retain final -e in Flemish. The word mudde, with its rounded vowel, shows that it probably does not belong to the same linguistic layer as pit, stik, etc. As a common term for trade, it was probably borrowed several times.

134. “It seems that this kind of consonant best preserved the palatalization.”

135. Boutkan 1995: 209: “Kortlandt points out to me that the northern difference between OE secg and here, ende suggests a direct connection between vocalization of *-j- and gemination: in geminated forms *-j- did not vocalize.” Hence from *sagjas arose OE secg, but from *andias and *xarjas, which did not geminate the consonant, arose OE ende and here.
the NOM.ACC.SG. ending *-i, yielding *huli, *stuki. In these forms, the consonant was then replaced by the geminate from the oblique case forms: *hulli, *stukki. What matters to us is the reconstructed stage *hull, *stukk. If the Old Franconian NOM. ACC.SG. of hil, pit, etc. had this form (or, rather, such forms with allophonic /y/, *hull, *stukk'), their monosyllabic form in Early Middle Dutch follows logically.

In a shift scenario, we could argue that the type *stukk' was adopted into Proto-Frisian as monosyllabic, and its (allophonic) front rounded vowel was unrounded. The new variant would acquire the forms NOM.ACC. *stikk′, GEN. *stikk′es. In the feminine jō-stems, the ending *-a was not absorbed by a preceding palatalized consonant. This scenario is represented in Table 39.

In a continuity scenario, the type *stukk' stayed monosyllabic and lost its allophonic rounding for a different reason, viz. because it occurred only in a restricted number of lexemes at that stage. In both scenario's, the Flemish m. and n. words with Early MDu. -e (bedde, ende, etc.) may reflect the regular Continental West Germanic reflex *-i of ja-stems after a heavy syllable (ende) or after an ungeminated consonant (here), cf. Boutkan 1995: 209. We can thus explain the gender-sensitive behaviour of the j-stems as the result of familiar phonetic and morphological changes, without the need to resort to the (alleged) semantic status of the words. The forms in -e of the central and eastern dialects (hulle, sticke, etc.) would show that the generalisation of NOM.ACC.SG. *-i in this stem type did not reach Flanders.136

Table 39. Language shift scenario for unrounding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Germanic</th>
<th>Old Franconian</th>
<th>coastal Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*stukkja-</td>
<td>NOM.ACC. *stükk′, GEN. *stükk′jes</td>
<td>→ *stikk, *stikkas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*bruggjō-</td>
<td>NOM. *brügg′u/i, GEN. *brügg′ja</td>
<td>→ *brigga, *brigga(n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marynissen (1995: 194f., 235) and Klein (2004: 263–6) explicitly note the similarity between the inflexional behaviour of ja-stems in Flemish and their development in Old Frisian and Old English, where these stems show a zero reflex in the NOM. ACC.SG. after light stems: OE bedd, OFri. bed. This behaviour is contrary to that of eastern Dutch and German, which display -i: OHG beti and betti.137 Marynissen

136. If this scenario is correct, the Flemish forms preserve an older Franconian stage than the oldest Franconian texts that we have (which have hrucci, nezzi, etc.). The theory of Kortlandt and Boutkan that there was an intermediate stage with a palatalized geminate would be confirmed in an independent way.

137. According to Klein, the main cause of the difference in reflexes of *-i was the date of the generalization of geminates from the oblique cases (*badja- > *baddja-) to the NOM.ACC.SG. In Anglo-Frisian, this would have happened before i-apocope (hence NOM.ACC. *beddi > bedd) but
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ascribes the loss of the NOM.ACC.SG. ending in Flemish ja-stems to an early loss of the ending. Yet this does not suffice to explain Flemish hil, pit, net, rec beside the type bedde, beelde, blecke, bunre, ende, erve, here, cäse, mudde, nutte, rike with retained -e. Nor does it seem likely that the phonetics of the stem-final consonant were decisive, in view of net vs. nutte, stik vs. blecke, rike. The distribution of apocopated and non-apocopated nouns is difficult to explain with the data we have. Some aspects of it may be due to dialect contact: for instance, some non-apocopating forms in Flemish may be due to the early adoption of Brabantish forms, such as the commercial word mudde ‘measure’, whose invariant /œ/ (no unrounding, no back vowel) is also conspicuous.

The pervasive absence of unrounding in all jan-presents with a geminate consonant (such as schudden, schutten, stutten, kussen, hullen, vullen, druppen, dial. jukken ‘to itch’) can be explained from paradigmatic analogy, i.e., from forms in the paradigm which did not have a geminate consonant, such as the 2sg. and 3sg. present indicative. In StDu. jeuken ‘to itch’, the lengthened vowel of those forms won out over the geminate consonant.

The following nominal j-stems lack unrounding: the adjectives nutte ‘useful’ < *nutja-, vlug ‘quick’ < *flugja-; the neuter nouns geschut ‘projectiles’ < *gaskutja-, geluk ‘luck’ < *ga-lukja-, kudde ‘flock’ (which later became feminine) < *kudja-, mudde ‘hectolitre, sack’ < *mudja-, mulle ‘dust’ < *mulja-, and the feminine jō-stem hulle ‘cover’ < *xuljō-. Probably, a variety of individual explanations applies to them. They could have retained /œ/ under the influence of cognate lexemes (e.g., nut ‘use’, dießen ‘to shoot’, lukken ‘to manage’, verhullen ‘to cover’) or be due to eastern influence (mudde and kudde?).

b. In open syllable

Table 40 summarizes the evidence for unrounding in open syllable. Some of the unrounded forms are quite general in all of coastal Dutch (in particular, evel, krepel, hepe), but most of the others are more restricted in time or region. This collection thus differs from the evidence in closed syllable (brigge, pit, etc.), which is distributed much more evenly across all coastal dialects. I therefore suggest that the unrounding in open syllable happened later than in closed syllables. In fact, as we will see, it must post-date the unconditioned fronting of post-language-contact *u in western Dutch.

in High German, after i-apocope (hence *betti remained, only later to be replaced by betti). The central and eastern Dutch forms hulle, bedde, etc. would thus belong to the High German type of development. Note that this would not help to explain the difference between Flemish hil and bedde, found within the same dialect.
Table 40. Unrounding in open syllable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>etymon</th>
<th>WGM.</th>
<th>attestations of unrounded forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clear evidence for unrounding:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. deuvik</td>
<td>*dubika-</td>
<td>devik (CDu., 17th c.; Breda, 1836)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. euvel</td>
<td>*ubila-</td>
<td>evel (CDu., all periods)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. heup</td>
<td>*xupi-</td>
<td>hepe (MDu. Hol. Fla.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. kneukel</td>
<td>*knukila-</td>
<td>knekel in CDu. (1640+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. kreupel</td>
<td>*krupilaka-</td>
<td>ODu. Crepellet (NH), MDu. crepel (Fla., Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. meuzie</td>
<td>*musjō-</td>
<td>messien (WFle., 1285), MoWFle. meuze, meze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. peluw</td>
<td>*pulwina-</td>
<td>pelu (Fla. 1163), pelew (13th c.; peluw (after 1800))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Rupelmonde</td>
<td>*rupila-?</td>
<td>Ripelmunda (1187), Repelmonde (1340+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. reuzel</td>
<td>*rusila-</td>
<td>resels (Hol. 1465–85), MoHol. rezel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. *sneudel</td>
<td>*sn(a)udila-</td>
<td>Snedelwike in SHol. (13th c.), nedel (SHol., 15th c.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. veulen</td>
<td>*fulinta/-an-velene</td>
<td>velene (Holl. 1462), velken (Bruges 1300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. volik</td>
<td>*fulika/ö-</td>
<td>velik (Hol.), vilke (Z.), vilck (Hol.), vilke, vulke (Fla.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. vleugel</td>
<td>*fuliga-</td>
<td>vlegel (Hol., Antwerp, 1400–1700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertain evidence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. deuvel</td>
<td>*dubila-</td>
<td>degel, devel (MoFle.), deur-develt (NHol., 1584)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. heuvel</td>
<td>*xubila-</td>
<td>hapax hevele (Van Maerlant’s Troyen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. keuken</td>
<td>*kukinō-</td>
<td>kekene (hapax, Ghent, 1376)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two generalizations can immediately be made on the basis of the data:

1. In devik, evel, hepe, krepel, Repelmonde, as well as in uncertain devel and hevel, the unrounded vowel is followed by the labial consonants p or v. The first four words probably have the most widely attested unrounding of this group in diachronic and geographic terms. Counterevidence without unrounding consists of the word heuvel ‘hill’ < *xubila-. Note that Dubbel- > Dibbel-, the one word with unrounding in closed syllable not from i-mutation, also has the vowel before a labial consonant.

2. In messien/meze, peluw, velen and velik/vilke, the unrounded *ü is preceded by a labial m, p or v. Among the counterevidence we find beugel ‘clasp’ < *bugila-, speuren ‘to watch’ < *spurjan and (ge)beuren ‘to happen’ < *burjan.

The unrounding of rounded vowels in open syllable next to a labial consonant can be interpreted as dissimilation. In coastal Dutch, it bears the character of a tendency rather than a sound law. The fact that these unroundings happened in the coastal Dutch dialects may be explained from the structure of the vowel system. In coastal Dutch, before unconditioned fronting of *u took place, front rounded vowels were basically restricted to the reflexes of Old Dutch *iu, which was not a very frequent phoneme. Thus the unrounding can be understood as a reaction to
the rise of new words having /ø/ and /øː/. This would most logically have taken place at the time when *u was being fronted, which gives us a roughly similar date for both phenomena in the relative chronology of sound changes. On a smaller scale, and possibly a later date, the same sequence of events gave rise to short up > ip and schuppe > schippe in central Flanders. The reverse tendency, viz. to round the mid front vowels /e/ and /eː/ in the vicinity of velar consonants, r and l (e.g., Middle and Modern Dutch tegen > teugen ‘against’, lenen > leunen ‘to lean’, MDu. rese > MoDu. reus ‘giant’) can then be understood as acoustic hypercorrection.

Words which were not unrounded, such as *heuvel ‘hill’, may have got their front vowel at a later date than the unrounding lexemes, or they may have retained their front rounded vowel for other reasons. In vlegel, knekel, and snedel, the rounded vowel stood before a velar obstruent (as in the hapax kekene), and after l or n, which may also have led to dissimilatory unrounding.

c. General conclusions

The main conclusions of this chapter are:

1. coastal Dutch *brigge, pit etc. had Old Franconian *ü plus a (palatal?) geminate, but no synchronic umlaut factor.
2. The apocope in *hil, pit, stik, rik, net, rek confirms that an endingless stage with final *-CC(′) existed in the Old Franconian ja-stems.
3. West Flemish *ip and *schippe show recent unrounding of West Flemish *u /œ/.
4. coastal Dutch *evel, *krepel etc. show recent unrounding of *eu /øː/, mainly before and after labial obstruents.

If these solutions are correct, they imply that nearly all instances of Old Franconian allophonic *[ü] by i-mutation from *u were adopted (by Proto-Frisian, in the language shift scenario), or rephonologized (by Old Flemish, in the continuity scenario), as /a/. Only if WGm. *j had been absorbed by the (palatalized) geminate stem-final consonant did *[ü] develop into /i/ in coastal Dutch.

The words with /i/ or /e/ from *[ü] were gradually replaced by words with /ø/ in the subsequent centuries, as speakers from the coastal regions were more permanently exposed to varieties with such rounded vowels. Important towns such as Ghent introduced these front rounded phonemes in their system and spread them further afield into Flanders. This scenario explains why e/i-relicts such as *brigge and *pit are strongest in the westernmost parts of Flanders, and why they are in general more present in Flanders and Zealand than in Holland, which was defrisianized at a later stage. Also, it becomes understandable why e/i-relics are found particularly often in (micro)toponyms, in words for other (small) natural phenomena (mig), and in terms which were later replaced by heteronyms in central and eastern dialects, such as *peluw >> *kussen.
d. **On the geographic distinction between i and e**

The vocalism of the unrounded short vowel is either /i/ in all coastal dialects or /i/ in Flanders and Zealand versus /ɛ/ in Holland. It has also been observed, e.g. by Miedema (1980b, 1988), that the coastal Dutch distribution can be compared to a similar distinction in English. In Old English, WGm. *ū̂* usually yields /y/ whence unrounded /i/, but Kentish and some Mercian charters show a lowering to <e> = /ɛ/. The unrounding can be dated to around 900 AD (Luick 1964: 168, 253, 261). The explanation of this geographic difference is unclear. Miedema (1980b: 183, 1988: 26–7) hesitantly proposes that the product of unrounded *ū̂* initially was *i* in all regions, only to be lowered to *e* in Holland (and Southeast-England) at a later stage. This would explain why Flanders did not share in the lowering. Versloot (2014a: 33–5) also draws the parallel with Old English. He furthermore shows that there was no uniform reflex in Proto-Frisian, since Insular North Frisian requires */i/ (InsNFri. *bræg* ‘bridge’) where the other Frisian dialects require a reconstruction */e/ (OEFri. *bregge*).

Note that there is no absolute geographic dichotomy: /ɪ/ can also be found in North Holland, and /ɛ/ in Zealand and Flanders. From the Hollandish 20th-century dialect data for StDu. *brug, rug, kruk, put, mug* and *stuk* collected in Heeroma 1935,138 the following picture emerges:

- *brug, rug* and *put* have /ɛ/ in all dialects, but *brigge* is attested for Vlaardingen in 1879.
- *kruk* has /ɛ/ in Texel, Wieringen, Callantsoog, Petten, Assendelft and Noordwijk, but /ɪ/ in Katwijk, Scheveningen and Vlaardingen;
- *mug* has /ɪ/ in Texel, Wieringen, Callantsoog, and a rounded vowel elsewhere;
- *stuk* has /ɪ/ in all dialects.

Flanders and Zealand also show variation. For instance, we find *dinne* and *denne* in Flanders, and *grippe* and *greppe* in Zealand. It follows that the description “/ɪ/ in Flanders versus /ɛ/ in Holland” does not do full justice to the data.

A phonetic conditioning for the distribution of /ɪ/ and /ɛ/ in coastal Dutch is difficult to see. Was it a chronological distinction? Since the early, Old Dutch instances of unrounding (*brigge, hil, pit*) have *i*-vocalism, it is conceivable that */ū̂* was first unrounded to /ɪ/ (as one would expect), only to be lowered to /ɛ/ in parts of England, Friesland and coastal Dutch afterwards. We thus return to Miedema’s hypothesis of 1980b. Miedema (p. 182) furthermore stressed the difference between classical Old Frisian <e> and the rarer reflex <i>, which according to him comes up in the course of the 15th century, particularly before consonants such as *l, rC, m, n, k, g: brigge, girdel, hil, hirne*, etc. This topic would require further investigation.

---

138. I omit *knuppel* for the reasons indicated above. The data from Egmond are irrelevant as this dialect has productive unrounding of front rounded vowels.
15.3 Fronting of *u and *o in coastal Dutch

WGm. *u and *o are reflected by Middle Dutch fronted /œ/, /ø:/ and back /ɔ/, /o:/.

For the main theories on the historical development, see § 15.1. The principal questions which this section addresses, are:

1. Does coastal Dutch show evidence of the Old Franconian difference between *u and *ü (i.e., does it show i-mutation of *u)?
2. Does coastal Dutch show traces of the allophonic distribution of [u] and [o] according to the putative Proto-Frisian system (e.g., with [u] before nasals and after labial consonants), according to the Old Franconian system, or is there a different distribution altogether?

The relevant forms from Middle and Modern Dutch will be discussed according to the following parameters:

- The position of *u in closed or open syllable. In the case of alternating paradigms, e.g. of a-, i-, and u-stems with a light root syllable, in which the nominative and accusative singular would yield a Late Old Dutch closed syllable as against an open syllable in the oblique cases, the word will be classified according to the more common reflex in Modern Dutch.

- The presence or absence of an i-mutation factor in West Germanic and Old Dutch. The mutation factor may have been present in all paradigmatic variants of the lexeme, as would have been the case, for instance, in ja-, jō- and in-stem nouns, jan-verbs, ila-diminutives, and īna-adjectives. Or the mutation factor was lost in certain forms of the paradigm, such as with heavy i-stems, where *-i would be lost in the nominative and accusative singular (see § 15.1.2). In such cases, if i-mutation surfaces in inland Dutch, it may in principle also have applied in the input forms of coastal Dutch.

- The type of consonant following *u. I distinguish the following categories: 1. labial stops (p, b); 2. labial fricatives (f, v); 3. alveolar stops (t, d); 4. alveolar fricatives (s, z); 5. velar stops (k, gg); 6. velar fricatives (g, ch); 7. single nasals (m, n); 8. nasal clusters (mp, mb, mm, nt, nd, nk, ng, nn); 9. laterals (l, ll, clusters lC), 10. single r.\(^{139}\)

\(^{139}\) The position in closed syllable before r (i.e., before rr and rC) will be left out of consideration in view of the frequent tendency in many regions of Dutch to front short back vowels before rC; cf. FAND I: 176–79, 256–65 on zorgen, dorp, kort, dorst, borstel, wortel, worm.
In his discussion of the evidence, Taeldeman (1971: 181–3, 251–2) includes what he calls affective words, e.g. *bok* ‘he-goat’, and onomatopoeia, e.g. *slok* ‘sip’. I will disregard both categories. As to the former, there is nothing specifically affective to ‘he-goat’, and, in general, the border between neutral and affective lexemes cannot be drawn in any falsifiable way. As to the latter, it is usually clear which words are really onomatopoeic, and they can easily be factored out in the conclusions.

The words discussed below have been collected on the basis of a search in the etymological database of *EWN* and in a number of secondary sources, such as historical grammars (van Helten 1908: 147–48, Taeldeman 1971, van Loey 1980, Weijnen 1991: 11–2, Goossens 2008: 73–7, van Loon 2014: 204–8) and various other books and articles. Words are selected if their etymology is reasonably clear with regard to the presence of stressed *u* and the presence or absence of an *i*-mutation factor, and if they are sufficiently attested in western dialects to have a bearing on the problem addressed in this chapter. The discussion is organized in the following way: § 15.3.1 discusses words with a short vowel in Middle and Modern Dutch (subsection A contains the words with *i*-mutation, B those without *i*-mutation), § 15.3.2 deals with words with a lengthened vowel (also subdivided into A and B, whereas § 15.3.3 looks at words with etymological variation between /u/ and /ü/). In § 15.3.4, the results of this long section rich in material will be discussed.

**15.3.1 Short vowel**

**A. With *i*-mutation**

1. *p, b*

   *druppel* ‘drop’ < *druppila-* (next to MDu. *dropel* and *droppel*). The modern variants *droppel* and *dropel* are found in two West Frisian dialects, in the north of South Holland, on Goeree-Overflakkee and in northern Zealand, in the westernmost part of French Flanders, and sporadically in the Betuwe. The western *droppel*-areas are typically conservative dialect areas. This does not apply to the sporadical inland dialect forms from Utrecht to Limburg, where *droppel* competes with suffixless *drop* ‘a drop’ (see section B below on this noun), by which it may have been influenced. Map 29 charts *droppel* with /ɔ/ or /ɔ/ in the *GTRP* dataset. For inland Dutch, we must assume that *druppel* had *i*-mutation. Coastal Dutch /œ/ in all of Flemish and southern Zealandish may either be due to unconditioned fronting or to influence of the verb *druppen* ‘to drip’. In West Flanders the lengthened variant *dreupel* was the usual one (de Bo 1892), and *MAND* gives it for large tracts of West and East Flanders. It is not mentioned in *WZD*. 
druopen ‘to drip’ < *drupjan-. The verb is not attested in the thirteenth century. Ypermann (15th c., Flemish) has the abstract druppinghe. In Early Modern Dutch druopen is the usual literary form, but droopen is attested in 17th-century authors from Holland.

huppen ‘to hop, hip’ < *xuppōn- or *xuppjan-, frequentative huppelen ‘to skip, leap gaily’. The variant hippoc (first found in 1624) is probably not due to unrounding of *ū, but represents earlier variation in the root vowel. Hippelen is more frequent than hippoc, especially in literary sources of the seventeenth century. Huppen is first reliably attested in Kiliaan (1599), but huppelen is already attested in 1460–62 (EWN), and indirectly in huplync ‘frog’, lit. ‘hopper’, in Teuthonista (1477). For variant hoppen Kiliaan gives no regional indication. A consonantal variant is hubbelen, hobbelen.

kub ‘weir, basket; reed roof’ < *kubjō- (Kroonen 2013: 308 s.v. *kuban-). MDu. cubbe (attested in Amstelland and in Overijssel), Early MoDu. kubbe, especially in Holland.

lubben ‘to castrate, lib’ < *lubjan-. Early MDu. lubben (1240, Limburg). All literary occurrences in Middle and Modern Dutch have <u>.
schoppen ‘to kick’ < *skuppōn- ‘to shove’ (Kroonen 2013: 450). MLG schüppen ‘to push away’ and MHG schupfen, schüpfen, suggest a variant with i-mutation. In Limburg, southern dialects also show a front rounded vowel but the northern ones do not. In Brabant, most dialects except the southeastern ones have schuppe(n). The back vowel seems to agree with that of the noun ‘kick’, so that the noun may have influenced the verb here. The verb has a back vowel in Zealandish, but Flemish also has schuppen (e.g., in Ghent and in Waasland) and unrounded schippen (de Bo 1892). Hence, we may assume the same order of events as postulated for the noun ‘spade’ in Flemish (see § 15.2.4, nr. 9), viz. schoppen > fronting to schuppen > unrounding to schippen.

schub ‘scale (of a fish)’ < *skubjō- (MLG schubbe, MoWF skobbe ‘id.’; MoHG Schuppe was shortened from OHG schuop(e) < *skōpō-). Modern dialects in Limburg and Brabant generally have schub with i-mutation. In the sixteenth century, a few northeastern Dutch attestations of schubb(e) occur. Kiliaan has schubbe van den visch, but he notes a variant schobbe for Holland and Guelders. From the seventeenth century on, schub is the literary form. Flemish mostly has the plural schubben (WVD) but Zealandish has schobbe from Walcheren to Goeree-Overflakkee (WZD). In North Holland, the adjective schobbig has been replaced by schubbig (Boekenoogen 2004: 465).

3. t, d
grut(te) ‘grit, small fry’, gort(e) ‘groats’ < *grutjō-. The variant grut(te) is only attested from Early Modern Dutch onwards, always with fronted <u> and mainly in Holland and Zealand. It can be explained as a borrowing from German, unless it represents a dialectal shortening of /y:/ as in MDu. grute ‘oats, ingredient for beer’. The older form is gort(e) with r-metathesis before dental obstruent, attested with <ur> in Holland and Flanders in the thirteenth century. Possibly, the metathesis explains the prevailing o-vocalism in later stages of Dutch.
kudde, kud ‘herd, troop’ N. > F., from PGM. *kudja- N. (MLG küdde, OHG kutti, MoHG dial. kütte, kitte, OFri. ked). The word is always attested with <u>.
kut ‘vagina’ < *kutjō- (MLG kutte; MHG kotze ‘whore’, Bavarian dial. kütze ‘part of the intestines’). The noun is clearly related to WGm. *kūt(j)a- or *kūti- ‘spawn, calf of the leg; soft part of the body’, see § 19.1. Early Modern Dutch cutte (1599), kutte (1563). Always attested with <u>, but the word does not appear frequently enough to make strong claims about the history of the vowel.
mud(de) ‘hectolitre’ < *mudja- N. (OS muddi, OHG mutti, MoHG Mutt; OE mydd), a loanword from Latin modius. Late Old Dutch mudde already occurs in Ghent (1101–1200), and after 1200, mudde is found in southern dialects hundreds of times. Never found with <o>.
nut(te) ‘useful’ < *nutja-. Early Middle Dutch only has nutte and the denominative verb nutten ‘to use’. We similarly find <u> in all later varieties.

schudden ‘to shake’ < *skudjan- (OS skuddian, MoHG schütten, OFri. skedda). The verb is generally found with <u> in earlier Dutch, but as schodde in dialectal men biene schodde me ‘my legs are trembling’ in the farce Lammert Meese by A. van Steyn (Delft, 1661). Nearly all modern dialects show a front rounded vowel, except for two small areas with schodden: a compact area in the north of South Holland (plus Aalsmeer and two villages in northwestern Utrecht), and sporadic traces in Zealand and northwestern Brabant (see Map 30). For North Holland, Boekenoogen (2004: 455) gives the frequentative schodderen ‘to walk while shaking’. Thus, the Delft form schodde of 1661 is a precious trace of the erstwhile generally Hollandish and Zealandish o-vocalism.

Map 30. Short back vowel /ɔ/ or /o/ in schudden (GTRP database)

geschut, MDu. ghescutte ‘artillery’ < *gaskutja- n. (MLG geschutte, MHG geschütz(e), geschuzze ’projectile’). Always with <u>, but it may have been influenced by the noun schutter.

schutten ‘to lock in, stop; protect’ < *skutjan-. Always with <u>. Modern Zealandish also has schotten, but it may have been influenced by the a-stem schot ‘partition, fence’.

schutter ‘marksman’, first attested in 1240, replacing older schutte < PGm. *skutjan- m. (OHG scuzzo, OE scytta). Eastern Dutch regularly has i-mutation in both nouns, and southern Brabant shows unrounding to schitter (Goossens 2014: 146–48). In West Flanders and Zealand, both the original noun and the r-variant are found with a back vowel in a number of dialects (RND sentence 92, WZD).

stutten ‘to prop’ < *stutjan- (MLG stütten, OHG -stuzzen, MoHG stützen). Always found with <u>.

4. S, Z
busse, bosse ‘case, shaft; hub’ < *buxsi- (G. Büchse; Goossens 2008: 73, TNZN 3.6). Limburgian bus /bœs/ shows i-mutation. Modern West Flanders and Walcheren have busse, whereas central and eastern Flanders and Zealand have bos(se). A fronted form already occurs in bus (Bruges, 1285–86). Bosse stands beside busse in Middle Dutch from Holland, and the twentieth-century dialect of Gouda had bos ‘sick-fund’, probably from ‘(money) box’ (Lafeber 1967: 75).
bussel ‘bushel’ < *buskila-. Early MoDu. bussel(e). The spread of this noun can be found in TZNZ 7.6 (‘sheaf’) and 7.8 (‘bushel of straw’), but the maps give no vocalic variants. The dictionaries show that Zealand has bussel, Ghent and north-eastern Flanders /bysəl/, Ninove /bušəl/. A variant bossel is sporadically attested in the seventeenth century with Hollandish authors.

kussen ‘to kiss’ < *kusjan-. Spelled with <u> in all but one of the 38 literary attestations in Early Middle Dutch. In modern dialects, northern Zealand and the islands of South Holland have or had kossen (van den Berg 1952: 60; WZD).

koster ‘church warden’, a loanword from Old French costre from Medieval Latin custor. In Dutch, the word has been treated (at least by eastern dialects) as having the productive, umlauting suffix *-arja- of agent nouns. Hence we find kuster in modern dialects of Limburg, Brabant and Guelders. In Flanders, Zealand and Holland, the usual form is koster, in West Flanders also kostere. The back vowel can be due to the regular absence of i-mutation in western Dutch, or to a date of borrowing after the rise of unconditioned fronting of *u.

kussen ‘cushion’, MDu. cossen, from Gallo-Romance *kuissinu (Old French coissin). All dialects, west and east, have a front rounded vowel (or its unrounded counterpart) with the exception of two relic areas with kossen: one in Zealand, and one in northern South Holland (GTRP database).

kust ‘choice’ < *kusti- (Goth. gakust accr.sg.; OS cust, OHG kust, OFri. kest, OE cyst). The word is rarely attested in Middle Dutch, and in Modern Dutch it only survives in the expression (te) kust en (te) keur ‘in plenty, galore’. North Hollandish kustbood ‘auction of real-estate’ has been attested a few times as kestebood in the nineteenth century (Boekenoogen 2004: 282), but it always has <u> in earlier texts, which makes it questionable whether we are dealing with an old case of unrounding.

lusten ‘to please, list’ < *lustjan- (MoWFri. lêste; beside *lustōn- ‘to desire’), lust ‘lust’ < *lusted/. The verb is always lusten in Middle Dutch, whereas losten first occurs in the sixteenth century and hardly ever afterwards. Its back vowel may have been influenced by the noun lost, lust ‘desire’ (lost in Brabant and Overijssel, but also in fifteenth-century Holland), which originally had no i-mutation.

mus, MDu. mussche ‘sparrow’ < *mušk(j)ō-. The GTRP database shows a front rounded vowel in all eastern, i-mutating dialects, and unrounding only in the southern, productively unrounding ones (FAND I, map 113). Western dialects partly have a back vowel o, viz. all of Zealand except Zeeuws Flanders, all traditional South Hollandish dialects, and Westfrisian (which has mosk). Since Modern West Frisian also has mosk ‘sparrow’ without i-mutation (also Wangeroog múzûk and North Frisian mōsk, mǎåsk < *mosukō), as do some German forms (MLG musche), it appears that West Germanic had both *muskō- and *muskjō-. Still, for western Dutch, we can assume that Zealandish and Hollandish mos(k)(e) is a relic form, and that all of Flanders displays unconditioned fronting.
Chapter 15. WGM. *u and *o in coastal Dutch

5. k, g

*bukken ‘to stoop’ < *bukk(j)an-. Zealand has *bokken, as does the older Gouda dialect (Lafeber 1967: 74), while North Holland has *bokken beside *bukken. Flemish has *bukken (de Bo 1892).

druk ‘pressure; busy’ < *prukki- (OWFri. *treck). MDu. *drucc in Flanders, *droc in Holland. StDu. *druk may well have been influenced by *drukken ‘to press’. Archaic dialects of Zealand have *drok ‘busy’ (WZD), as does North Holland (Boekenoogen 2004).

drukken ‘to press’ < *prukjan- (OWFri. *thretza, *tritza, MoE dial. *thrutch). Flemish has *drukken. The verb is absent from a number of dialect dictionaries, such as Zealandish and North Hollandish.

*(ge)luk ‘luck’ < WGM. *(ga)lukkja-. Early MDu. *ghelucke (Limburg) and *gheluck (Flanders) point to an original neuter ja-stem. Spellings with <o> are extremely rare, and unrounding is never found. In modern dialects, however, *gelok and the verb *lokken are found in northern Zealand (WZD) and on Goeree-Overflakkee (Landheer 1951). The relatively stable form *geluk in North Holland (see the undated map by Kloeke), which never loses ge-, suggests that that form was taken from the standard language.

*mug ‘midge’ < *mugjō-. For the occurrence of unrounded *mig, see § 15.2.1. A back vowel form *mog, *mohhe is attested in Zealand and in the central Hollandish relic area. Elsewhere, we find a fronted vowel (GTRP).

*plukken ‘to pluck, pick’ < *plukjan- or from Romance *pilukkāre. The latter would not explain the i-mutation found in eastern Dutch and G. *pflücken. In Middle Dutch, the verb is also attested as *plocken, especially in Holland; this coincides with modern *plokken as found in northern Zealand (WZD), on the islands of South Holland, and generally in North Holland (Boekenoogen 2004). Low *o is also found in some of the modern Flemish dialects (de Bo 1892). In this verb, the back vowel in the present may come from the preterite, where East Limburgian inf. *plōkke, 3sg. pret. *plocht (beside newer *ploog and *plōkte; data from the 1914 SGV enquiry), shows a preterite without umlaut.

*rukken ‘to jerk’ < *rukjan- or *rukkōn-. Rocken is found in seventeenth-century Holland and in modern dialects of Utrecht; *rokken is also found on Goeree-Overflakkee (WZD), whereas the verb *rukken is unusual elsewhere in Zealandish. The original preterite was *rochte, which could in theory have influenced the vowel of the present. For North Hollandish, Boekenoogen mentions that *rokken used to occur for what is now *rukken, though it is unclear whether he implies this only on the basis of earlier written texts or also for the spoken dialect.

140. See also the map by van Ginneken in the archives of Meertens Institute, http://www.meertens.knaw.nl/kaartenbank/kaart/dialectkaart.html?id=25130.
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\[ \text{stug(ge) 'stiff, dour' < } *\text{stugja-}. \text{ Always } u, \text{ including in Zealand, but hardly attested in Flanders.} \]

\[ \text{sukkelen 'to be ailing' < } *\text{sukkilôn-}. \text{ We find Late MDu. suckelen 'to stagger, drag along' in Flanders and the same form in Early Modern Dutch. Modern Dutch sukkel\text{en} has the same form. A derived noun is sukkel 'clumsy person'. For central and northern Zealandish, WZD mentions as the basic forms sokkel for the noun and sokkel(n) for the verb.} \]

\[ \text{vlug(ge) 'that can fly well, winged; quick' < } *\text{flugja- (OHG flucki). The oldest attestation is ulugghe in West Flemish (1287), and all subsequent texts have } u. \text{ In modern dialects, Brabant has vlug, but the word seems rare in Flanders and is absent from WZD. Groningen has vlog(ge).} \]

6. \[ \text{cht berucht 'renowned, infamous' < } *\text{bi-xrōftiþa-}, \text{ past participle of the verb MDu. beruchten, Hol. beruften, berochten, 'to accuse'. The verb itself was derived from the noun ruchte 'shouting, cry' < } *\text{xrōftja-} \text{ to the ptc. } *\text{xrōfta-} \text{'called'. It is generally found with a front vowel } <u> \text{ in Middle and Modern Dutch: Early MDu. berucht 'suspect, accused' (WBrab., 1291–1300), and berucht is the usual form in Hollandish literature after 1600. The form berochtet 'accused' in the medieval accounts from Zutphen may hide a front vowel } /æ/. \]

\[ \text{gehucht 'hamlet' < } *\text{ga-xubtja-}. \text{ All Modern Dutch literary attestations have } u. \text{ According to the maps in the Meertens Archive,}^{142} \text{ the word has a front rounded vowel in all dialects of the Netherlands – with the exception of an area in Drente which has } o, \text{ but which may be due to analogy with hof.} \]

\[ \text{gerucht 'rumour', MDu. gheruchte 'clamor' < } *\text{ga-xrōftja- } n. \text{ (MHG geruofte). All literary instances have } u; \text{ no dialectal forms with } o \text{ were found.} \]

\[ \text{klucht 'section, part, generation; farce' < } *\text{klufti- (OHG klucht 'crack, crevice', MoHG Klucht, MLG klucht, OFri. kleft 'hamlet', ME cleft, MoE cleft). In modern inland dialects, there is a striking vacillation between front and back vocalism. According to the maps from the Meertens Institute archives,}^{143} \text{ klocht(e) or kloft(e) is found in northern and eastern North Brabant, Liemers, Twente, northwestern Overijssel, northern Drente and North Groningen, whereas klucht/klucht(e) appears in southern North Brabant, Limburg, most of Gelderland and South Drente. This points to an alternating paradigm with } i\text{-mutation in only some case forms in Old Dutch. Middle Dutch cluft(e), klucht(e) 'section, hamlet' is mainly attested in northeastern dialects, and points to } i\text{-mutation. East Brabantish clochtelike 'largely' (1276–1300).} \]

---


could well represent a front rounded vowel. The western Dutch (Flanders, Holland) meaning ‘farce, joke’ is first attested in 1510 and always has <u>. In Zealand, *klucht* can mean the ‘handle of a spade’. For North Holland, Boekenoogen (2004: 243–5) mentions *kloft* and *klofter* (with variants *knoft* and *knofter*) as words for a ‘very small parcel of land’. The fronted variant *kluft* there has the meanings ‘road ascending a dike; bridge; pile of dung’ and ‘element in a sawing mill’. It must be noted that the o-vocalism may in theory have been influenced by *kloof* ‘gap, cleavage’ and the participle *gekloven* to *klieven* ‘to cleave’.

*nuchter* ‘sober’, a loanword from Latin *nocturnus* (MLG *nochtern*, nochter, OHG *nuohtarnin*, nuohturn, MHG näuchtern, MoHG nüchtern; MoWF nochter, nofter). Early MDu. *nuchterne*, enugterne (Limb., 1240), en ogeren ‘soberly’ (Rijkhoven, Limb., 1280–90); MoDu. *nuchter* ‘calm, realistic’. Boekenoogen 2004: 347 mentions *nochter* as the usual North Hollandish form. According to WZD, *nochter(en)* is found in central and northern Zealand, whereas Zeeuws Flanders agrees with Flanders in having *nuchter(en)*. Modern Limburgian dialects have *neuchter* /nøːçtər/, which points to ODu. *nöxtarn-* with i-mutation factor, that is, the same preform as is required to explain OHG *nuohtarnin*, MoHG nüchtern. Whereas EWN thinks that *nocturnus* was influenced by *ūxt(w)ō-* ‘morning’, this is contradicted by the root vowel *ō*. Hence, we may alternatively suggest that Romance *noktúrnu* was adopted into the phonological system of Germanic as *nṓxtarn(j)a-, with long /ō/, since short /o/, at this stage of Germanic, was still only an allophone of /u/ before a low vowel. One could also imagine that the initial vowel was lengthened in Romance (cf. French *nuit* < *nōkte*), but it is uncertain whether the lengthening would also have applied in pretonic position. Western Dutch *nochte, nuchter* shows the usual shortening of long vowels before the cluster *cht* (as in *ochtend* ‘morning’).

*vluchten* ‘to hide; to flee’ < *flüxtjan-, or, more probably, originally derived from the noun ‘flight’. Rarely MDu. *vlochten*.

*vocht(ig) ‘damp’* < *fūxti- < *fūnti(j)a- (OS fūht, G. feucht)*. Strictly speaking, we are dealing with i-mutation of *ū*, but long vowels before *cht* were already shortened in the Old Dutch period (cf. *licht* ‘light’, verkocht ‘sold’) in most dialects. The neuter of the original adjective ‘damp’ was substantivized as ‘moisture’ in Middle Dutch or even earlier. In Middle Dutch, <u> seems particularly frequent in eastern dialects. For instance, *Teuthonista* (1477) has *vucht(e)* in all instances, which suggests an i-mutated vowel. But also the translation of Bartholomeus Engelsman,

---

144. Though *vugteg* in Glossarium Bernense (1240) may well represent /vúxtɔx/. A Guelrish ms. of the 16th c. has *vyuchtigeit* ‘humidity’. Limburgian, in general, seems to retain long vowels better in this position, as shown by the dialectal correspondences for *nuchter* ‘sober’, *zacht* ‘soft’ and *licht* ‘the light’.
printed in Holland in 1485, has *vucht*. Kiliaan (1599) under *vocht* refers to *voiecht* /vo:xt/, and has the main entry as *voiecht, vucht*. The earlier Plantin dictionary (1573) also treats *vocht* and *vucht* as equal forms. Only in the seventeenth century does *vocht* gain the upper hand in written Dutch. Modern Hollandish dialects generally show *vocht*.

*vrucht* ‘fruit’ < *fructu*-, a loanword from Latin *fructus*. See FAND I map 118 for the modern variants. An *i*-mutation factor is betrayed by the front rounded vowels in eastern Dutch and Ripuarian. This suggests an earlier transfer from *u-* to *i*-stem, though in Old Germanic there are no traces of such a change. In Dutch, /œ/ is also normal in Holland and Flanders. A single instance of *vrocht* is found in Ursem in West Friesland, and there is a small *vrocht*-area in the north of South Holland and adjacent western Utrecht, from Katwijk to Kamerik.145

*zuchten* ‘to sigh’ < Late ODu. *sýfton* < WGm. *siuftjôm* (MLG *sufßen, suchten*, OHG *süftan, süfzen*, MoHG *sufzen*, Ripuarian *ziûtë*, *züüete*; without *t*-suffix: MHG *sufzen*, OE *sêôfian* ‘complain’ < *suif(ô)jan*). Early MDu. *sugten* (1240), *suchten* (1265–70). Nearly all Modern Dutch dialects have a front rounded vowel in this verb, with the exception of the rural northern South Hollandish area, for which the GTRP database has /zoxt(n)/. In Early Middle Dutch, the verb is attested with <u> in all tokens, which all stem from southern Dutch. Variants with <o> are very rare in Late Middle Dutch and absent from Early Modern Dutch. All of the data thus suggest that the verb had a front vowel in eastern Dutch and that, in western Dutch, too, the front rounded vowel was the usual reflex.

8. mC and nC

*om* ‘about, around’ < *umbi* (OS *umbi, MLG umbe, ümme, omme*, OHG *umbi, umbe*, MoHG *um*; OFri. *umbe*, OE *ymbe*, ME *umbe*). The preposition mostly has a back vowel in Modern Dutch, with the exception of a northeastern dialect area (Drente, Overijssel, Gelderland) and a southeastern one (Northeast Brabant, North and South Limburg), which both have /œ/ (FAND map 122). The lack of *i*-mutation in High German is due to the cluster *mb* which could block *i*-mutation; some Middle German dialects do have *ümbe*. In Early Middle Dutch, a front vowel in *um* is not only found in southeastern dialects but also in Holland and Utrecht, though in a minority of cases; see Berteloot 1984a, map 72. It seems most likely, therefore, that *umbi* lost or never acquired *i*-mutation in Flanders; in later periods, the form without umlaut spread to Holland and other dialects.

145. Note that this information can be gleaned from the GTRP database as given on the internet, but not from Map 118 in FAND I, which subsumes all the South Hollandish forms under the centralized vowels [ɜ] and [ɵ], which it regards as variants of “[œ]”.
bundel ‘bundle’ < *bundil-, a diminutive of *bunda- ‘bond, tie’ (OS gī bund, MHG bunt). Middle Dutch and Early Modern Dutch have bondel, and Modern Flemish dialects often show bondel, boendel. Front vocalism only starts to come up in the seventeenth century, and dominates after 1700. In Zealand, the noun has been replaced by bunsel. In some eastern dialects, bondel/bundel do not occur but bindel does (MDu. bindel(e), MoHG Bindel).

dunken, donken ‘to seem, appear; believe’ < *þunkjan- (see § 15.2.1 for further discussion of this verb). In the thirteenth century, Brabant and Limburg have <u> in all instances, but Zealand and Flanders only spell <i>, which may be due to unrounding of *ü or to a merger of the verb with denken > dinken ‘to think’. In Holland, dunken is more frequent that dinken. Several times in Holland and Utrecht in the Middle Ages, the variant donk- is found. The distinction between unrounding throughout in Flanders and the retention of u in Holland is preserved in Late Middle and Modern Dutch, see WNT. Note that the preterite MDu. dochte(n) may have supported o-vocalism in the present.

kunde ‘knowledge, ability’ < *kundin-. MDu. cunde is the regular form, found mainly in eastern dialects (thus EWN). Under the influence of the verb connen ‘to be able’, cunde was replaced by conde. In Early Modern Dutch, the verb (in western Dutch) became konnen and the noun, subsequently, returned to kunde.

munt ‘coin’ < *munitō-. In Early Middle Dutch, Holland, Flanders, West Brabant and Limburg have a front rounded vowel in munte, which is sometimes lengthened to /ø:/ in muente or moente. Whereas the western forms could be due to spontaneous fronting, the eastern dialects confirm that we are dealing with i-mutation. In modern dialects, a back vowel in mont is found in the central Hollandish relic area (Katwijk, Stompwijk, Aalsmeer, Zegveld, Kamerik, Aarlanderveen; GTRP database).

zonde ‘sin’ < *sundi/jō-. Modern Dutch dialects oppose eastern zund(e) to coastal Dutch zonde, zoende; see the discussion in § 15.2.1, nr. 19. North Holland knew zonde beside zunde (Boekenoogen 2004: 624). In the GTRP database, only Zandvoort, Huizen and Laren show zunde in North Holland, as well as De Lier and Stolwijk in South Holland. To these we may add Katwijk, where a dialect text from 1846 has zunde (Halbertsma 1846: 21).

9. 1

bult ‘lump’ < *bulti- m. or *bultja- (MLG bulte, OFri. bult, MoWF bult(e); Old French bousson ‘arrow’ < *bultjō(n)-). The Glossarium Bernense (Limb., 1240) has thrice boelt, which points to a front vowel /œ/, as does West Flemish bult (1287). Bult remains the normal spelling throughout all periods of Dutch. The masculine gender and the fact that bulte only very sporadically occurs as a side form, suggest that bult continues a m. i-stem rather than a f. jō-stem. Low German bülte may continue *bultjan- (thus Franck & van Wijk 1912), an extension of the original i-stem.
A similar vacillation between vocalic stem and n-stem is found in *bulta- (> Du. *bout) next to *bultan- (> G. Bolzen) ‘bolt’.

*dulden* ‘to bear, tolerate’ < *þulþjan* (OFri. *pelda*). Although the verb must go back to West Germanic, it is not attested in Dutch texts before 1450, as opposed to *geduld*, *gedout* ‘patience’, which is found earlier. It is doubtful whether *dulden* existed as a current word in many dialects.

gulden ‘golden’ < *gulþīna-. In Early Middle Dutch, guldin, -en is found in Limburg, East Brabant and West Flanders, particularly in literary texts. West Flemish also has goudi(j)n, with replacement of guldijn on the model of goud ‘gold’. Later in Middle Dutch, semantic specialization arose in western Dutch between gulden ‘a golden coin, guilder’ and gouden ‘golden’.

*hulde* ‘favour, loyalty; praise’ < *xulþīn-. Normally hulde in Early Middle Dutch. The five West Flemish instances of (h)oude in the thirteenth century can be due to analogy with the adjective houd ‘loyal’. No certain instances of unrounding to helde were found, despite the claim by Franck (1910: 41).

*hulle* ‘case, cover’ < *xuljò-. Always hulle after 1200.

*hullen* ‘to cover’ < *xuljan-. The verb was possibly derived in Late Middle Dutch from the noun hulle, see EWN.

*hulst* ‘holly’ < *xulisa- (OS hulis, MLG hülis, OHG hulis(a), huliso; borrowed into Old French as *huls > OFre. houx*). In Modern Dutch, the noun has a front rounded vowel in all regions, see PLAND.146 Although there are only few medieval attestations, there is no reason to believe that the vocalism was different in Middle Dutch. The short vowel in hulst points to syncope of the unstressed *i (probably in oblique case forms) before open syllable lengthening took place.

*houten* ‘wooden’ < *xultīna-. In Early Middle Dutch, hulten is found in the Life of Saint Christine (EBrab.) and houtin in West Flanders. In general, Limburg also retains a front vowel and I. In this word, the analogical introduction of ou on the basis hout ‘wood’ seems to have been more pervasive than in gulden, gouden ‘golden’.

*mul(le)* ‘dust’, whence the ADJ. mul ‘loose, sandy’, < *mulja- ‘dust’ N., cf. OE myl. In the thirteenth century we find West Flemish ACC.SG. mul, DAT.SG. mulle in literary sources; Late MDu. mol in Flanders, moll in Teuthonista. Modern Flemish has mul. Generally, the noun has a monosyllabic NOM.ACC.SG. mul in all Middle Dutch dialects. The absence of -e in this ja-stem is striking, contrast other ja-stems such as hulle < *xulja-. North Hollandish meul ‘fine, soft’ (soil, meat) is explained by WNT from the paradigm of meluw, with rounding of e to eu; though it could in theory also represent fronting of lengthened *u. Note MLG mol, which does not have i-mutation, and could point to an alternating paradigm with and without i-mutation factor. Such a paradigm could only have been an i-stem with NOM.ACC. *muli, oblique *mulj-.

schuld, scelde ‘debt, obligation; guilt’ < *skuldi- (OS skuld, OHG sculd, OFri. skeld, skild, MoWF skuld, OE scyld). The earliest nom.acc.sg. form is attested in the gloss cogskuld /ko:gskuld/ ‘tax on land outside the dykes’ in the tenth century. Loss of *-i in Old Dutch led to paradigmatic alternation between *skuld and oblique *skuldi(-), yielding Late ODu. *skoud versus *skuld- by sound law. Whereas scolt, scoud/t are well attested in Middle Dutch (including in the compound scolthete, scout(h)ete ‘bailiff’, see § 20.3.6), schuld has become the only form in Modern Dutch. The adj. schuldig ‘in debt; guilty’ may have contributed to the ousting of the variant schou-. Judging by the distribution in the thirteenth century, it would seem that Brabant generalized scoud- and Flanders sculd-, whereas Holland and Limburg retained both variants side by side.

vullen ‘to fill’ < *fuljan-. Sometimes vollen in Middle Dutch in Holland and the southeast, and still in modern Zealandish (WZD) and in some Hollandish dialects (e.g., vollen beside vullen in North Holland); elsewhere vullen. The back vowel o may be due to vol ‘full’.

wollen ‘woollen’ < *wullīna- (OFri. willen, wollen). Generally wullin, -en in thirteenth-century Flanders and Brabant. Kiliaan still has wullen next to wollen. Wollen has become the usual form, probably due to analogy with the noun wol ‘wool’.

zolder ‘attic’ < Rom. *solarium < Lat. sōlārium. We find a front vowel in East Limburg, northeastern Brabant and in some eastern dialects of Antwerp and South Brabant. A single western Dutch front rounded vowel (transcribed as ə by GTRP) is found in Wissekerke in Zealand, though WZD does not mention a form zulder(e). All other western dialects have a back vowel.

zult, zilte ‘brawn, head cheese’ < *sultjō- ‘salt water’. See § 15.2.1 for the reconstruction and the occurrence of unrounded vocalism in coastal Dutch. Wherever the vowel is rounded it is a front vowel u, never o.

See § 15.3.4 for a survey and interpretation of the results of this section.

B. Without i-mutation
I-stems and u-stems with a heavy root syllable listed in this subsection have a back vowel in eastern dialects. For these dialects, we may assume that the case forms that did not undergo i-mutation served to generalize the non-mutated form in the whole paradigm.

1. p, b

bobbel ‘bubble’ < *bubbalō- (MLG bubbele ‘bubble’, MoWF bobbel ‘lump’, ME bobles ‘bubbles’). Bobbel is the usual form in literary Early Modern Dutch. In modern dialects, West Flanders and parts of French Flanders have bubbel(e), but all other dialects have a back vowel in bobbel(e), boebel(e), etc. (GTRP).

dobbe ‘pool; ditch’ < *dubbō/an-. It is found as Early MDu. dobbe (hydronym near Leiden, 1280–87) ‘stagnant water, pool, low-lying land’, Early MoDu. dobbe in
texts from South Holland (e.g., Leiden, 1574). Boekenoogen (2004: 95) gives many examples from North Holland. No variants with <u> are attested.

*dubben* ‘to submerge; dig out’ < *dubbôn-* (Kroonen 2013: 109–10). The verb is attested in some literary Middle Dutch texts, e.g. van Velthem’s *Spiegel Historiaal* and the prose *Reynaert*. After 1600, the verb has gone into disuse. De Bo (1892) has *doebelen* ‘submerge’ with a back vowel. A derived noun is MDu. *dober* ‘buoy, float’ (before 1410), *dobber* (1415), MoDu. *dobber*.

dop ‘shell’, MDu. *doppe* < *duppa(n)*-. The form *dup* in the Limburgian *Sermoenen* (ca. 1300) probably represents short /u/. Otherwise only <o> is found in Middle and Modern Dutch.

*drop* ‘drop (of water)’ beside *drup* < *drup(p)a(n)*- (OS *dropo*, OHG *tropfo*, OE *dropa*). Some forms have a short vowel before -pp- whereas others show a lengthened vowel before single p: Early MDu. *druppen* pl. (WBrab.), *drope* sg. (Limburg, Cleves/Guelders), Late MDu. *drop* and *drope* (Holland), *druppe* (Ruusbroec, WBrab.), Early MoDu. mostly *drop* but also *druppe* ‘drop’, *droop* ‘sauce’. In the modern standard language, *drop* only survives in the meaning ‘liquorice’ (originally: ‘a drop of liquorice extract’, 1746). The GTRP database shows three modern dialect areas where suffixless *drup* or *drop* was given as the translation of StDu. *druppel*: Groningen and northern Drente, which have *drup*; the central Peel area between Deurne and Venlo (*drup* or *drop*); and the southernmost part of Belgian Limburg, which has *drup*. Opperdoes and Wijdenes in West Friesland have *droowp*.

Altogether, fronting is attested especially in closed syllable, where the noun may have been influenced by *druppen* ‘to drip’. See also s.v. *druppel*.

dubbel ‘double’ (from Old French *doble*, MoFre. *double*). The GTRP database shows a preponderance of front rounded vowels in the Netherlands, which may well be due to the influence of the standard language. A back vowel /ɔ/ or /o/ is found in nearly all of Limburg, Flemish Brabant, Antwerp, eastern East Flanders, and eastern North Brabant, which shows that the word was borrowed with a back vowel (see Belemans/Goossens 2000: 121, in particular for Brabant). Coastal Dutch shows an interesting distribution. French Flanders generally has /ɔ/-vocalism, and a back vowel is also frequently found in southern West Flanders (e.g. /dobalo/ in Waregem) and northwestern East Flanders. The more conservative dialects in northern South Holland, from Katwijk to Aalsmeer and Kamerik, have /dobal/. This situation suggests that the front vowel in *dubbel* arose from unconditioned fronting in northern Dutch and spread under the influence of the standard language. In Early Middle Dutch, all texts from Flanders have <o>, whereas <u> is found only once in Dordrecht. Nearly all attestations with <u> from Late Middle and Early Modern Dutch are also from northern Dutch, whereas southern Dutch retains <o>. Note that the verb *dobblelen* ‘to throw the dice’, attested from the early fourteenth century on, has retained its back vowel in the standard language.
**hommel** 'bumblebee' < *humi/ala- (OHG humbal). Usually o-vocalism in the dialects. The noun may be onomatopoeic in origin, and the sound symbolism may have favoured a back vowel.

**hop**, MDu. *hoppe* 'hop' (the plant) < *huppan-*. Hop is found in modern dialects mainly in Limburg, South Brabant and East Flanders, nearly always with a short back vowel. In literary texts, we only find <o>.

**kloppen** 'to knock' < *kluppōn-. Always a back vowel in Middle Dutch and in Modern Dutch dialects (*GTRP*), with the exception of the productive fronting area in Drente.

**knobbel** 'bump' < *knubbVL* (MLG knubbe). Found with a back vowel in eastern Dutch dialects. In North Holland, knobbel beside knubbel.

**knop** 'button' < *knupp-*. No front vowel in modern dialects (*GTRP*).

**kobbe** 'tuft of feathers, crest of a bird, knoll' < *kubbō-, cf. E. cob-web. Also used for various animals, such as 'spider' (Flemish), 'hooded lark' (Flemish), 'black-headed gull' (whence StDu. kokmeeuw), kobber 'male pigeon' (Flemish). No front vowels are attested in kobbe. The word is probably cognate with kubbe 'bin, weir' < *kubjō- which has been discussed in section A.

**kop** 'head' < *kuppa-. A loanword from Latin cuppa. No front vowels in western Dutch.

**koppel** 'couple', a loanword from Old French cople. Always with a back vowel.

**krop** 'crop, goitre' < *kruppa- 'body, bud' (Kroonen 2013: 307). Always with <o> in Middle and Modern Dutch.

**lob** 'collar, formless mass' < *lubbō (E. lob). Kiliaan has lobbe, Early Modern Dutch literary texts usually have lob. The variant lubbe has its own entry lub in *WNT* and is attested, mainly as a diminutive, before 1800 with Roemer Visscher (Amsterdam, 1600), in the *Klucht van Droghie Goosen* (Amsterdam, 1632), with Wolff and Deken (18th c.), Berkhey (end of 18th c.), and a few other North Hollandish authors. Boekenoogen (2004: 303) mentions NHol. lubberig for lobberig 'weak, marshy' (of land). Lobbe also means 'lout' and 'hairy dog', Modern Dutch lobbes. The frequentative verb lobberen 'to stagger, wade; to hang off', derived from lobbe, is now realized as lubberen in Dutch.

**nop** 'burl, stud', MDu. noppe 'wool fluff' < *xnuppō/an- (OE wullhnoppa). Always with <o>.

**op** 'up' beside Flemish up and ip from *upp. See § 15.2.4.

**pop** 'puppet' < *puppōn-? See Taeldeman 1971: 196–8 + Map 5, which shows that the word has a short back vowel in all of coastal Dutch in the Netherlands, but a front rounded vowel in West Flanders and western East Flanders. From the shape of the East Flemish /œ/-area, Taeldeman deduces that West Flanders was the original centre of the vowel fronting. Surprisingly, Taeldeman gives French Flanders as an area which also and exclusively has /œ/, whereas the *GTRP* database
mostly finds /ɔpɔ/ in French Flanders. If the latter is true, it would be a relic area in comparison to West Flanders.

schop ‘kick’ < *skupp-. Most western dialects have a short back vowel, but we find a front rounded vowel in northern East Flanders and in many dialects of Antwerp, North Brabant and Betuwe. The Flemish vowel may be due to unconditioned fronting, whereas the others may be influenced by the verb schoppen ‘to kick’.

schop ‘spade’ < *skupp(j)ø-. See § 15.2.4 for a detailed discussion of the evidence. It was shown that West Flanders was the original locus of unconditioned fronting of schoppe to schuppe, whereas French Flanders represents a relic area with retained o.

schrobben ‘to scrub’ < *sk(r)ubbōn- ‘to scratch’. Zeelandish and Hollandish have schrobben, Flemish schobben and the frequentative schrabbelen. In Brabant, we find schrobben beside schroeven with /u/. Limburgian has sjroebe especially in the South, schrobbe also in the North.

slobben and slobberen ‘to eat or drink noisily’ < *u (MLG slubberen), frequentative to MDu. slabben ‘to drool’. Compare also Early MoDu. slob(be) ‘mud’ and slob ‘apron; drudge’. Always <o> in Modern Dutch sources. A southern Dutch dialectal variant with /u/ is the source of StDu. sloeber ‘poor sod’, for instance, West Flemish sloeberen ‘to eat or drink noisily’ (de Bo 1892).

sop ‘broth; juice, liquid’ < *supa- n. and *suppō- f., derived from PGm. *suppōn- ‘to soak’ (Kroonen 2013: 493). Spelled with <o> at all stages of Dutch.

stobbe, stubbe ‘stump’ (of a tree, etc.) < *stubbō-/an-. The first attestations with <u> from the documents of the Diepenveen monastery, close to Deventer, from 1534, could render either /o/ or /u/. In literary texts of the seventeenth century, we find only <o>. In Flanders and Zealand the word has been replaced by strobbe(l), with the variants strubbe(l) ‘river eel’ in West Flanders, strubbel ‘difficulties’ in Zealand.

stoppen ‘to fill, close; stop’ < *stuppōn-, ODu. stopen. All modern dialects have a short back vowel, and all literary forms have <o>.

stoppel ‘stub’ (OHG stupfula, stupfila), borrowed from Latin *stup(u)la- (French éteule). A short back vowel is found in all variants of western Dutch.

strop ‘noose’ < *struppān- dervied from the verb *struppōn- ‘to writhe’ (Kroonen 2013: 486). Always with a back vowel.

tobbe ‘tub’ < *tubbVn-. Middle Dutch mostly has tobbe but sometimes tubbe, e.g., in the accounts of Zealand. Modern Dutch generally has tob(be), but West Flemish shows tubbe and tibbe (de Bo), East Flemish tobbe. The exact geographic distribution within Flanders is unknown to me, but in view of the position before bb, the unrounding of u to i can probably be compared with that in schop > schup > schip ‘spade’. The word is absent from modern Zeelandish (WZD).

top ‘top’ < *tuppa- (OHG zopf ‘pluck of hair’). Mostly top in western dialects, but tup(pe) in Central Zealand (WZD). For North Holland, Boekenoogen (2004: 540) mentions tup from Assendelft which means the ‘bud’ of rushes.
2. 

*dof* ‘dull’ and *duf* ‘musty’ < *duba-*., cf. MHG *top* ‘crazy’ (Kroonen 2013: 105). The word is only attested after 1600. The variant *duf* has been lexicalized as ‘musty, dull’ in the modern standard language. Zeeuws Flanders and West Flanders *doef* means ‘oppressive’ (of the weather; WZD), and North Holland *dof* is ‘moist’ (Boekenoogen 2004). None of these regions has a fronted variant *duf*. Even in the Willems survey from the 1880s, *dof* is always rendered with a back vowel as *doof* or (in inflected forms) *dove* in western dialects. In view of the semantic split with *duf*, this does not necessarily mean that the informants did not know *duf*. In any case, the split between *duf* and *dof* cannot be interpreted geographically.

*doffer* ‘male pigeon’ < *dūbazan-* (Kroonen 2013: 106; MDu. *duiver*, MoHG *Täuber*). Kiliaan mentions Hollandish *doffer* as an equivalent of *duyverick* ‘male pigeon’. Modern *duiver* would be the regular reflex of MDu. *duiver*, but in some dialects, the vowel was shortened before *vr*. Map 1.6 of TNZN shows the modern distribution: West Flemish has *duver*, East Flemish *duiver*, while Zealand, Holland and Groningen, Drente and northern Overijssel have (a variant of) *doffer*. A variant *duffer* does not occur on the map. This probably means that *doffer* was shortened directly from */du:fǝr/*, i.e., from a Middle Dutch form in which *ū* had not yet been fronted to *y:/. This matches Kiliaan’s *doffer*. The word is therefore irrelevant for the reflex of Old Dutch *u*.

*doft*, *docht* ‘thwart, rowing seat’ < *þuftō-*. Whereas *dochte* is already attested in Middle Dutch, the Hollandish form *dof* wins out in the literary language after 1600. It is always spelled with <o>.

*graf* ‘coarse’ < *gruba-*. The word has a back vowel everywhere, also *groef* in French and West Flanders.

*hof* ‘farm, court’ < *huba-*. No front vowels are attested in modern dialects (GTRP database), nor in surnames derived from *hof*.

*juffer* and *jofer* ‘damsel, young lady; roof beam’ are shortened from MDu. *jon-fer* < *jonkfer* < *jonkvrouwe* ‘young lady’. The variant *juffer* is more recent than *jofer* (mainly from Early Modern Dutch onwards), and the vowel fronting is generally ascribed to initial *j-*. In modern dialects, *juffer* is found in northeastern Brabant, *jofer* in southern Brabant. Unrounding of earlier *y/ or *ø/ surfaces in West Flemish *ief(f)er* ‘nun; roof beam’, East Flemish *eefer*, *eefvrouwe*. This was probably due to the following labial *f*.

*knuffelen* ‘to push; grope; rub; cuddle’, also *knoffelen*, *knoeffelen* < *knūb-*. Eastern dialects usually have a back vowel. In the standard language, only ‘cuddle’ is the actual meaning of the verb. Although *knuffelen* is already found in the early sixteenth century, *knoffelen* was competing with *knuffelen* in the literary language until at least 1650. In North Holland, both *knoffelen* and *knuffelen* occur (Boekenoogen 2004). With a long vowel, Kiliaan (1599) has *knuyffelen*. 
lof ‘praise’ < *luba-, gen.sg. MDu. loves, dat.sg. love. Always with <o>. The same noun is found in compounds such as MDu. belof >> MoDu. belofte ‘promise’, MDu. gelof >> MoDu. gelofte ‘vows’, oorlof ‘leave, permission’, verlof ‘leave’.

nooddruft ‘indigence’ < *naudi-þurb-ti- ‘poverty’. See § 10.4 on this word, where it is argued that *-rft first became -rcht before vowel metathesis took place, giving East Flemish noetdorch in 1289. Early MDu. noetdort and MoDu. nooddruft must be due to restoration of f on the model of the verb dorven ‘to need to’. Thus, the vowel first developed as o before rC, and is therefore irrelevant here. It is furthermore replaced by nooddorst in modern dialects, e.g. in West Flemish (de Bo 1892: 653).

offeren ‘to sacrifice’, a loanword from Latin offerre (OS offron, OE offrian). The pervasive o-vocalism in all stages of Dutch could have been strengthened by the relatively transparent link with the Latin word.

schoft ‘shoulder blade of cows or horses’ < *skufta- (MLG schuft), cf. Kroonen 2013: 449. The word is hardly attested in texts before 1600. EWN suggests that the Dutch word was borrowed from Middle Low German, which is unlikely. The vocalism is not the same, and dialectal schocht (e.g., in Brabant and in part of the Flemish dialects) shows that the word shared in the Old Dutch change of ft > cht. Flemish has back vocalism in all dialects (WVD). Strikingly, however, most of Brabant and Limburg retains f in schoft, schoeft. Was its retention due to dissimilation (because of sk > sch in the initial position)? Or to analogy with schof ‘slide, bolt; work break’ which, with paragogic -t, has also become schoft?

slof ‘slow, languishing’ < *sluba-. Always with back vocalism. Generally sloef in Zealandish and Flemish (WZD, WVD).

stof ‘dust’ < *stuba-. According to the GTRP data, only Limburgian s(j)töp has a front vowel; see also the map ‘stof’ by van Ginneken in the Meertens Institute archives (Kaartenbank). The latter form continues a masculine noun *stubbja- and agrees with ODu. stubbi, MDu. stubbe, MLG (ge)stubbe, OHG stuppi, Goth. stubjus. The other Dutch dialects have (a back vowel variant of) stof, in which final f reflects earlier intervocalic *v.

stof ‘cloth’, a loanword from Old French estophe. Only back vowels occur in modern dialects (GTRP).

3. t, d

bod ‘offer’, gebod ‘order’ < *buda-. Always with <o>.

bot ‘blunt’, ‘kind of fish’ < *butt-. The adjective has a back vowel everywhere, but the fish is also called but in West Flemish (de Bo) and Zeeuws Flanders (WVD).

bot ‘bone; knot, bud’ < *buttan-. Generally spelled with <o>.

bottel, buttel ‘the fruit of certain bushes’, derived from MDu. botte ‘bud’. Teuthonista has buttel, and Kiliaan gives bottel, buttel as a word from Guelders. The word has short o in all attestations in PLAND, but this may well be due to
influence of the standard language. It appears that the word was not indigenous in western Dutch.

*botte, butte* ‘basket, barrel’ may be a loanword from Romance *butta*, though it has *i*-mutation in some West Germanic languages (OE *bytt*, MoHG *Bütte* and *Butte*). Kiliaan mentions *botte* next to *butte*. North Hollandish has *bodde* ‘fishing net’ (Boekenoogen 2004).

dot, *dod* ‘fool’, bedodden > *bedotten, bedutten* ‘to fool’; also *dutten* ‘to sleep briefly’. The Modern Dutch forms are probably due to contamination of two Middle Dutch roots, *dodden* ‘to fool’ and MDu. *dutten* ‘to rage’ beside *doten* ‘to be mad’. They go back to PGm. *dudd-* and *dutt-*, respectively, but it is unclear which Middle Dutch forms may have had *i*-mutation.

genot ‘enjoyment’ < *ga-nuta-. Always with a back vowel.

god ‘god’ < *guda-. Due to the obvious influence of church language, the fact that this word has a back vowel everywhere tells us nothing. But the interjection *gut!* ‘my!’, attested in Hollandish texts from the early seventeenth century onwards, is clearly the same word as *god*. This is especially clear from the expressions *by gut!* ‘by God!’ (Coster, Bredero), *begut*! (Huygens).

lot ‘lot’ (OE *hlot*) < *xluta-. In Middle Dutch it is also found with lengthened vowel as *loet*, DAT.SG. *loet*. Always with a back vowel in all varieties of Dutch.

modder, *moder* ‘mud’ < *mudra-. In modern dialects, *modder* is not attested with front vowels (GTRP), but Boekenoogen 2004 mentions *mudder* for North Holland. Flemish and Zealandish use heteronyms such as *moor(e), moos(e)* and *goor(e)*.

mot ‘moth’ < *muþþan-/-þon- (OE *moþþe*, MoHG *Motte*). Generally *mot* in Flanders, but *mat* in North Holland (Boekenoogen 2004: 321). No fronting is attested.

otter ‘otter’ < *utra-. A back vowel in Flanders, Zealand and Holland and in all literary attestations.

pot ‘pot’ < Gallo-Romance *pottu*. All modern dialects have a short back vowel, mostly [*ə*] (GTRP).

schot ‘shot’, geschot ‘arrow, artillery’, MDu. *geschot, gen. jscoets* < *ga-skuta* (MLG *geschot, geschōt*, OHG *giscoz*). The word is closely cognate with *geschutte* < *gaskutja-, see above. Probably, some of the <*u>-forms of the latter entry represent unconditioned fronting of *geschot*, rather than reflexes of *geschutte*. See also s.v. *scheut* ‘pouring’ in § 15.2.3, A.3.

geschot ‘polder tax’ < *skuta-. In Early Middle Dutch it is only found with <*o* and lengthened <*oe*> in West Flanders and Zealand. The simplex *schot* ‘partition, tax’ has <*o*> in western Early Middle Dutch.

slooderen ‘to hang down (of clothes), spill’, a frequentative to *sloden*. The etymological connections are uncertain, but the reconstruction *sludd-* seems safe. Always with <*o*> in western Dutch.
slot ‘lock’ < *sluta-. All modern dialects have a short back vowel, except for the productive fronting area in Groningen (GTRP).

snot ‘snot, mucus’ < *snutta(n)-. Middle Dutch has snot (in all vocabularies) beside snotte (in Yperman’s Cyruргie from 1351). The variant snot only occurs in Kiliaan’s snutdoeck, snuttfdoeck ‘handkerchief’, which may have been influenced by the verb snuiten. Modern Zealandish has snot(te), as do Flemish and North Hollandish.

spot ‘spot; mockery’ < *sputt-. See de Vaan 2014a for the etymological connection of the synchronically different lexemes MDu. spot ‘mockery’ (OHG OS spot, OIC. spott n.) and Flemish spotte ‘stain, spot’ (MoE spot, OIC. spotti ‘small part’). Within the nominal framework proposed by Kroonen 2011: 267–96, we can reconstruct a PGm. n-stem with nom.sg. *spūþō, gen.sg. *sputtaz, from which Dutch generalized the intervocalic *-tt-. The a-stem was secondarily derived from the gen. sg. *sputtaz or the gen.pl. *sputtan of the original n-stem, cf. Kroonen 2011: 60. The word spot ‘stain’ survives in Zeeuws Flanders spot ‘humid stain in clothing’ (WZD 916). No <u>-forms are attested.

strot ‘throat’ < *strut(t)ō(n)-. The different Germanic variants were derived from an n-stem paradigm nom.sg. *strutō, gen.sg. *struttaz (Kroonen 2011: 295–6). Many dialects, particularly in Brabant but also in Zealand, have a lengthened vowel in open syllable: strote, stroot. In Flanders, one would expect metathesis into storte, but this lexeme has been replaced by keel in nearly all dialects (Belemans/Goossens 2000: 216).

vlot ‘raft’, ‘quick’ < *fluta-. Only <o>-vocalism.

zot ‘mad’, a loanword from Old French sot. This is a southern Dutch word which replaced earlier door (G. Tor) < *dauza- which is retained is some areas. Only o-vocalism is attested.

zodde ‘wetland’ < *suddō- ‘broth’ (MLG sudde ‘moor’, MoWF sodde, sodze ‘moorish ground’, MoHG sutte ‘pool’). The variant sudde is found in Kiliaan and with Early Modern Dutch authors from Holland, and rietzudde ‘rushes surrounding a piece of land’ in North Hollandish (Boekenoogen 2004).

4. s(s)

bos ‘bush’ beside bus < *buski-/an-. Early MDu. busc(h), probably with a front vowel, is found in West Flanders and Holland, cf. Berteloot 1984a, Map 62. According to Map 1 in Taeldeman 1971: 259, the modern dialects of French Flanders and almost all of West Flanders have bus. In Zealand, WZD gives mostly bos but bus in Zuid-Beveland. To the east of this area, we find bos. This distribution is confirmed by the GTRP data, but Boekenoogen 2004 also claims co-occurrence of bos and bus in North Holland.

drost, drossaard ‘steward’ < ODu. *druxti-sāтан- < WGm. *druxti-sēt-an-. Early Middle Dutch forms are Flemish and Hollandish drussate, Brabantish drossate, Limburgian dru/ossete. Syncope led to the modern standard form droste > drost. Where apocope preceded syncope (i.e., drossate > drossat), possibly in the
nominative and accusative singular, folk etymology replaced the suffix by \textit{-aard} after 1500. No modern <\textit{u}>-forms are attested for \textit{drost}.

\textit{dus} ‘thus’ < WGm. \textit{*þus} (OS \textit{thus}, OFri. \textit{thus}, OE \textit{p}us). Early Middle Dutch has (\textit{al})\textit{dus} in Holland, Flanders and, occasionally, in eastern dialects, but systematically (\textit{al})\textit{dos} in West Brabant. Although the latter form may actually represent a front vowel, the Germanic cognates show no sign of \textit{i}-mutation. It is therefore more likely that western \textit{dus} is due to unconditioned fronting of an original back vowel.

\textit{kosten} ‘to cost’ from Romance \textit{costâre}. No forms with a front rounded vowel are attested in literary Dutch. North Hollandish \textit{kusten} ‘to settle the bill’ (Boekenoogen 2004, Pannekeet 1984) may be denominal to \textit{kust} ‘cost, bill’ in the same dialect.

\textit{kust} ‘coast’ from Old French \textit{coste} ‘side; region’, compare English \textit{coast}. MDu. has \textit{coste}, Kiliaan \textit{koste}, \textit{kuste}, but we always find \textit{kust} in literary texts after 1500. West Flemish dialects have \textit{kuste}.

\textit{los} ‘lynx’ < *\textit{luxsa}-. The word is hardly attested in Middle Dutch. In Modern Dutch, we find forms such as \textit{losch}, \textit{lochts} and plural \textit{losschen}, but the word is not attested widely enough to draw any conclusions for the vocalism.

\textit{lust} ‘lust’ < *\textit{lustu}-. Whether Early MDu. \textit{lust} beside \textit{lost} (Limburg, 1240) and WBrab. \textit{lost} reflect a form without umlaut is uncertain. The occurrences of \textit{lost} in various Brabantish and Hollandish texts from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (\textit{MNW}) strongly suggest a back vowel /\textit{ɔ}/. Kiliaan has \textit{lost} beside \textit{lust}. \textit{WNT} mentions a number of authors with \textit{lost} in the sixteenth and seventeenth century, though their regional appurtenance is not always clear. In any case, it seems that non-umlauted \textit{lost} may have been the regular inland Dutch form, whereas \textit{lust} arose in coastal Dutch, either from unconditioned fronting, or taking its \textit{u} from \textit{lusten} ‘to lust, please’ < *\textit{lustjan}.

\textit{mossel} ‘mussel’ beside \textit{mussel}, from Romance *\textit{muscula} ‘little mouse’. In modern dialects, French Flanders and western West Flanders have /\textit{œ}/ (\textit{GTRP}; Taeldeman 1971: 259, Map 1; \textit{FAND} I, Map 90).

\textit{mos} ‘moss’ < *\textit{musa(n)}-. We find a back vowel in all dialects and all periods of Dutch.

\textit{most} ‘must’ < Latin \textit{mustum}. Always \textit{most} in coastal Dutch texts and dialects. The same goes for \textit{mosterd} ‘musterd’, a borrowing from Old French \textit{mostarde}.

\textit{os} ‘ox’, MDu. \textit{osse} < PGm. *\textit{uxsan}-. No front vowels are attested in modern dialects (\textit{GTRP}).

\textit{post} ‘post, pole’, MDu. \textit{post}, a loanword from Latin \textit{postis}. Probably borrowed as an \textit{a}-stem, as there is no trace of \textit{i}-mutation anywhere in West Germanic. All Dutch forms have a back vowel.

\textit{vos} ‘fox’ < *\textit{fuxsa}- (OHG \textit{fuhs}, OS \textit{fohs}, OE \textit{fox}). Always <\textit{o}> in all stages of the literary language. Also /\textit{o}/ or /\textit{ɔ}/ in all dialects. The assimilation of *\textit{xs} to \textit{ss}, which took place in this word, can be dated to ca. 1000 CE for Flemish.
5. k.g.ch

\( \text{be)} \text{drog} \) ‘deceit’ < \*\text{drug}a-, MDu. \text{gedrog} ‘monster’. No \text{u} -forms are attested.

\( \text{blok} \) ‘block’ < \*\text{bluk}ka-. No fronted forms are attested.

\( \text{bochel} \) ‘hump’ < \*\text{bug}la/-\text{o}-. First attested as \text{boechel} with \text{/u/} in Kiliaan’s dictionary (1599). Spelling variants include \text{buchel} (Oudaan), \text{buchgel} (Heinsius, 1695), \text{bugchel} (Comenius, \text{Deure der Talen}, 1642), all in books edited in Amsterdam. The noun seems to be absent from Flemish and Zealandish, but these dialects have the verb \text{buchelen}, \text{buggelen} ‘to cough constantly; to do hard work, toil’ (WZD 147–48; de Bo 1892: 170), which may well be derived from \text{buchel} ‘hunch-back’. This verb is already attested in Kiliaan, viz. as \text{buchelen}, \text{boechelen}, \text{buechelen}.

\( \text{bok} \) ‘he-goat’ beside \( \text{buk} \) < \*\text{buk}ka-. Early MDu. \text{buc} in Flanders and West Brabant. For modern dialects, see Taellement 1971: 266, Map 8 and \text{FAND} I, Map 93. \text{Buk} has a front rounded vowel in West Flanders and most of French Flanders, and used to have \text{u} in an adjacent small part of East Flanders as well. In the \text{GTRP} dataset, \text{buk} has been ousted from East Flanders.

\( \text{brok} \) ‘chunk’ < \*\text{bruk(k)}a(n)-. West Flemish \text{brokke}. No fronted forms attested.

\( \text{juk} \) ‘yoke’ < \*\text{juka}- is a Hollandish form beside \( \text{jok} \) in other dialects, such as Flemish and Zealandish.

\( \text{klok} \) ‘clock’, MDu. \text{clocke}, is a loanword from Old Irish \text{clocc}, which may have entered the continental Germanic languages via Old English. The \text{GTRP} database shows a short back vowel \text{/ɔ/} or \text{/o/} in all Dutch dialects.

\( \text{kok} \) ‘cook’ < WGM. \*\text{koka}- < Latin \text{cocus}. Some dialects have generalized \text{kokk} from the oblique case forms. No front vocalism was found.

\( \text{log} \) ‘slow, plump’ < \*\text{lugga}-. The adjective is only attested in Modern Dutch. Theoretically, the toponym \text{Lugghevorde} in West Flanders in the thirteenth century could also belong here, as could Flemish \text{lugge}, \text{logge} ‘disease of grain’ (de Bo 1892: 572; first attested in 1700 as \text{lugge} in a spell against the rot in wheat), although this remains uncertain for semantic reasons. Kiliaan and Plantin have the verb \text{lugg(h)en} ‘to be lazy, to lug’. If the verb was primary, then the \text{u}-vocalism in the adjective might have been taken from the verb. The verb itself could have \text{i}-mutation (if from \*\text{luggjan}-) or unconditioned fronting.

\( \text{lok} \) ‘tuft, lock (of hair)’ < \*\text{lukka}- (Kroonen 2013: 343) beside \*\text{luka}- . MDu. \text{loke}, dial. also \text{loke}. No fronted forms appear.

\( \text{lokken} \) ‘to entice’ < \*\text{lukkôn}. No front-vowel forms occur.

\( \text{nog} \) ‘still, yet’ < WGM. \*\text{nu}x. No front vowels are attested. Of course, the un-stressed status which this word often has makes it conceivable that its \text{o} would develop differently from a stressed vowel.

\( \text{plug} \) ‘prop, peg’ < \*\text{pluggan}- (MLG \text{plugge}). Groningen has \text{plog(ge)} without \text{i}-mutation. The word \text{plugg(h)e} in Plantin and Kiliaan is followed by general literary \text{plug} in Modern Dutch texts. West Flemish also has \text{plugge} with a front vowel
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(de Bo 1892), whereas plogge is reported for Zierikzee in Zealand by WNT. North Hollandish pleghout ‘wooden peg in a plane’ (Boekenoogen 2004) looks like a local unrounded variant of *plughout.

pluk ‘bundle’, pluk ‘tuft’. Pluk is derived from the verb plukken ‘to pick’. Teuthonista’s plock, the first attestation in Dutch, is congruent with the preterite plocht which the verb often has in modern southeastern Dutch. Zealandish plok(ke) has the same vowel as the verb does in parts of Zealand and Holland.

pok ‘blotch, blister’ < *pukkō- and *pukka- (MLG pokke, Early MoHG pfoche ‘botch’ vs. MHG pfoch ‘purse’, OE pocca ‘purse’ vs. pocc ‘botch’). Middle Dutch pocke, Kiliaan pocke, pockele, and pok in all Modern Dutch literature. In South Brabantish dialects also poek. In the meaning ‘small child, small animal’ the form puk is widespread in Hollandish.

pukkel ‘pimple’, pokkel ‘hump’, derived from MDu. pocke ‘blotch, blister’ < *pukkVla- (MoHG Pickel). The earliest Dutch attestation is from 1567. Kiliaan has “puckel i.e. pocket.” Pokkel ‘hump’ is known in all dialects, including all eastern ones, and must therefore be reconstructed without i-mutation factor. North Hollandish has pokkel (Boekenoogen 2004).

rog ‘ray’ (OE rohha) < *ruggō(n)-, compare the verb *rukk/ggōn- ‘to move to and fro, rock’ as reconstructed by Kroonen 2013: 417. MDu. rogge, Kiliaan roch, modern Flemish dialects roch(e), rog(ge). No fronting is attested at any stage of Dutch.

rogge ‘rye’ < *ruggan-, which existed beside PGm. *rugi- (whence MoE rye), see Kroonen 2013: 416–7. Many dialects have adopted the Standard Dutch word rogge. Where this does not seem to be the case, fronting is found in French Flanders and the northwestern half of West Flanders in /rœhə/, see Taeldeman 1971: 262, Map 6. The province of Antwerp sporadically has fronting to /rœga/. As against regularly apocopated /rsk/ in North Limburg, the south of Belgian Limburg has /rœgə/ with i-mutation and final schwa. Kroonen mentions Brabant reugel ‘rye’ < *rugiela- (WBD) which would confirm the erstwhile existence of *rugi- on Dutch soil.

rok ‘skirt’ < *rukka-. Modern dialects have a back vowel everywhere (except occasionally in Drente; GTRP).

schocken ‘to rock’ < *stukkōn- (Kroonen 2013: 450). No front vowels are attested.

slok ‘sip, gulp’, deverbal to slokken ‘to swallow’ < *slukkōn-. All dialects have a back vowel (with a few local exceptions), see the GTRP database.

spinrokken ‘distaff’, MDu. (spin)rock(e), Early MoDu. spinrock (OHG rocko, MoHG Rocken). Probable from WGM. *rukkōn- ‘rocker’ to the verb *rukkōn- ‘to rock’. The word has practically died out in Modern Dutch. No front vowel forms are attested.

sok ‘sock’, MDu. socke, a loanword from Latin soccus. No fronted forms occur in the western dialects.

stok ‘stick’ < *stukka-. All modern dialects have a back vowel /o/ or /ɔ/ (GTRP).
trog ‘trough’ < *truga- (Kroonen 2013: 523). MDu. trog, troch, pl. troghen with /oː/.
The standard plural is troggen, but we find a singular troog in Limburg. No front vowels occur in the modern dialects.

vlok ‘flake’, MDu. vlocke < *flukkan-. No front vowels are attested.

wrok ‘grudge’ either directly reflects WGM. *wruka- or is a more recent derivative to wreken ‘to avenge’. It is only attested from 1550 onwards, yet its appearance in proverbs and the existence of MLG wrok, wruk ‘hatred, grudge’ suggest that it is older. No front vowels are attested.

zog ‘mother’s milk; wake’ < *suga-, a productive derivative of zogen ‘to suck’. In oblique case forms we find MDu. soghe with open syllable lengthening. There are no variants with front vowels.

6. cht

bocht ‘bend, curve; enclosure’ < *buxti- (OE byht, MoE bight). The only form attested before 1500 is the Old Dutch toponym Buhtene (Limburg). Modern Dutch mostly has a back vowel but several West Flemish dialects and Zeelandish have bucht (WZD).

bocht ‘dirt, bad weeds, etc.’. If MHG bāht n. is the oldest form, we can reconstruct PGM. *banxta-, with a development *bōxt > bocht in Dutch as in brocht, bracht ‘brought’ (Franck & van Wijk 1912). Yet no good root etymology has been proposed for *banxta-. One could think of *bi-anxta- (compare *būtan from *bi-ūtan and similar formations), which could be a derivative of *ank- ‘complain’ or *ankw- ‘smear’. The word is given as bucht by de Bo (1892) and by several local dictionaries from Flanders, but it also occurs with a fronted vowel in eastern dialects, e.g. in Tienen (SE-Brabant) beucht. The latter seems to be an original plural; compare bócht ‘rubbish’ in the town of Weert, a plural form (Hermans et al. 1998: 47). Cornelissen & Vervliet (1899–1906) give bucht, beucht, boecht for Antwerp and the western Campine. In Limburg and southern Guelders, we generally find an o-vowel in the meaning ‘bad weeds’ (PLAND s.v. ’onkruid’). If MoDu. bocht ‘money, treasure; stuff’ is the same word, note that it is found as bucht already in Early Modern Dutch, e.g. with Anna Bijns (1548) and De Dene (1560), see WNT s.v. bocht-III.

dochter ‘daughter’ < *duxtar-. All modern dialects have a back vowel (GTRP).

kocht ‘bought’ < *kōxta < *kōfia has a back vowel in all modern dialects (GTRP).

lucht, locht ‘air’ < *luftu- (MoWF loft, OE lyft, MoE lift). Early Middle Dutch shows o in Brabant (10x) and Limburg (2x) but only u in West Flanders (81x). As Map 31 shows, modern eastern and south-central dialects to a large extent still have the back vowel /ɔ/, /o/ or /u/, viz. Antwerp, Vlaams Brabant, Limburg, Achterhoek, Overijssel, Drente and southern Groningen. Within the western and central area with a predominant front vowel, two relic areas with /ɔ/ can be distinguished, viz. northern Zealand and northern South Holland plus southern North Holland.
ochtend ‘morning’ beside uchtend < *uxt(w)ø-. Early MDu. nuhte (Cleves/Guelders), nuchtens ‘in the morning’ (Bruges). Kiliaan (1599) calls nuchte(n)(s) Hollandish, Flemish and Guelrish. Modern Flemish has nuchtend or another variant with a front rounded vowel (de Bo 1892; WZD), whereas northern Zealand has (n)och(t)end (WZD).

tocht ‘journey; draught’, tucht ‘discipline’ < *tuxt- ‘pulling’ (see § 7.2.1). In Modern Dutch, tocht and tucht have undergone semantic specialization: tucht has come to mean ‘discipline’, whereas tocht continues literal meanings that refer to ‘pulling’ (‘journey’, ‘draught’) or has become opaque (as in lijftocht ‘subsistence’). The meaning ‘discipline’ seems to have been influenced by German Bible translations (thus EWN), but the u-vocalism may have been supported by tuchtig ‘virtuous’. In the thirteenth century, there is a clear regional difference between tucht in Flanders versus tocht elsewhere, particularly also in Holland. Compare, for instance, the attestations of meentocht ‘community’ (-tucht in Flanders), lijftocht (-tucht in Ghent, -tocht elsewhere), ademtocht ‘breath’ (with u in WFla. but o in EBrab.) and borgtocht ‘bail’ (u in WFla., o in Holland). The consistent o-spellings in eastern dialects throughout the Middle Dutch period suggest that there was no i-mutation of this word. Hence, tucht in Flanders may be explained from unconditioned fronting of *u. Possibly, then, the survival of tucht as ‘discipline’ in Modern Dutch may lie in the regional origin of the works in which this term was spread in the sixteenth century.

vlucht ‘flight’ < *fluxti- ‘fleeing; flying’ (ODu. fluht, OFri. flecht, ME flyght). The single Early Middle Dutch instance of unrounding in vlecht (Liese Diatessaron,
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1291–1300) is tentatively regarded as a spelling error for *vlucht* by VMNW. In modern dialects, *vlocht* is found in the Achterhoek. The fronted vowel is spread more widely than in some other stems in *-xti-*, in particular, also in eastern dialects which would have regular *i*-mutation; but here *vlucht* may have been influenced by the verb *vluchten* ‘to flee’ < *fluxtjan-*. 

*vocht(e)* ‘fought’ (<< earlier *vachte*) has a back vowel in all modern dialects (GTRP). *zucht* ‘disease’ < *suxti-* (OS *suht*, OHG *suht*, OE *suht*; but OFri. *sechte*, *siochte*, MoWF *sjocht* < *seuxt-*). In the thirteenth century, the Life of Lutgart ms. K (WBrab.) writes *socht* but Der Natueren Bloeme ms. D (WFla.) consistently has *sucht*. The Gloss. Bern. (Limb., 1240) has *blutsogt* ‘dissintheria’, *hantsoech* ‘cyragra’ and *uoet sogoht* ‘podagra’. Whereas the *o*-spellings from Brabant and Limburg are ambiguous, for Flanders we may assume a front vowel /œ/. In Modern Dutch after 1600, the spelling *s/zucht* prevails, the vocalism of which may have been influenced by the verb *zuchten* ‘to sigh’. In the modern language, *zucht* ‘disease’ has been replaced by its synonym *ziekte*.

8. **mC and nC**

Before *m*:

*brommen* ‘to murmur’ < *brumm-*. Unattested in Middle Dutch. *WNT* mentions that the word previously also occurred as *brummen*, but the attestations are from eastern Dutch and may therefore represent a back vowel, viz. Theuthonista (1477) *brummen*.

*dom* ‘dumb, stupid’ < PGm. *dumba-*. MDu. *domp*, inflected *domme*, MoDu. *dom*. Always a back vowel in modern dialects, with /u/ in the Brabantish area which frequently has /u/ before nasals where Standard Dutch has /ø/.

*drommen, drummen* ‘to throng’. MDu. mostly has *dromen* ‘to throng, insist, chase’, also *drommen*, with a derivative *drummere* ‘pilar’ in Ghent. Early MoDu. *dromen* with a long vowel stands next to *drommen* (which is Flemish, according to Kiliaan) and *drommen*, mainly in Flemish and Hollandish sources. De Bo 1892 gives the verb as *drummen*, WZD has *drummen* for Walcheren and Zeeuwds Flanders and *drommen* elsewhere. Most likely, *drommen* reflects shortening of MDu. /o:/ before *m* (see § 17.2.3 below), followed by fronting in Flanders to *drommen*. MDu. *dromen* has been derived from *prumi-* ‘crowd’ (see s.v. *drom* in § 15.3.2, A.7), but it is more attractive to connect OS *drōm* ‘mirth, noise’, OE *drēam* ‘joy, jubilation’, MDu. *drom* ‘crowd’ < *drauma-*. This word may derive from PGM. *draugma-* ‘host, group’ to the verb *dreugan-‘to join a band, do a duty’ (Kroonen 2013: 102, Seebold 1970: 167). Whether *dromen* ‘to throng’ continues *u* or *au* could be decided by modern dialect variants, but the word is not very reliably described. For West Flemish, de Bo
1892 lists *drum, drom, druim, droom, dreum* for ‘a dense crowd’, of which the variants *druim* and *dreum* are more compatible with *drauma*-.. In any case, the word cannot be used as certain evidence for the reflex of short *u*.

*gom* ‘gum’ from French *gomme*. The GTRP database shows an interesting distribution. A front rounded vowel is found in many of the northeastern dialects, in Limburg and in East Brabant, but only down to the state boundary with Belgium. In Belgium, all dialects have a back vowel. No doubt this distribution was influenced by the presence of *gum* in Standard Dutch of the Netherlands versus *gom* in Belgium. It is therefore striking that almost all of the western dialects of the Netherlands have a back vowel too, viz. Zealand, Holland and Utrecht. Only here and there do we find *gum*.

*kom* ‘bowl, valley’ < *kumbō-. No front vowels in modern dialects (GTRP).

*krom* ‘crooked’ beside *krum* < PGm. *krumba-*. Fronting is rare in historical texts. In modern dialects, the usual form is /krɔm/. Only a small area in southwestern Brabant and adjacent southeastern Flanders has *krum, kreum*, with unrounding to *krim* in the productively unrounding areas (Taeldeman 1971: 267 Map 16; GTRP database; FAND I, Map 104).

*lomp* ‘rag’, ‘rude, clumsy’ < *lumpa-*. It has a back vowel in all regions, with high /u/ in South Brabant, southern and western Antwerp, and *passim* in West Flanders (GTRP).

*nummer* ‘number’, a loanword from Old French *nombre*. MDu. *nomber* and *nommer*, Early MoDu. also *nomber*. The first attestation of *nummer* dates from 1697 (van Yk, *De Nederlandsche Scheepsbouwkonst*, Delft). Only in the course of the nineteenth century is *nommer* gradually replaced by *nummer* in literary texts (WNT). In modern dialects, the back vowel is still usual in the south: *noember* in South and West Antwerp, *noemer* in all traditional Zealandish dialects (WZD). Limburgian generally has *nómmer*. In Flanders, the word has been modified according to later French forms, giving *numer* or *noemeroo*. This means that *nummer* must have arisen in Holland or North Brabant.

*pomp* ‘pump’, probably a loanword from French, has no front vowel in any modern dialect. A high back vowel /u/ is found in South Brabant and in some West Flemish dialects (GTRP).

*som* ‘sum’, a loanword from French *somme*. It has back vowel in all modern dialects (GTRP).

MDu. *som* ‘some’ beside *sum*, MoDu. *sommige* ‘some’, *soms* ‘sometimes’ < PGm. *suma-*. Early MDu. *sum(-)* is found sporadically in Flanders and Brabant. No *u*-forms occur in Modern Dutch.

*stom* ‘mute; stupid’ < *stumma-*. ‘mute’ always has a back vowel, usually between /ɔ/ and /ʊ/, but /a/ in Vlaams-Brabant and southern Antwerp.

*stomp* ‘blunt’ < *stumpa-.* No front vowels are attested.
Before \(n(n)\):

*begon(-de, -ste)* ‘started’, preterite of *beginnen*. The *GTRP* database shows a front rounded vowel in the northeast (Overijssel, Drente, parts of Groningen) and in French and southwest Flanders. The latter dialects have *behu(n)ste* or *behunde*, whereas the northeast shows *begunde*, *begunne* and *begun*. Most of these dialects, however, also have /œ/ in the present of ‘to start’. Hence, the preterite vocalism does not necessarily stem from fronting of *\(\textit{o}\)*.

*non* ‘nun’, a loanword from Old French *nonne*. For Zealand, *WZD* gives *nonne*, whereas many West Flemish dialects have *nunne* (also in *nunnehouse* ‘clavicula’ in *de Bo* 1892). In Leiden there is the *Nummen brugghe* ‘Nuns’ bridge’ (1641). For North Holland, *Boekenoogen* (2004: 348) mentions that both *non* and *nun* occur.

*ton* ‘barrel’, a loanword from Old French *tonne* or a similar Romance word. Old forms are Late ODu. *tunna* and the diminutive *tunnekin* (WFLa., 1295). In modern dialects, we find a fronted vowel in French and West Flanders, on Walcheren, Beveland, Duiveland and on Goedereede (*Taeldeman* 1971: 190, 261, Map 3; *GTRP*). The other dialects all have a back vowel.

*zon* ‘sun’ beside *zun(ne)* < *sunnō(n)*. Early Middle Dutch shows only one *u*-spelling in West Flanders as against usual *zonne*. In modern dialects, *zunne* is found throughout French and West Flanders, and in central and northern Zealand.

Before \(nT\):

*blond* ‘blond’ < Old French *blond*, *blund*. Old Dutch *Blunde* (PN), MDu. *blont*, *blonde*. No front vowel forms in modern dialects.

*bond* ‘bond, bundle’ < *bundi-. No front vowels are attested.

*donder* ‘thunder’ < *þunra-, donderdag* ‘Thursday’. Early MDu. *dunredach* occurs in West Flanders, cf. *Berteloot* 1984a, Map 143. For ‘thunder’ in modern dialects, *GTRP* shows a front rounded vowel in French and West Flanders and central parts of Zealand, as well as in Groningen and northern Drente. For Flanders see also *Taeldeman* 1971: 261, Map 3. In ‘Thursday’, the fronting is distributed in modern coastal Dutch dialects in the same way as in *donder*.

*(ge)zond* ‘healthy’ < *(ga-)sunda- ‘being, alive’. No front vowel forms are attested.

*grond* ‘ground’ < *grundu-*(Kroonen 2013: 192). We only find back vowels.

*gunst*, southern Dutch *jonst* ‘favour’ < *ga-unsti-. Early MDu. *gunst* (Limburg), *ghonste* (Brabant), and *jo(e)nst(e)* (in western texts). In *CRM14*, *gonst(e)* is found in Overijssel, East Brabant and Limburg, *jonste* in IJsselstein, Ghent and Brussels, and *gunst(e)* in some towns in Central and East Brabant.
and Southwest Limburg. In modern dialects, West Flemish has junste or jeunste, East Flemish jonste. Obviously, the noun may have been influenced by the verb ‘to grant’, which is still jnnen, jeunen in West Flemish. For northern g- in gunst, this influence is even clearer, as its g- is due to restoration of *ge- (see § 9.3 for *ga- > *je-). The simplex is reflected in MDu. onst(e) which was lost from Modern Dutch.

hond ‘dog’ < *xunda-. No front vowels occur in Modern Dutch. French and West Flanders generally have /u/ (GTRP).

honderd < *xund-rada- ‘row of hundred’. The Early Middle Dutch instances of hun- in eastern and northern texts may indicate /u/, cf. Berteloot 1984a, Map 68. In modern dialects, we find ondert or (h)oendert in Zealand and West Flanders. Only back vowels are found.

kunst, MDu. const(e) ‘art’ < *kunsti-. MDu. o and MoDu. u can be explained from influence of the verb connen > kunnen. Hence, the distribution in this word does not provide reliable evidence for the Old Dutch reflexes of *u.

mond ‘mouth’ < *munþa-. No front vowels in modern dialects (GTRP).

plunderen ‘to pillage’ beside plonderen < *plund- (cf. MDu. plundware, MLG plunde ‘small furniture; rags’). West Flemish has plunteren (de Bo 1892). Kiliaan (1599) has plunder, plonder ‘rags, small furniture’ and plunderen beside plunteren ‘to pillage’. For ‘rags’, we find a sg. plun in North Holland (already in the 18th century, e.g. in plunzak ‘bag for clothes’ in 1730) and plonedeke, plongske ‘ragged hat’ in West Flanders. In the western Dutch literature of the seventeenth century, plunder(en) is the most frequent variant, replaced by plunder(en) only after 1800. It appears that front vocalism arose in several places independently.

rond ‘round’ from French ronde. It has a back vowel in all modern dialects, with [u] in French and West Flanders (GTRP).

slons ‘slut’, no clear etymology. Maybe it is cognate with Modern Swedish (dial.) slunta ‘to loiter’, MoHG (dial.) schlunzen ‘id.’. The Middle Dutch form would have been *slonze. French and West Flanders and some western dialects of East Flanders have [slœ:(n)sə], which shows unconditioned vowel fronting (GTRP).

stond ‘stood’. In 1641, we find stunt in a description of the town of Leiden; otherwise, the word generally has a back vowel.

stonde ‘time, moment’ < *stundō- (MoHG Stunde ‘hour’). Early MDu. stonde and stont, eastern stunt with /u/. After ca. 1650, Early MoDu. stont disappears from active usage except in literary senses such as morgenstond ‘early morning’.

zondag ‘Sunday’. Fronting is found in the same Flemish areas as with the simplex zon ‘sun’, but not in Zealand (GTRP). We also find zundag with a front vowel in archaic South Holland dialects and in large parts of North Holland,
which have a back vowel in ‘sun’. This accords well with the front (but lengthened) vowel of Bredero’s *Seundaaghs* ‘on Sundays’. See also *FAND* I, Map 100.

*zonder* ‘without; except’ < *sundar*. Only three South Holland dialects, viz. De Lier, Gouderak and Ameide, show a front rounded vowel in the *GTRP* database.

**Before nK:**

*donker* ‘dark’ < *dunkra*- (Kroonen 2013: 119). No fronted realizations in the *GTRP* database.

*dronk* ‘drink’ < *drunki*- . Only back vowels are attested.

*drunken* ‘drunk’ < *drunkana*- . Early Middle Dutch has *drunken* in Limburg and Brabant versus *dronkin* in Flanders. Maybe the original participle was replaced by an *in*-adjective in Flanders. For the vowel in the past participle ‘drunk’ in Flanders, see Taeldeman 1971: 268, Map 18, which shows [u] in West Flanders and Brabant versus [u] in East Flanders. No front vowels are attested.

*honger* ‘hunger’ < *xungru*- . No front vowels in Modern Dutch, generally /u/ in French and West Flanders (*GTRP*).

*jong* ‘young’ < *junga*- . In eastern Early Middle Dutch we have *jung*, cf. Berteloott 1984a, Map 70. No front vowels occur in modern dialects, and French and West Flanders generally have /u/ (*GTRP*).

*tong* ‘tongue’ < *tungō(n)*- . All modern dialects have a back vowel (*GTRP*).

*vonk* ‘spark’ < *funkan* -m., see Kroonen 2013: 160. Generally *vonke* in Middle Dutch and *vonk* in the modern literary language. The dialects of Brabant and Limburg show *vonk* or *voenk* (*WBD, WLD*), whereas in Zealandish, *voenke* is being replaced by *vonke* (*WZD*). In Flanders, *vonk(e)* has largely been replaced by heteronyms.

9. 1(C)

*bol* ‘globe’ < *bullan- < *bulnan*- . The *GTRP* database has no front vowel occurrences.

*bul* ‘bull’ < *bul(l)an*- (Kroonen 2013: 83). Already attested in the twelfth century in the Flemish toponyms *Bulleskamp* and *Bulscamp*. The PN *Ihan die bul* in Saaftinge (EFla.) in 1293 may well have a front vowel. Kiliaan has *bolle* and *bulle*. Early Modern Dutch literature from both Holland and Flanders generally has *bul(le)*. For modern dialects, Map 1.15 of *TNZN* gives the variants of ‘male bovine’. A reflex of *bul(l)an*- is found in most of the northern provinces. This is *bul* in South and North Holland (the front vowel is confirmed for earlier centuries by toponyms, see Boekenoogen 2004: 79), the island of Texel and all of Utrecht, and *bol* or *bolle* in all dialects east of the Veluwe and north of the Rhine. Fryslân, too, has *bolle*. The absence of data from Zealand and Flanders on the map is strange. *WZD* 148 gives *bul* ‘bull’ for Zuid-Beveland, western Zeeuws Flanders and Goeree, and
metaphoric *bul* ‘a strong guy’ for all of Zealandish. In West Flemish, *bullig* refers to a cow that has become infertile and may be vicious like a bull (de Bo 1892: 174).

MDu. *abolghe* ‘ire, wrath’ < *ā-bulūgī-. In Old High German, the neuter *ābulgi* and the feminine *ābulgī* are both attested (Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 §201 Anm.1). In the thirteenth century, MDu. *abolghe* is only attested in literary texts from Brabant, and, in at least part of the cases, as a feminine. In later Middle Dutch we always find the spelling with *o*, and MoDu. *oubollig* ‘droll, corny’, which has developed out of Early MoDu. *abolgig*, also always has *o*. If it was an original *ī*-stem, *i*-mutation is expected in all forms of the paradigm. Since that does not seem to be the case, the noun may have shifted to a different stem type, or its vocalism was influenced by the verb ODu. *irbelgan* ‘to get angry’ (WPs.).

From the same root *belg*- is derived MoDu. *verbolgen* ‘angry’, the strong participle of MDu. *belgen* ‘to swell, make angry’. Its participle *verbulgen* is attested in the play *Josep ende Maria* by the Haarlem rhetoric chamber of the sixteenth century. A derived verb is MDu. *bulgen* ‘to swell’ < *bulgjan-, with the noun *bulge* ‘a swelling’. Both words are only attested in Hollandish literature, but *bulghen* (Jan van Boendale, Antwerp, 1330) ‘to expectorate’ may well be the same verb as ‘to swell’. In the meaning ‘billow’, Kiliaan calls *bulghe*, *bolghe* Frisian and Saxon words. The verb is attested in modern North Hollandish as *bulge* ‘to bulge’, and in modern Zealandish *bulgen* (pl.) refer to the intestines of animals (WZD).

*bolster* ‘husk’, in Middle Dutch also *bouster*, beside *bulster* ‘pallet, straw mattress’ < *bulstra(n)-* (cf. MoHG *Polster* ‘pillow’; Kroonen 2013: 84). The variants *bolster* and *bulster* were both known to Kiliaan, who treats *bolster* as the normal form and *bulster* as a variant. In Early Modern Dutch literature, there already seems to be a semantic differentiation between *bolster* ‘husk’ and *bulster* ‘pallet’ (according to the presentation in WNT), but all attestations with *u* are found in Hollandish authors whereas no regional restriction applies to *bolster*. *Bulster* ‘pallet’ with a front vowel is also found in West Flemish dialects (de Bo 1892: 175), and the adjective ‘puffy, bloated’ has both variants *bulsteraächtig* and *bolsteraächtig* according to de Bo (1892: 142). It follows that fronting was not restricted to Hollandish. The word is not mentioned in dictionaries of modern North Hollandish. The verb *bolsteren* ‘to peel, remove the husk’ is found in Kiliaan, and also in modern Zealandish *bolsteren* ‘to weed’ (WZD).

dol*’mad*’ beside *dul* < *dula*- (OE *dol*, OHG *tol*, MoHG *toll*). The adjective generally has a front vowel in modern dialects of French and West Flanders, northern East Flanders, and in some dialects of southern Zealand. All central, northern and eastern dialects have a (usually short) back vowel, with the exception of Limburg, where a front vowel */ø/, sometimes lengthened to */ø:/, is concentrated in the east and south of the area. The vowel lengthening in the adjective is normal for these Limburgian dialects (it was generalized from the oblique case forms of the paradigm). The fronting, however, is surprising. The lengthening in Limburg precludes an stem variant
*dulja-*, which would have always had a short vowel. The same argument can be made against an explanation of the front vowel as taken from the Limburgian verb *verdullen* ‘to dazzle’. Dialectal /dø:l/- may alternatively reflect *dwela-* ‘confused, erring’, with the occasional rounding of *e* or *i* after *Cw*, as in *swestar > zuster* ‘sister’, *twisk- > tusschen* ‘between’ and *swelk- > zulk* ‘such’. Beside PGm. *dwala-* and *dwula-* ‘foolish’ (Heidermanns 1993: 169–70), *dwela-* may have been derived secondarily from the verb MDu. *dwellen, dwalen*, MoDu. *dwalen* (MLG *dwelen*, OS *fordwelan*) ‘to err’ < PGm. *dwelan-*, cf. Kroonen 2013: 112.

dol ‘thole’ < *pulla-*, MDu. *dolle*. A dat.pl. *dolle* is found in Dordrecht in 1286. Kiliaan has *dolle* as a Saxon, Guerlrish and Hollandish word. Generally it is *dol* in literary Modern Dutch. Along the West Flemish coast we find *dolle* in modern dialects (WVD).

geduld ‘patience’ < *ga-puldi-*. MDu. *ghedout* next to *gedolt* points to the absence of *i*-mutation. Modern dialects, also in the east, have /œl/, but the sequence *ul* could be restored any time from the adj. *geduldig* ‘patient’ and the verb *dulden* ‘to bear, tolerate’.

hol ‘den, hollow’ < *xula-*. Modern fronting is attested very sporadically in Drente and northern Overijssel (Tubbergen), and more consistently in southeastern Limburg, with a lengthened vowel, such as /oː/. (GTRP; FAND I, Map 81). The latter vocalism will reflect a preform *xulī-*, cf. German *Höhle* ‘a hollow’. In eastern South Holland and western Utrecht, the toponym *heul* ‘opening in a dike; bridge’ occurs (MDu. *hôle, huele, heule*), from which the modern surname *Verheul* in eastern South Holland derives. The noun *heul* is explained by the etymological dictionaries from regular *i*-mutation in *xulī-*. It is conceivable, however, that it represents a western form, Early MDu. */hoːlə* from *xula-* in the oblique cases, which underwent unconditioned fronting.

hol ‘hollow’ adj. < *xula-*. No relevant fronted forms occur in the GTRP database.

knol ‘thick root’, originally ‘knoll’ < *knullan-*. First attested in the sixteenth century. To Kiliaan, *knolle* for ‘turnip’ is Frisian, Guerlrish, and Hollandish. For the back vowel in modern dialects of Brabant and Limburg, see PLAND s.v. *knolraap* ‘turnip’. No front vowels are attested.

kolf ‘butt; flask’ < *kulban-*, MDu. *kolve*. Modern West Flemish has *kolve* ‘fist’. No front vowels are attested.

kolk ‘pool, eddy; well’ < *kulka-*. The word is mainly northern Dutch. We find *culck* in the Informacie of Holland of 1514 and *kulc* in the Delft Keurboek of 1545, and *u* in a few other Hollandish sources. Most literary texts have *o*-vocalism, as does modern North Hollandish (Boekenoogen 2004). Because it is a microtoponym, the word is also well represented in family names. *Kolk* is concentrated in Overijssel and Drente, whereas *Kulk* is mostly found on the South Hollandish coast and on Texel. *Van de Kolk* is especially frequent in Gelderland and *Van der Kolk* in Overijssel,
but also in western parts of the Netherlands. Other eastern forms are Kolkman (Achterhoek, Overijssel) and Modderkolk on the Veluwe. The names confirm that *kulk* was a (South) Hollandish variant.

*krul* ‘curl’ < *krulla*-ADJ, *krullō-/–an- noun. See FAND I, Map 120, for the modern dialect variants. The provinces of Antwerp, Flemish Brabant and all of Limburg have a back vowel /o/ or /ɔ/, as is expected from the preform without *i*-mutation factor. All other Dutch dialects, viz. Flemish and nearly all dialects in the Netherlands except for Limburg, have a front rounded vowel, as in the standard language. The authors of FAND (p. 250) comment that the spread of /œ/ in the northeast all the way to the German border would be a remarkable case of Hollandish expansion, which is true; and indeed, it could alternatively be due to “dental mutation” (Hoekstra 2007) in the northeastern dialects. The dialect distribution is roughly confirmed by the surnames derived from the adjective, such as *Crul* in East Flanders and *Krul* in Holland and Overijssel vs. *Crol* in South Brabant and *Krol* in Fryslân and, generally, in the northeast. In Early Modern Dutch, *crol* and the verb *crollen* are found with a back vowel also in texts from Holland, and a few relics of *krol* are given by the FAND for North Holland and around Woerden. Boekenoogen 2004 mentions *krol* for a ‘hat with a colourful rim’, which used to be known in North Holland and which may have been called thus after the small curls of the astrakhan fabric. Thus, *krul(le)* may originally have been a southwestern word (Flanders, Zealand) more than a Hollandish one, although we already find the surname *Cruls soon* in Gouda in 1374.

*mol* ‘mole’ (the animal) < *mul(l)a(n)-*. No front vowels are attested at any stage of Dutch. See the Meertens Institute’s Kaartenbank for published and unpublished maps with the variants of *mol* in Dutch dialects.

*molm* ‘mould’ < *mulma-*. Kiliaan has *molm*, and in Late Middle Dutch legal texts from Holland we find *mollem*. In modern dialects I encountered a single fronted form *mulm* for Berlare (East Flanders). There is not enough evidence to draw conclusions.

*pols* ‘pulse, wrist’ < Lat. *pulsus*. Modern dialects show a back vowel everywhere, except for Roeselare, Ieper and Moorslede in southern West Flanders, which have /œ/ (GTRP). Whether this is an old fronting seems uncertain. Taeldeman (1971: 189) thinks that the area with a front vowel used to be larger, reaching to the northeast of Ghent.

*schol* ‘floe; plaice (a fish)’ < *skullōn-/-a-*. Early MDu. *sculle* (Limburg) probably has /u/, since a back vowel appears in MDu. *scolle*, MoDu. *schol(le)* in most dialects. A single fronted instance of *schullen* (pl.) ‘plaice’ occurs in a 1495 account from Rotterdam (MNW).

*solfer, sulfer* ‘sulphur’ from Old French *soulfre* > *soufre* or directly from Latin *sulfur*. In the thirteenth century, West Flemish *sulfer* in various sources already
indicates the fronting. *Sulfer* is also the usual form in Modern Dutch literary sources, but *solfer* and *zolfer* also occur, viz., in Flemish, Brabantish and Hollandish sources. In fact, WZD finds *solfer* on all Zealandish islands, in eastern Zeeuws Flanders, and on the South Hollandish islands of Goeree and Overflakkee, whereas *sulfer* is at home in Walcheren and western Zeeuws Flanders. West Flanders has *sulfer* (de Bo 1892: 975). Antwerp, South Brabant and Belgian Limburg have *solfer* with a back vowel.

*stulp* ‘hut, hovel’, *stolp* ‘bell jar’ < *stulpō- ‘cover*. Kiliaan has *stolpe* beside *stulpe* ‘fire cover’. The older Hollandish texts all have *stolp*, see also Boekenoogen 2004: 509 for North Holland. The word is not well enough attested outside Holland to warrant further discussion. Another word *stolp(e)* ‘short beam’ has gone out of use.

*vol* ‘full’ beside *vul* < *fulla-. In Early Middle Dutch, *vul* is usual in Flanders, Zealand, West Brabant, cf. Berteloot 1984a, Map 63. In Modern Dutch, a front vowel /œ/, /ø/ or /y/ is found in all of Flemish except for Waasland, in western Zeeuws Flanders, and in northern Twente (GTRP database).

*volgen* ‘to follow’ < *fulgēn- has a back vowel /o/ or /ɔ/ in all modern dialects (GTRP).

*volk* ‘people’ < *fulka-. A back vowel in all Dutch dialects, compare FAND I, Map 82.

*wol* ‘wool’ beside *wul(le) < *wullō-. Early MDu. *wulle* in Flanders, *wolle* in Brabant and Limburg; similarly, we find *wul(le)* in modern French Flemish, West Flemish and western East Flemish (GTRP; FAND I, Map 97).

*wolf* ‘wolf’ < *wulba-. Early MDu. *wulf* appears with a front vowel in West Flanders and in Ghent. In Modern Dutch, *wulf* is found in French Flanders and sporadically in West Flanders (GTRP, FAND I, Map 98). The distribution of the surnames *De Wulf* versus *De Wolf* shows that the palatalization used to occur further eastward: *De Wulf* dominates in all of West Flanders and in western East Flanders, up to and including Ghent. It may be assumed that StDu. *wolf* has recently replaced *wulf* as an apppellative in these regions (FAND I, p. 206, with map).

*wolk* ‘cloud’ < *wulkō- f., *wulkan- m./n. We find a back vowel in all Dutch dialects (GTRP).

See § 15.3.4 for a survey and interpretation of the results of this section.

### 15.3.2 Lengthened vowel

#### A. With i-mutation

1. p, b

*kreupel* ‘cripple’ < *krupila-. See § 15.2.3 for a discussion of this word. It was concluded there that MDu. *krepel* was the native form of the coastal provinces whereas medieval Brabant had i-mutated *kreupel* as well as unmutated *kropel*. 
2. f, v
deuvel < *dubila-. Early Modern Dutch shows a front rounded vowel in duevel, deuvel, also doordeuvelt ‘pierced with dowels’, and sporadic unrounding to devel is found in modern coastal dialects (cf. § 15.2.3).

deuvik ‘plug in the vent of a barrel, dowel’ < *dubika-. We find MDu. doevek (1365, Brussels), 17th-century deuvi(c)k and unrounded devi(c)k (cf. § 15.2.3).
euvel, ovel ‘evil’ < *ubila-. Coastal Dutch in general had unrounded evel, see § 15.2.3. Eastern Dutch euvel is due to i-mutation, whereas western and standard Dutch evel could also have rounding of e- due to the v. MDu. ovel can be interpreted as /o:/, but Early Modern Hollandish ovel seems to contain /u:/ . Whereas a mid vowel /o:/ could be explained from the absence of i-mutation (as in western koning or molen), a high vowel /u:/ would be unexpected. Possibly, ovel underwent a specific raising from expected /o:/.

heus ‘real, honest’, MDu. hovesch, hoofsch, heusch ‘courteous’, ODu. PN Houesca < *xubiska- ‘of the estate’. We expect i-mutation in central and eastern dialects, but we also find fronting in western Dutch. In the original form heusch, v > f has been lost by assimilation to -sch. The vowel /o:/ was restored to oo in MoDu. hoofs ‘courteous’ on the model of hof, pl. hoven ‘court’. Compare MoHG hübsch ‘pretty’ (the immediate reflex of the Old Germanic preform) versus höfisch ‘courteous’ (remade on the basis of Hof), which show the same relationship. MDu. heusch, MoDu. heus is regarded by the dictionaries as a western form. Unfortunately, the medieval spellings <o>, <oo>, <oe> do not inform us about possible vowel fronting. In the sixteenth century, we find huesch, heusch in texts from Flanders and Holland, and in standardizing Dutch. Modern dialects of Zealand and Holland have only eu-vocalism (WZD, Kaartenbank s.v. ‘heus’).

heuvel, hovel ‘hill’ < *xubila-. Anna Bijns (Antwerp) uses hovel, and Kiliaan regards heuvel as a variant of hovel. After 1600, the usual form in written texts is heuvel. In western dialects, the word seems to have been largely replaced by hil, hul in recent centuries. The alternative meaning ‘knob’ is also attested in the sixteenth century for hovel. To the lexicographer Hexham (1648), hovel or heuvel mean ‘knob or a bunch’. Another (East Flemish?) variant is huffel. In surnames it is found e.g. in Van Huffel(en) in East Flanders, Van Nuffel(en), concentrated in East Flanders and West Brabant, and Van Uffel(en) in the province of Antwerp. Spellings with o such as Van Hoffel are extremely rare. Thus, spelling and geography confirm that the noun had i-mutation. Whereas the appellative heuvel is found in surnames in all productive combinations, for instance, with an article (Van den Heuvel) or with patronymic suffixes (Heuvelmans, Heuvelink), huffel only occurs after van and without an article. This suggests that van Huffel(en) and variants are all derived from specific toponyms, such as Steenhuffel in South Brabant (1112 Stenhufle, steenhuffle, 1125 Stenofle, 1132 Stenhuffle, 1235 Steenhoffle; Debrabandere et al. 2010: 241) and Mertshuffel in Southeast Brabant (1261 Mertshuffele), not from a generic appellative meaning ‘elevation’. 
beul 'courier; hangman', MDu. beudel, bodel < *budila- (OHG butil, MoHG Büttel, OE bydel 'courier'). The Middle Dutch and Middle Low German spellings bodel and bole, which may all render /ø:/, are referred to by Kiliaan (partly as Saxon and Guelrish), but there is no certain attestation of 'hangman' with a back vowel in Dutch.

keutel 'turd' < *kutila-. We find a front rounded vowel in all Dutch dialects (GTRP). In West Flanders and French Flanders, keutel(e) competes with kreutel(e).

noot 'nut' < *xnut- e. (Kroonen 2013: 237). The word has become an i-stem in OHG nuz, pl. nuzzi. Since 'nut' displays i-mutation in the east of the Netherlands and in southern Limburg, the same shift to an i-stem *xnuti- may be assumed for Old Dutch. In central dialects we find /ø(:)/, whereas in coastal Dutch, fronting to neut(e) with /ø(:)/ is found in French Flanders, the northwestern half of West Flanders, most of Zealand, in southern South Holland, in some traditional central Hollandish dialects, and in West Friesland, see Map 32. Whereas noot has become the form of the standard language, metaphorical neut(je) 'small drop of liquor' and 'old woman' has been lexicalized with the front vowel.

Map 32. Front vowel reflex in noot (data: GTRP)
reu ‘male dog’ < MDu. reude < *xruþjan- (Kroonen 2013: 251, cf. MLG rode, rodde, rödde ‘big dog’, OHG rudio, rudo, OE hroð-hund ‘useless dog’, rypþa ‘big dog’). OHG rudo leaves the possibility open that non-umlauted forms were also inherited in Dutch, but it rather seems a more recent form than rudio. I found no forms with a back vowel (West Flemish reud, West and East Flemish rut ‘male dog’, North Hollandish reutel ‘young dog’).

scheut ‘shoot, twinge’ < *skuti- m. (OHG scuz ‘lightning, speed, shot, projectile’, MoHG Schuss, OFri. skete ‘shot’, OE scyte ‘shot; projectile’). For MDu. scote ‘shoot; shot’, the spelling does not enable us to distinguish between the reflexes of *skuti- and those of *skuta- ‘shooting’ (whence MoDu. schot ‘shot’), in particular when the vowel was lengthened in open syllable (e.g., pl. scoten, WFla., 1285). An early unequivocal instance of back vocalism for ‘shoot (of a plant)’ is scoot in the Hollandish version of Mandeville’s travel diary (1462). In the modern standard language, scheut ‘shoot’ and schot ‘shot’ have two separate meanings and scheut has become extinct (in these meanings), but until 1700, one can also find scheut for ‘shoot’ and schoot for ‘shoot (of a plant)’ in literary texts. The similar meanings and semantic cross-overs between *skuti- and *skuta- imply that we cannot rely on the difference between oo and eu to conclude anything about the dialect history. It seems likely that Zealandish and West Flemish schote ‘shoot’ represents *skuta- (since *skuta- would not normally yield a disyllabic stem in modern dialects) and shows the absence of i-mutation in coastal Dutch. It is also likely that West Flemish scheute ‘shoot; shoot’ and Hollandish scheut ‘shoot’ are due to unconditioned fronting of Old Dutch *u. But we cannot be certain.

sleutel ‘key’ < *slutila-. Early Middle Dutch generally has slotel(e), but fronting is explicitly written in Brussels sluetel, and probably also in Mechelen sloetele and WBrab. sloetel. Later texts show eu in the centre and east but oo next to eu in Flanders (see also Vereeken 1938: 7–19). In modern dialects, sleutel(e) is the main form found throughout all dialects. Dissimilated variants occur in sneutel (Huizen, Laren in North Holland), sneutele (Zealand, East Flanders) and sleuter(e) (Flanders). Back vowels occur in the GTRP database in French and West Flanders and in Zealand. Map 33 indicates the occurrence of stressed /øː/, /øːl/, /uːl/, /ou/ in GTRP; see also Vereeken 1938, Map 1, WZD 875. As suggested by Taeldeman 1971: 249, the spread of these back vowels indicates that the word was adopted as *slutel by coastal Dutch, before it was fronted (unless the back vowel was influenced by slot ‘lock’). An unrounded variant sneetel is quoted by Boekenoogen (2004: 484) from a 1667 document from North Holland. It could in theory be the remnant of an earlier, much larger unrounding area for ‘key’, but we have no written evidence to that effect from Middle or Early Modern Dutch. Since Flemish and Zealandish have /øː/; it seems more likely that sneetel has a different origin.
4. **s, z**

euzie, oozie << oose 'overhanging part of a sloping roof, eaves', MDu. ovese, from WGM. *ubis(w)ō-. In Middle Dutch, a nom.pl. *ueuesen /o:voæn/ is attested in a 1291 document from Oudenaerde. Other distinctive Middle Dutch spellings are rare, we find heuziën in a charter from Comines (between Ypres and Lille) of 1420 (MNW). Kiliaan (1599) has (h)oosdrup. For modern dialects, WVD reports general oo-vocalism for French and West Flanders and eu-vocalism for East Flanders, but local dictionaries also give (d)euzie for French and West Flanders. Limburg and Brabant generally have i-mutation (cf. Roukens 1937 I: 118–121), as does Low German. North Holland has only o-vocalism: modern ozing, hozing, 1647 oosem. This distribution may point to an originally umlautless form in the coastal dialects which later underwent unconditioned frontening.

_ kneuzen_ (MDu. ptc. also gheknust) 'to bruise' < *knusjan- (OHG knussan, OE cnyssan). MDu. cneusen, cnoosen next to cnussen (viz. in the ptc. gheknust, translation of B. Engelsman, Haarlem, 1485) shows a similar length alternation as other jan-verbs. Most of the Middle Dutch attestations are from Holland, sometimes with explicit oo-vocalism (e.g., _die metalen poorten sel ic knoosen_ 'I will crush those metal gates', 1431), sometimes with an explicit front vowel (e.g., _die sal gheknueset worden_ 'he will be wounded', 1431). After 1600, nearly all literary texts have kneuzen. The only exception I found is gheknoost in Hendrik Storm’s _Lucanus_ (1620, Amsterdam).

_ leus_ 'slogan', earlier 'password, war-cry'. First attested early in the sixteenth century as lose. Between 1500 and 1700, the noun vacillates between _leus(e)_ and _lose, loos(e)_ in literary and official texts. The etymology is unclear, see EWN: the word might reflect *luxi-, *lausi- 'liberation' with regular i-mutation to leus, or *lusa- or *lausia- 'loose', in which case the Dutch eu-forms are due to unconditioned fronting.

_ neus_ 'nose' < *nusi- or *nusō-; for the etymology and dialectal distribution, see § 15.2.4. All modern dialects have a front rounded vowel in _neus_ or _neuze_, except for the Limburgian dialects which continue *nasō- (GTRP). A back vowel is rarely attested with certainty. In his play _Moortje_ (1615), Bredero puts _noos_ 'nose' in the mouth of Kackerlack and Angeniet, who speak a local North Hollandish vernacular. Since _naze_ is the form used by the Haarlem translator of Engelsman (1485), it is
conceivable that the Amstelland dialect of around 1600 retained a reflex of *naas as *noos. Alternatively, one could think of Old Frisian *nose, *nòs, MoWF *noas.

*reuzel ‘lard’ < *rusila-. See § 15.2.3 on the etymology. No back vowel forms are attested. There is generally a short vowel in *russel in northeastern dialects (van Ginneken, unpublished map, see Kaartenbank).

5. k, g, ch
beugel ‘clasp, iron ring’ < *bugila-. The word is rarely attested in Middle Dutch. After 1500, we find explicit indication for /ø:/ in all literary texts. An unpublished map on Kaartenbank, based on the ANKO database, shows beugel for nearly all dialects in the Netherlands, with buggel sporadically in Twente and Achterhoek. Modern Flemish dialects have beug(e)l(e) or beu(ë)l(e), see WVD. I did not locate any forms with a back vowel.

breuk ‘breach, rupture’ < *bruki- m. In spite of the general spelling as <broke> or <broeke>, there is no certain indication for a back vowel realization in Middle Dutch. The sporadic form broock in the seventeenth century as a mathematical term for ‘fraction’ may be derived from gebrook ‘id’, which has the vocalism of the participle gebroken. No modern oo-variants were found, except for antiquated brook in Gouda (Lafeber 1967: 76). The forms braoke, brøòke /brɔ:ka/, which can be found in Zeeuws Flanders and West Flanders, correspond with StDu. braak ‘breaking, burglary’.

deugd ‘virtue’ < *dugunþi- f. For cognate forms and the presence or absence of a nasal, see § 13.3. I find no certain instances of a back vowel, but van Loey 1976: 50 points to evidence from Middle Dutch rhyme to that effect, e.g. doget rhyming with vōget ‘guardian’ (MoDu. voogd). Even if back vowel forms did exist, we can never exclude influence from the verb deugen, dogen, where an i-mutation factor was lacking.

heug ‘liking, fancy’ (< *xugi/u- m.), MDu. hoghe, hoeghe, hueghe ‘thought, memory’. There is no early spelling which compellingly points to a back vowel. After 1600, we find only eu-vocalisms.

heugen ‘to remember’, geheugen ‘id.’, verheugen ‘to rejoice’ < *xugian-. Long /ø:/ was certainly prevalent already in Middle Dutch, but we sometimes find <oo> pointing to /o:/, e.g. in Parthenopeus of Blois. Van Loey 1976: 50 points to evidence in Middle Dutch rhyme for a back vowel. Note, however, that there were several West Germanic variants of this verb, some of which did not have an i-mutation factor, such as OHG hogēn, OFri. hugia < *xugēn-. Thus, even if back vowel forms such as hogen did exist, they do not certainly derive from *xugian-.

jeugd ‘youth’ < *jugunþi-. In Modern Dutch we find only eu-vocalism, but in many dialects jeugd is probably imported from the standard language, beside local jongte or similar nouns. Clear <oo>-spellings are rare in Middle Dutch, and wherever we find them, as in yoocht in Willem van Hildegardsberch, they interchange with jeucht in the same text. In Der Minnen Loep, yoocht rhymes with duecht ‘virtue’.
jeuken ‘to itch’ < *jukjan-. The vowel quality of Early MDu. ioken and the noun iokede ‘itch’ (Limb., 1240) is uncertain, but the West Flemish noun joekte (Rijmbijbel, 1285) probably renders /oː/. Late Middle Dutch shows front vowels (<ue>, <uy>) and back vowels (<oo>), the latter mainly in Holland and Flanders. Kiliaan (1599) has both joocken and jeucken. In the WNT entry jeuken, published in 1914, joken is said to occur only as a solemn and poetic variant in northern Dutch written language; it has since disappeared completely from usage. In modern dialects, according to the GTRP database, we mostly find a front vowel such as /ø./.

There is also a sizable area with a short vowel in jukken. This is found, for instance, in West and East Flanders, Zeeuws Flanders, Walcheren and westernmost North Brabant. In eastern Dutch, the front vowel can be explained by i-mutation. Two areas suggest that the variant jooken must have occurred in inland Dutch, too. In the western part of the province of Antwerp some dialects have /juːkaː/ or /juːkɑː/, and in northern Overijssel and southern Drente we find /jɔkn/ or similar forms. Both areas show a back vowel within an i-mutating dialect. Possibly, the back vowel was taken over from a suffixless preterite *jochte < *jukkida. Alternatively, it may have been adopted from the verb *jukkōn- ‘to hop, run’, which has often merged with *jukjan- ‘to itch’ in German dialects according to Kroonen 2013: 274.

In western Dutch, the vowels of jukken and jeuken could be due to unconditioned fronting of *u. There are also a few areas with a back vowel, see Map 34. In Holland, Katwijk jokken and Aalsmeer joken once again show the relic character of these dialects. Most of Zealand plus Goeree-Overflakkee has joken, with jokken in Zeeuws Flanders. Jokken is also attested in the westernmost dialects of French Flanders, viz. Wulverdinghe, Bollezeele and Nieuwpoort (these dialects also retain the back vowel in bok ‘he-goat’ as opposed to West Flemish bok). A compact area in southern East Flanders has jokn. It thus seems possible that Early Old Dutch had *jukkon, *jukip, which underwent spontaneous fronting in many dialects but retained the back vowel in others. The position before k may have favoured the retention of the back vowel.

keuken ‘kitchen’ < *kukinō-. MDu. kokene, kukene probably represents /koːkene/. In Early Modern Dutch, the form kook en is sometimes found in Hollandish literature beside usual keuken. Nearly all modern dialects of Dutch have a front rounded vowel, with the exception of kook en in Oude Tonge on Goeree-Overflakkee (GTRP).

kneukel ‘knuckle, bone’ < *knukila-, see § 15.2.3 s.v. knekel. We find mainly knokel in inland Dutch and kneukel in coastal Dutch, with occasional unrounding to knekel after 1600.

kreukel ‘crease’ < *krukila-, or derived from the verb kreukelen ‘to crease’. The noun is only attested in Teuthorista and after 1500, so that derivation from the verb cannot be excluded. See s.v. kreuken in section B below.
Map 34. Back vowel in _jeuken_ (data GTRP)

_leugen_ ‘a lie’ < *luginō- (ODu. _lugina_, Early MDu. _luedgehene_). Compare the modern verb _logenstraffen_ ‘to belie’, which retains the oo-variant, which was frequent in the literature between 1600 and 1800. In the thirteenth century, West Flanders consistently has _loghene_ with a back vowel, but in East Flanders we find once _lueghene_. Nearly all modern dialects have a long front rounded vowel or diphthong in the noun ‘lie’, but a few exceptions with a back vowel can be interpreted as traces of erstwhile _logen_, viz. Brouwershaven in Zealand (GTRP), Aalsmeer and Moordrecht in South Holland (van Ginneken, unpublished map, _Kaartenbank_), and _looge_ in the more archaic variant of the Gouda city dialect (Lafeber 1967: 126).

_neuken_ ‘to knock; fuck’, _verneuken_ ‘to make a fool of’ < *xnukjan-. There is also a noun _neuck_ ‘stub’ in Early Modern Dutch (Zealand). No back vowel variants are found.

_reuk_ ‘smell; scent’ < *ruki- m. (Early MDu. _roke_, MoHG _Geruch_). The value of the medieval <o(e)>-spellings is uncertain. After 1500, literary Dutch mostly has a front rounded vowel, but there are a number of certain instances of /oː/, given under the lemma _rook-III_ in _WNT_. Oo-variants occur, among others, with the authors
Bijns, Stalpert van der Wielen, Spieghel, Vondel, and Hooft. The demise of rook for ‘smell’ in the modern language is ascribed by WNT to the avoidance of homonymy with rook ‘smoke’ (< PGm. *rųkʷ-). In modern dialects, van Ginneken (unpublished map from 1932, Kaartenbank) finds rook in southeastern South Holland and roke on the islands of Overflakkee and Tholen. According to WZD, the variant roke is found more generally on the Zeelandish islands, as against reuke in Zeeuws Flanders. Flanders in general has reuke.

spreuk ‘maxim’ < *spruki- m. (MDu. sproke, MoHG Spruch). In Middle Dutch, both spoke with /oː/ and sprocke with /øː/ must have existed, but the spelling does not allow us to distinguish them. In Modern Dutch after 1600, the simplex is mostly spreuk, but, in the seventeenth century, sproock(e) ‘speech, utterance, verdict’ occurs with a few Hollandish authors. For example, in one of the gheestelijcke liedekens by J. Jacobsz. Harlingen (Amsterdam, 1612), where sprooken rhymes with the participle broken ‘broken’. Coornhert frequently uses sproocke ‘tale’ in his writings. The back vowel has been generalized in the diminutive sprookje, first ‘little tale’, now only ‘fairy tale’. The suggestion that sprookje, which is attested quite frequently in the seventeenth century, would have introduced its back vowel as a spelling pronunciation based on MDu. sproke (as is suggested by several etymological dictionaries of Dutch) must therefore be dismissed. The word is not well enough represented in modern dialects to allow any geographic conclusions.

teg ‘draught’ < *tugi- m. (also MDu. toge, MoDu. toog; MoHG Zug). In Early Modern Dutch, we find both toog ‘the act of pulling; a draught, pull (of liquid); trait’ (in North Holland also toog ‘sleigh, sled’), and teug, which only refers to a ‘draught’ of liquid. In the modern standard, teug ‘draught’ has survived whereas toog ‘pulling, trait’ has been replaced by other words (the homonym toog ‘counter, bar’ derives from tonen ‘to show’). Similarly, in modern dialects, toog has all but disappeared. Of course, it cannot be excluded that the oo-forms, old and new, were influenced by the verb togen ‘to pull’. The meaning ‘draught’ and the explicit spelling with a front rounded vowel for teug are already found in the thirteenth century, viz. in dat.sg. thueghe in West Flemish (1287).

teugel ‘rein’ < *tugila- (MoHG Zügel). Most post-1600 spellings point to eu. But Anna Roemer Visscher (from Amsterdam) once has toghel, and Pannekeet 1984 gives togel as an antiquated variant of teugel for North Holland. Boekenoogen 2004 has togels as ‘reed stalks’; according to WNT, this may well be derived from togen ‘to pull’. In fact, for North Hollandish togel in general, it cannot be excluded that its vowel replaced eu on the model of togen (on which see section B).

vleug ‘flight; impulse; tinge’ < *flugi- m. (MDu. vloghe, MoHG Flug). It is unclear whether the Middle Dutch spellings, which never explicitly have <ue> or <eu>, allow positing a back vowel for the medieval period. After 1550 we find only a front vowel. Whether West Flemish vloge ‘bush, small forest’ is cognate, is also
unclear. Since “vleuge or vloghe” can mean a swarm of birds in the sixteenth century (Plantin), that seems possible (‘bush’ as a ‘swarm’ of trees?).

\textit{vleugel} ‘wing’ < \textit{flugila} - (MoHG Flügel). Middle Dutch unrounding is found in \textit{vlegel}, see § 15.2.3. Early Modern Dutch has \textit{vleugel} beside \textit{vlogel} and the verb \textit{vleugelen} ‘to fetter, tie the hands behind the back’. In modern dialects, East Flanders has \textit{vleugel} (and \textit{vleuger}), NHol. \textit{vleugel}. Elsewhere it has been replaced: Zealand has \textit{vleke}, Holland mostly \textit{vlerk}.

\textit{zeug, zog} ‘sow’ < \textit{sugu-} < \textit{suwu-} (OE sugu; for this reconstruction, see Kroonen 2011: 152–6, 2013: 490). In Early Middle Dutch, Limburgian \textit{soog} is already opposed to West Flemish \textit{sueghe} beside \textit{soghe}. In Late Middle Dutch the variant \textit{soch} appears especially in Brabant, and in the seventeenth century, \textit{zeug} and \textit{zog} vie for dominance in the literary language. All of this appears to reflect rather well the modern dialectal situation as it emerges from Map 1.8 of \textit{TNZN}. We find \textit{zeuge} in Flanders and Zealand and \textit{zeug} in South and North Holland, all clearly the result of unconditioned fronting. Directly to the east, in eastern Holland, Utrecht and North Brabant, the type \textit{zog} predominates, and Antwerp and Flemish Brabant have \textit{zoeg}, which in these areas may reflect earlier short \textit{o} before labials and velars (Belemans/Goossens 2000: 121). In East Limburg we find \textit{zoog} with a lengthened vowel. Goossens (1999) has shown that the plural \textit{zeug} which accompanies Brabantish sg. \textit{zog} points to an \textit{i}-stem which in turn may continue an earlier \textit{u}-stem.

7. \textit{m, n}

\textit{beun} ‘stage’ < *\textit{bunī-} (< PGm. *\textit{budnī}, -jō-; MoHG Bühne ‘stage’, OE byðne ‘ship’s bottom’, bytne ‘keel’; for the etymology, see Seebold 2011: 161). MDu. \textit{boene} ‘attic’, Early MoDu. \textit{boene, buene} ‘roofbeams, floor’ (1599; Kil.), \textit{beun} ‘attic’ (18th c.). Northeastern dialects of Dutch show the effects of \textit{i}-mutation, but the word does not occur in southern Dutch. The same word is also reflected in MoDu. \textit{beun, bun, bon} ‘creel’. With this meaning, North Hollandish mostly has \textit{bun}, and Zealand regularly has \textit{bun(ne), bunt} for ‘creel, ship’s hold where the fish is kept’ (WZD). In French Flanders, \textit{beun} means ‘cistern’. The interchange between a short and long vowel in \textit{bun} vs. \textit{beun} suggests an Early Middle Dutch paradigm *\textit{bōnə}, obl. *\textit{būnnas}, which reflects the PGm. \textit{i/jō}-stem.

\textit{Beunen, Boonen} ‘Boulogne-sur-Mer’ < Latin Bononia. Flemish and Hollandish sources from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries generally have \textit{Buenen}, but the modern translation is \textit{Bonen}, which is probably a spelling pronunciation.

\textit{deun} ‘tune’ < *\textit{duni-}. All unambiguous forms show a long, front rounded vowel.

\textit{deunen} ‘to resound’ < *\textit{dunjan-}. Because of its \textit{th-}, the Limburgian form \textit{thunnen} (1240) probably rests on an original text from the twelfth century or was taken from a Low German source. In literary Modern Dutch, all instances have \textit{eu}-vocalism. An exception is Camphuysen’s \textit{beest-gedoon} (1630) for usual \textit{gedeun} ‘thundering’.
dreumel ‘piece of string; small guy’ < *brumila-, a diminutive of drom ‘thrum’. The Late medieval West Frisian town laws have dromellen, droemelen, also plural druemelen. North Hollandish drummelsdraad ‘repair thread’ (Boekenoogen 2004) shows shortening of eu in a compound. A first attestation of metaphorical dreumel applied to a person appears in 1669 (Witsen) Ian dreumel ‘Jan Drommel’. In Modern Dutch, this meaning is represented by drommel, also arme drommel ‘poor sod’. In Early Modern Dutch, drommel also exists but is mainly used for ‘devil’.

drom ‘thrum, piece of string, string-end’ < *brumi- (OHG trum, OS thrumi, OE thrum ‘end (of a string’)’. The plural dreumen, druemen is found in early modern textile industry laws from Holland and Utrecht. A singular druem, plural druemen occurs in Gildeboek Schonenvaarders, Haarlem, 1542.147 In the seventeenth century the usual forms are sg. drom, pl. drommen, but we also find fronted forms such as drum in van Yk, (Scheepsbouwkonst, 1697), adj. dreumd ‘ragged’ (Bredero), and dreum, dreumel, or drom in Winschoten’s Seeman (1681). Modern dialects of Flanders and Antwerp have drom with a back vowel, while North Holland has dromdreed ‘thrum-thread’. We thus seem to have unconditioned fronting of the lengthened vowel in Holland but generalization of the short back vowel in Flanders and Zealand.

dreunen ‘to rumble’ < *drunjan-. All unambiguous instances show eu-vocalism.

koning, dial. keuning < *kunina- (G. König). In Early Middle Dutch, all dialects (Flanders, Brabant, Limburg, Holland) spell coninc or, rarely, lengthened coeninc. The absence of any front vowel spelling in Flanders and Holland at first sight makes it unlikely that the word had a front vowel in a significant part of the western dialects (for Brabant and Limburg, the assumption of /ø:/ is unproblematic), yet the data from modern Dutch require us to assume just that (Kloeke 1950: 88). In Late Middle Dutch, the spelling cueninc with explicit front rounded vowel is still very rare, though a charter from Bruges from 1341 consistently spells (Jan) Cueninc and Cueninx. In the sixteenth century in Flanders, and in the seventeenth century in Holland, cuening, keuningh are found a bit more often. Vereecken 1938: 19–25 and Map 2 discusses the old and the modern forms, showing that nowadays, inland Dutch always has keuning with regular i-mutation. The form keuning in Flanders and (as a relic form) in Zealand and Holland must be due to unconditioned fronting; the Hollandish towns have generalized koning which has become the standard word. In late twentieth-century dialects, the Dutch-Belgian state border plays a significant role: in Belgium, nearly all dialects have a front vowel, whereas in the Netherlands, most dialects close to the border, especially in the west, have a back vowel (GTRP).

Vereecken interprets *konig as the western form from before unconditioned fronting, although it is unclear, in which dialects the back vowel would have originally been retained. Therefore, the view advocated by Kloeke (1950: 88) seems more plausible, viz. that *konig is due to spelling conservatism, preserving the medieval spelling <co-> which before 1500 could stand for /ko:-/, but was later reinterpreted as /ko:-/. The evidence from the family names can be interpreted as supporting this hypothesis, since their spelling is very sensitive to tradition. We find *konig not only in the west, but also in inland Dutch, where ‘king’ has (or had, until recently) i-mutation throughout. The name *konig is found in the northern Netherlands, particularly in North Holland, Groningen, and Drente, *konink in East Guelders and Twente, de *koning in South Holland and North Brabant, De *koninck in West Brabant and East Flanders, De*coninck in southern West Flanders, and genitival *konings, *koninckx, Conings in Brabant and Limburg. In comparison, spellings with eu or ue are very rare: only Deceuninck and De Ceuninck are relatively frequent in west Flanders, Keuninckx is sporadically found in western Limburg.

*monnik, munnik ‘monk’ < *munika- from medieval Latin municus for earlier monachus. All Dutch dialects presuppose a preform nom.acc.sg. *munik, gen. *munikes, in which i-mutation would be expected throughout in eastern dialects. In the west, it is uncertain whether one would expect i-mutation in the genitive singular. Indeed, in Early Middle Dutch we find spellings which point to a front rounded vowel from Flanders via Brabant to Limburg, but only if the vowel was long. Open syllable lengthening in the strong case forms yielded a long vowel (/mø:nik/ or /mo:nik/), whereas syncope in the weak cases bled lengthening and led to a short stressed vowel (/münk/ or /monk/). The short vowel was then introduced into the strong cases yielding munnik, monnik.

The literary spellings do not provide a reliable indication for the vocalism. Modern Dutch family names that contain the word ‘monk’ show that i-mutation or unconditioned fronting must have prevailed in all dialects, since front rounded vowels are pervasive. A lengthened vowel is found in names such as de Muijnck (Zealand), Demuynck (West Flanders), De Muynck (northern Flanders), Meuninck (East Flanders), Smeuninx (West Limburg), and Muniken (Pays d’Herve). Probably, western Muijnck represents lengthening of earlier short u before nk. With short vocalism, the most frequent types are de Munnik (Zealand, Holland, northeastern Dutch), Munnik (ibidem), de Munck (North Holland), de Munck (East Flanders, Zealand, South Holland), de Munynck (Ghent, Antwerp, Brussels), Munnix (East Limburg, Eupen), and Munnichs (central East Limburg). Names with /o:/ are absent from the name inventory, whereas spellings showing /ɔ/ are very rare, being mainly restricted to the eastern part of Twente.
heul ‘culvert, bridge across a ditch; ditch’ < *xuli-. The word is only found in the western provinces. In Bruges in the thirteenth century, the fronted spelling huele (12x) clearly outweights hoele (3x). In Holland, the medieval spellings <oe> are unclear, but from 1500 on, we only find <ue> and <eu>. West Flemish heulebrughe, hoelebrughe ‘bridge across a ditch’ (13th c.) occurs as a toponym and a surname. Modern Zealandish mostly has eule, but oele in Land van Hulst (WZD). For West Flanders, de Bo 1892 gives only heule. WVD similarly reports eu-vocalism for western Zeeuws Flanders and some adjacent towns, but oole in the northern part of Land van Hulst. This would seem a very restricted occurrence for a word that escaped unconditioned fronting. More likely, this oole took the back vowel from hol ‘hollow’, compare Afrikaans hool, pl. holen with a long vowel, or from the Middle Dutch noun hole ‘hollow’ < *xulō-.

Keulen ‘Cologne’ < *kolnjō- < Lat. Colōnia (MDu. colne, coelne). There is one West Flemish instance of unrounding in Peter van kelne (Bruges, 1285).

molen, dial. meulen ‘mill’ < Late Lat. molina, cf. Vereecken 1938: 42–8, who gives the medieval attestations. Most medieval forms point to /ø:/ or have an ambiguous spelling which does not exclude a front rounded vowel, with the exception of moolne with Lodewijk van Velthem, who was from Brabant. I was not able to find the Middle Dutch form melen cited by van Loey 1976: 45. In modern dialects, we find a front vowel or diphthong everywhere except in Holland and Utrecht, which largely have a back vowel. Some dialects in Zeeland and western North Brabant also have oo (GTRP, FAND II/III Map 41), which may be regarded as a relic variant in those areas. Nonetheless, there are traces of eu in Holland too, e.g. in Gouda (Lafeber 1967, citing Zoet 1895), as well as in North Holland, e.g. in Junius’ spelling meulen (1567, Nomenclator) and in Town Frisian mullen, with vowel shortening from *meulen (Kloeke 1950: 90). As in the case of ‘king’, the data from the family names do not exactly match the modern dialects. The surname van der Meulen is particularly concentrated in Fryslân, but is widespread all over the northern Netherlands, including Holland. Van der Molen is primarily found in Fryslân, Groningen, northern Drente and northern North Holland. Van der Meule is typical for Walcheren, and Vermeule for Zeeland in general. Vermeulen occurs in the Betuwe, eastern South Holland, North Brabant, Antwerp, East Flanders and northern Limburg. Meulemans is found in Vlaams Brabant and the Campine, but Molemans in Belgian Limburg, even though the noun has i-mutation in local dialects. Thus, it appears that molen was preserved as a conservative spelling and was then introduced in the modern western dialects. It is possible that this orthographic conservatism goes back at least to the fourteenth century. In Gouda, different administrative sources from around the year 1400, edited in Goudriaan et al. 2000, point to a value /ø:/ in ‘mill’ and ‘miller’, as shown by muelen (1x) and muelnaar,
muelner (6x; plus 1x moelner). But the simplex is spelled with <o> in the other four instances: molen, molens, Molenteghe and Molen worf.

veulen ‘foal’ < *fulina-. See § 15.2.3 for the co-occurrence of etymological *fulina- and *fulan- in West Germanic, and Map 1.5 of TNZN for the modern dialect forms. The i-mutated form veulen, vulle in central and eastern dialects suggests that we may reconstruct an i-mutation factor for the Old Franconian stage in the Low Countries. In modern dialects, there is a large area with a back vowel in vool(tje) in North Holland, as well as a small one on the island of Tholen, and once oo-vocalism on the Flemish coast. South Holland has veul(en), whereas most of Zealand and West and French Flanders have the heteronym kachtel. East Flanders has veul(en). This situation would be compatible with unconditioned vowel fronting in Flanders which spread to (Zealand and) South Holland, but left Tholen and North Holland unaffected. Note that i-mutated veulen, vulle, in central and eastern dialects borders on the East Flemish and Hollandish veulen area.

10. r
beuren ‘to lift’, gebeuren ‘to happen’ < *burjan-. The verb has a number of frequent derivatives, but the Middle Dutch spelling does not allow to distinguish /o:/ from /ø:/ in modern Dutch, no forms with a back vowel are attested.

deur ‘door’ < *duri-. There are no modern dialects with a back vowel (GTRP, FAND II/III Map 36).

keur ‘choice, statute’ < MDu. cuere, coere, core < *kuri- m. (usually f. in Dutch). Beside a single instance of koor with Vondel (1620), which may be due to the influence of the verb kiezen, ptc. koren, all Modern Dutch tokens have eu.

deur ‘to prove’. The verb has a lengthened front vowel in all modern dialects (GTRP). Middle Dutch coren did not have a front vowel, but, quite probably, the modern verb has introduced eu from the noun keur ‘statute’. In any case, keuren is a high-register word nowadays.

leur and loor ‘loss, deceit’ < WGm. *luri- m. < PGm. *lusi-, which occur in MoDu. teleur-stellen ‘to disappoint’ and teloor-gaan ‘to be lost, perish’. EWN rightly underlines the probability that Early MoDu. te lore and te leure both go back to *luri-, a form which would yield i-mutation in eastern dialects but not in the west. The words are not attested well enough to support any claims about the distribution of eu and oo in earlier centuries.

scheur ‘crack’ < *skuri- m., scheuren ‘to tear, rip’ < *skurjan- (or denominal to scheur within Dutch). The West Flemish spelling <scur-> in the thirteenth century in the noun and the verb suggests a front rounded vowel for this area. In modern dialects, Flanders and Walcheren have scheur(e) for the noun and scheure(n) for the verb, but central and northern Zealand and Goeree-Overflakkee have schôôr(e) and schôôre(n) with a back vowel. For North Holland, Boekenoogen 2004 gives
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schoren as the usual form of the verb. This suggests that oo-vocalism was original in coastal Dutch.

sleuren ‘to drag, trail’ (if from *slurjan-‘); there was also a variant *slūran-, to which Zealandish sluuren, sluieren may belong.

speuren ‘to trace’ < *spurjan-. I found no clear back vowel variants in Modern Dutch. In MoDu. naspooren ‘to track down’ the influence of the noun spoor ‘trace’ may be assumed.

steur ‘sturgeon’ < *sturjan- m. In the thirteenth century, WFle. stuere already displays a front vowel. Modern Flemish and Zealandish generally have eu-vocalism, as do the dialects of Brabant (in the Willems Enquiry from 1885). No oo-forms were found.

storen ‘to disturb’ may in theory reflect *sturjan- or *staurjan-. In literature from Holland from the seventeenth century, steuren is found quite frequently. On Kaartenbank, there is an unedited map on the verb storen in all Dutch dialects drawn in 1932 by van Ginneken (probably based on the earlier enquiries by Te Winkel and Willems). It shows a front vowel eu in large parts of Zealand, in southwestern South Holland, in Scheveningen, and in western North Holland. The remainder of Holland, western Utrecht, the western half of Brabant, and nearly all of Flanders, have storen. A back vowel oe is found in parts of Central Brabant and uu in southermost Limburg. For all of these dialects, the vowel variation is similar to that of horen ‘to hear’ < *xaurjan. Stoere is also found in the north and the southwest of Belgian Limburg. A front rounded vowel is found in all northeastern and eastern dialects of Dutch, mostly steure(n) but sture(n) both in North Limburg and southernmost Limburg. In any case, since the dialects of Brabant and Limburg point to *staur(j)an-‘, it seems likely that the western Dutch forms also go back to *au and are therefore irrelevant here.

vuren ‘deal’ adj. < *furxīna-. All Middle and Modern Dutch forms have a front rounded vowel, except for one Hollandish document of 1428 which has vieren sparren ‘deal beams’ (MNW). In Witsen’s Scheepsbouw (Amsterdam, 1671), we find another instance of unrounded vieren and vieren-hout ‘pine-wood’. Since vuur ‘fire’ was unrounded to vier in the coastal dialects at an early stage, making ‘fire’ and ‘deal’ homonyms, it cannot be excluded that the unrounding in vieren ‘deal’ followed the example of vier ‘fire’.

See § 15.3.4 for a survey and interpretation of the results of this section.
B. Without i-mutation

1. p, b

koper ‘copper’ < WGM. *kupar neben *kuppra-, from Latin cuprum. In Middle Dutch, koper alternates with kopper due to vowel shortening before -pr-. A palatalized variant kueper is found in Overijssel and Guelders; WNT ascribes it to influence of the derived adjective *keuperen ‘of copper’, itself unattested.

open ‘open’ < *upana. We find a long back vowel in all Dutch dialects, with the exception of a compact ø-­area in southeastern Fryslân, northern Overijssel, and southwestern Drente. In western Dutch, two fronted forms are found, viz. [ø.pə] in Huizen and [ʔœːpə] in Brielle (GTRP).

zope, zeup (Flanders) ‘draught, swallow’, dimin. zoopie ‘drink’, from WGM. *supan- (MLG sōpe m. ‘draught, drink’, OE sopa, ON sopi m.) or *supi- (Westfalian siap ‘boozing’, MHG suf, sof m. ‘soup’, OE sype m. ‘sucking’), or both. Early MoDu. has sope, zoope ‘sauce’ and zuepe. Literary sources between 1500 and 1700 give the impression that oo is the coastal Dutch vocalism, as against eu mainly in southern Dutch. There may also be semantic specialization between sope ‘sauce’ and zuepe ‘draught’. For modern West Flemish, de Bo (1892) gives a masculine noun zeup ‘draught’ and a feminine zeupe, zope ‘draught, drink’. The word is not mentioned in WZD.

2. f, v

boven, MDu. beuven (G. oben) ‘above’ < *bi-ubana. None of the modern dialects shows a fronted vowel in this word (GTRP; except for Bruges, which has productive fronting). This is in agreement with the spelling <bouen>, <boven> in all Middle Dutch dialects.

keuvel ‘monk’s cap, woman’s bonnet’ < *kublō- (OE cufle). In view of the meaning, the word can hardly be separated from kuif ‘forelock’ and kobbe ‘crest’ (see above on kobbe ‘spider’). A loanword from Latin *cupella is therefore less likely, also because i-mutation is lacking. Middle Dutch has kuevele, covel(e), coevel(e), which, judging by the later attestations, represent partly /oː/, partly /øː/. Kiliaan, for instance, has kovel with a clear back vowel, but Plantin (1573) gives kovel and keuvel. Both vowel variants exist in Early Modern Dutch, with cuevel(e), keuvel(e) clearly being Flemish but co-occurring beside oo-vocalism in Holland. Modern West Flemish and Zealandish have keuvel. In North Brabant, the word occurs as keuvel in central dialects but is attested as kovel in Best, Den Dungen (North Brabant), and Bonheiden (near Antwerp), and in Rotem in Limburg. In combination with Kiliaan’s form, this suggests that keuvel is the older inland Dutch variant.

loven ‘to praise’ < *lubōjan-. In Middle and Modern Dutch, only loven with a back vowel is attested.
oven ‘oven’ \(< \ast \text{ufna}.\) No front vowels are attested in modern dialects (GTRP), nor in any of the stages of the literary language.

roof ‘scab’, MDu. rove, from PGM. \(*\text{xruf/bōn}-\) (ON \text{hruf} f. ‘crust’, MoWF rouwe) or \(*\text{xrufi}-\) (OHG \text{hruf}, MHG \text{ruf} f. ‘scab, leprosy’, MoHG Rufe), cf. Kroonen 2013: 246. We find reuve in West Flanders and Zeeuws Flanders, and rove in central Zealand but with a variant roeve beside it in many places. The data from WBD, showing roof in central North Brabant, rouf in eastern North Brabant and roef in the province of Antwerp, suggest a preform \(*\text{rauf}-\). This is supported by a remark in Cornelissen & Vervliet 1899–1906 that the word is pronounced with a mid-to-low oo in the southern Campine. It follows that roof ‘scab, crust’ was contaminated with the word roof ‘fleece’ \(< \ast \text{rauf}-\) (discussed in § 20.4), and adopted its vocalism in at least a number of dialects. Therefore, western reuve is not a reliable witness for the unconditioned fronting of unmutated \(*u\) or \(*o\).

stoof ‘oven’ \(< \ast \text{stubō}-\), MDu. stove. Still stove, stoof in modern dialects of Zealand, Flanders and Brabant. No vowel fronting is attested.

3. t, d

dode ‘messenger’, also ‘message’ \(< \ast \text{budan}.\) Generally boo, booi in Zealand, Flanders and Brabant, bood in North Holland. No fronted variants occur.

bodem ‘bottom’ \(< \ast \text{bupman}.\). In the GTRP dataset, we find a back vowel in all dialects.

boter, beuter ‘butter’ \(< \text{WGM. } \ast \text{buterō}-\) from Latin \text{butyra}, pl. of \text{butyrum}. No i-mutation factor appears to have worked in the cognate languages: MLG botter, OHG butera, MoHG Butter, OFri. butera, botera, MoWF būter, OE butere. In Early MDu. botre, boter, botter, bueter(e) (the latter form only in Bruges), the vowel quality is not always clear. Modern dialects, according to the GTRP database, show a short, mid palatal vowel [œ] in French and southwestern West Flanders, as well as in northern Zealand, southern South Holland, some archaic coastal dialects of Holland, and West Friesland (and here and there in Drente). The coastal area in between, viz. two thirds of West Flanders, western Zeeuws Vlaanderen, Walcheren and Zuid-Beveland, has beuter(e) with a lengthened vowel. Thus, regardless of the differences in vowel length, it appears that all of coastal Dutch originally had a front vowel (cf. Kloeke 1950: 78–85). ‘Butter’ has a back vowel in all central and eastern dialects (cf. Vereecken 1938, Map 9; Taeldeman 1971, Map 21).

dooyer ‘egg yolk’ \(< \ast \text{dudra(n)}-.\), OS dodro, MDu. doder. For the modern dialects, see TNZN Map 9.2. Dialects preserving intervocalic d are found in three small areas, viz. the northern part of French Flanders (dudder), the southernmost tip of Groningen (deudel, deutel), and four points in the Achterhoek (dodder). Most dialects of Brabant, Gelderland and Utrecht have changed d to j, yielding dooyer, also doejer, deujer. Since dooyer is the standard variant, its spread to Holland, Zealand,
Overijssel and Groningen – where it occurs beside other local variants – is probably recent. Finally, loss of intervocalic \( d \) characterizes the remaining provinces: \( dorre, doore, door \) and similar variants occur in Flanders, Zeeland and Holland in the west, and in Limburg plus eastern Antwerp, Overijssel, Drente and Groningen in the east. Some areas, such as southern East Flanders and southern Groningen, have final \(-l\) rather than \(-r\). Except for French Flemish \( dudder \), no fronted variants are found to any significant degree in western Dutch. 

\( *u \) and \( *o \) in coastal Dutch

\( *gutō- \) (MDu. \( gote \), MoHG \( Gosse \)) and \( *guti- \) (MDu. \( gote \), MoHG \( Guss \)). According to the \( GTRP \) dataset for ‘gulley’, most of the eastern Dutch dialects have \( geut(e) \) or similar, which presupposes \( i- \)mutation. In all of Belgium, however, we find a back vowel, also in the \( i- \)mutating dialects. Hence, these dialects rather continue a preform \( *gutō- \), or they have leveled the vowel from non-umlauted forms of the erstwhile paradigm of \( *guti- \). In the west of the Netherlands, \( geut \) ‘gulley’ is restricted to a few dialects in the Meuse delta and to Aalsmeer and Monnickendam. For Zaanstreek, Boelen (2004: 147) remarks that \( geut \) is sometimes found as a variant beside \( goot \). A similar situation holds in Zeeland, where \( WZD \) mentions, beside usual \( gote \) and \( goot \), a rare variant \( geute \) for Walcheren and Zuid-Beveland. In West Flanders, \( geute \) (in Veurne-Ambacht: \( goote \)) means ‘a drop, a pouring’ as opposed to \( gote \) ‘gulley’ (de Bo 1892). The semantic differentialization must be the reason why Flemish \( geute \) does not appear in \( GTRP \) for ‘gulley’. In any case, \( geute \) must have been quite widespread in coastal Dutch, but it may have coexisted with \( gote \) for a long time, and both may have had different meanings. Looking at the meaning of the High German forms, I would say that Flemish \( geute \) corresponds to High German \( Guss \) ‘pouring’ but Flemish \( gote \) to \( Gosse \) ‘gutter’. Thus, putative Old Dutch \( *guti- \) ‘pouring’ yielded a fronted vowel which is not the case for Old Dutch \( *gotō- \) ‘gulley’. If this is correct, the Zealandish and Hollandish \( eu- \)forms meaning ‘gulley’ took their vocalism from ‘pouring’. 

\( *putōjan- \) (MDu. \( poten \), MLG \( poten \), \( potten \), OE \( potian \)). No front vowel variants are attested.

\( *rudōjan- \) (MDu. \( roden \)). Early MoDu. \( uutroeden > uitroeien \) ‘to extinguish’ represents a dialectal variant which was adopted in the standard language with a specialized meaning. Judging from intervocalic \( j \) and the texts in which it first occurs, \( uitroeien \) is probably a Brabantish form, and it may have spread in the standard language because of the religious works of the sixteenth century, such as Bible translations. For ‘uprooting’ trees, Zealand has \( /ruːdɑːl/, \) with a reflex of \( *ō \) that does not match that of the other dialects. In West Flanders we find a plethora of variants, viz. \( reuden, reun, reumen, reulen, roon, ronen, roeien \) (de Bo). \( WNT \) s.v. \( reulen \) gives the following possible scenario. To begin with, \( reuden \) seems to have unconditioned fronting of \( oo \). Intervocalic \( d \)-loss yielded \( reun \), which got recharacterized as \( reumen. \) But \( reun \) and \( reumen \) could also
be due to fronting of the vowel of *roon* and *roonen*, which presuppose *roden*. The frequentative *reulen* could go back to *reudelen* or have been fronted from *rolen* < *roden*. Thus, although the exact path to the attested *eu*-forms is unclear, they all imply unconditioned fronting.

*schoot* ‘shot; shoot’ < *skuta-*. See s.v. *schot* and s.v. *scheut* above.

*schuttel, schotel* ‘plate’ < *skutilō- < Lat. *scutella*, resp. *skutalō-* (OHG *scuzzila*, MoHG *Schüssel*, MLG *schôtel*; OS *skutala*, OE *scutel*). Early Middle Dutch has *scotele, scotele* in eastern texts, *scotelhe, scotele* in western dialects. This is easiest to understand if Old Dutch had a vacillating *i*-mutation factor. The back vowel then underwent unconditioned fronting in Holland and Flanders. This, implicitly, is also the position of Taeldeman (1971: 254–55). For *scutelle*, attested mainly in Holland, the explanation from unconditioned fronting is unproblematic anyhow. For *scuetele*, attested in Bruges next to *scoetele*, it is at least possible. Thus, if the eastern forms contain /o:/ (which we cannot know for sure), the Early Middle Dutch data foreshadow the modern dialect situation. Present-day dialects show an unmutated back vowel in most of Brabant and Limburg versus a front rounded vowel in all of French and West Flanders and Zealand, as well as in the more traditional dialects of Holland including West Friesland (*GTRP*; see Taeldeman 1971: 270, Map 21, for the exact border in Flanders). There is also a front rounded vowel in most northeastern dialects. In order to explain the cooccurrence of *i*-mutated and unmutated forms in West Germanic, Franck & van Wijk 1912 assume suffix replacement of borrowed *-*ilō- by the inherited variant *-*alō-. This seems indeed to be the best option.

*stro(o)t* ‘throat’ < *strut(t)ō(n)-, -a-* (see also § 15.3.1, B). The word has undergone *r*-metathesis in Flanders, Zealand and Holland, yielding *storte, starte* in the thirteenth century, later also *sterte*. See Belemans & Goossens 2000: 217 for the modern isogloss between *stort* and *stroot*. Thus, the area with unconditioned fronting is irrelevant for this lexeme as the phonetic context has been changed. In East Brabant we find *strote* (1276–1300) with a lengthened vowel. Central and eastern Dutch *strote > stroot* was replaced by *strot* (< *struttō-*) in the standard language in the seventeenth century.

*vloot* ‘fleet; tub’ < *flutan-* ‘floating object’, MDu. *vlote*. In the meaning ‘butter tub’, a form *vleut* is sometimes found in late texts, but it seems to have an eastern dialectal origin. In western dialects I find only back vowels.

4. S, Z

*blozen* ‘to blush’ < *blusjan- or *blusōn* (MLG *blöschen*, OE *blysian* ‘to be red’, *blyscan* ‘to blush’), or representing a more recent derivative of an ADV. *blusa-* ‘red’. Middle Dutch *blōsen* and *bluesen*. In modern dialects of western and northern East Flanders, Zeeuws Flanders, West Flanders (sporadically) and Central Zealand, we find /bloːz(ə)n/, see Map 35. Most other Dutch dialects have a long back vowel or diphthong, as in StDu. *blozen*.
5. k, g

*beloke* ‘enclosed field; monastery’ < *bi-luka-*. Early Middle Dutch has *biloke f., gen. -en* (in Flanders) and *bilo(e)c m., gen. bilox* (in Limburg), with stress on the second syllable. Reduction of the pretonic syllable to zero yields Modern Dutch *blook, blok*. There is no fronting of *u* in western dialects. With stress on the first syllable (which must have developed after reduction of *bi- to *bi-*), we find Early MDu. *belec, beelc, belc, buelc* (in West Flanders and Oudenaarde), developing to modern *bilk, bulk.*

*boog* ‘bow’ < *bugan-. The GTRP database has no front vowel occurrences for *boog.*

*knook* ‘bone’ < *knukan-. No front vowel variants were found.

*koken* ‘to cook, boil’ < *kokōjan-,* borrowed from Latin *coquō*. All modern dialects have the regular reflex of lengthened *o* in open syllable (GTRP).

*koker* ‘case, cylinder’ < *kukara-* (ODu. *cokare, MDu. coker, MoDu. ko(o)ker*). No front vowel forms.

*kreukaen* ‘to crease’ < *krukōjan-. MDu. *croken* ‘to break’ (Cleves/Guelders, 1220–40, rhyming with *gebroken* ‘broken’ and thus proving a back vowel). There is an explicit back vowel in *krooken* in *Der Minnen Loep* (Holland), and in Kiliaan’s *kroken, kroocken*. In the seventeenth century, *krooken* and *kreukaen* are in competition with each other in the literary language. In modern dialects, I find *(ver)kroken* in Antwerp and South Brabant plus the frequentative *kroolken* beside *krooken* in Zealand. There is also a noun *krok* ‘a crease’ in West Flanders and North Holland, corresponding to *kreuk(el)* of the standard language. Thus, it appears that western *kreukaen* is due to unconditioned fronting. In eastern dialects, the frequentative has regular *i-*mutation to *kreukelen*, which may have favoured the spread of *eu* to *kreukaen*. Note also that standard *kreukaen* has shifted its meaning from ‘break’ toward that of *kreukelen* ‘to make folds or wrinkles, to crease’.

Dial. *meugen, meukt* vs. StDu. *mogen, mooigt* ‘may’ (OHG *mugun*). Nearly all of western and southern Dutch has *eu-*vocalism in Middle and Early Modern Dutch, according to Vereecken 1938: 48–53 (plus Map 7). She explains *eu* from unconditioned fronting, although she leaves open the possibility that *eu* was adopted.
from the subjunctive forms in *mug-ī-. For modern dialects, the GTRP database shows a front rounded vowel in all of Flanders, most of Brabant, and large stretches of northeastern Dutch, but a back vowel o(u) or low back a (on the analogy of 1sg.+3sg. mag) in Zealand, Holland, Utrecht, Limburg, and larger sections of the northeast. The eastern dialects without i-mutation and with a rounded back vowel suggest that western meugen is due to unconditioned fronting. In the derivative mogelijk ‘possible’, the GTRP data show eu in all eastern dialects, all of Antwerp, South Brabant, Flanders, and in large parts of Zealand. A back vowel is found in western North Brabant, South and North Holland, and Utrecht, but there are relic forms with /o/ along the Hollandish coast. The /o/ in Waterland, Gooi and in southeastern South Holland, on the other hand, may be a remnant of inland Dutch i-mutation.

poken ‘to stir’ < *puk-. No front vowel variants are attested for the verb, but the noun pook ‘a thrust’ is found as peuke in West Flanders. Vondel has zijn pijp uitpeuken ‘to clean out his pipe’, which may belong here.

stoken ‘to stir’ < *stukōjan-. No front vowel variants are attested.

togen ‘to pull, tow’ < *tugōjan-. MDu. togen ‘to pull, travel’, pret. toochte, is occasionally attested in Hollandish and Flemish sources from the fifteenth century onwards. To Kiliaan, it already felt like an antiquated word; he also gives teugh-naghel ‘pulling-nail’. Still, teugen survives in the seventeenth century and in modern dialects in specific usages such as pulling a plough or a fishing net. We find eu-vocalism in a number of coastal dialects. Thus, West Flemish has both toog and teug as imperatives for ‘proceed, go on!’ (de Bo 1892 s.v. togen); see WNT for other traces.

vogel, dial. veugel ‘bird’ < ODu. *fugal or *fogal < WGm. *fugla-. Compare Vereecken 1938: 25–31 plus Map 3, Taeldeman 1971: 269, Map 19. The latter shows veugel in all of French and West Flanders, and in the northwestern half of East Flanders. The same front vowel is also usual in all of Zealand, southern South Holland and West Friesland (GTRP database, FAND II/III, Map 50). Thus, coastal Dutch veugel fairly uniformly contrasts with inland Dutch vogel.

7. m, n
komen ‘to come’, MDu. komen < *kweman. In the GTRP database, komen has a back vowel in nearly all dialects. It shows up either with a lengthened vowel from *o or *u in open syllable, or with short /ɔ/ (see FAND II/III, Map 34). Older enquiries show basically the same picture. An unpublished map on Kaartenbank shows a long /o./ in the infinitive in large tracts of East Flanders and Brabant and in Groningen, versus short /ɔ/ in most other Dutch dialects. There are sporadic instances of eu-vocalism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries from Holland. Examples include Westerbaen (1624), who has someone from the Hague using keumen for ‘to come’, and Witsen (1690), where a Hollandish ship’s pilot says Kijn sy keumen af = ‘child, here they come’. Jan van Elsland’s local characters from Haarlem say keumen ‘to
come’, _keumt_ ‘comes’ and _keumst_ ‘coming’ (1738, _Gezangen_). Still, there are also a number of playwrights in the seventeenth century, such as Bredero and van Santen, who never use _keumen_. The 18th-century manuscript by Kool (see de Vaan 2013b) with North Holland dialect also has _keumen, zy keumt_ for ‘to come, she comes’.

_vroom_ ‘pious’ < MDu. _vrome_ adj. ‘brave, honest’ and subst. ‘gain’ < *fruman- ‘first’. The word survives in modern West Flemish _vroom, vrom_ ‘strong’. No front vowel variants are attested.

_zomer_ ‘summer’ < *sumara-. Early MDu. _somer, soemer_. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, _seumer_ occurs in a few texts from Zealand (van de Venne, 1623) and Holland (Huygens; _Hoornse Speelwerck_, 1732). In modern dialects, a lengthened front vowel or diphthong is found in Zealand, peripheral dialects of South and North Holland, and in West Friesland (_FAND II/III, Map 51_), whereas Flanders does not share in the fronting. The back vowel in eastern Dutch (except for Groningen) confirms that there was no _i_-mutation factor.

deun, _doon, don_ ‘tight, close by, soon’ < *_þuna/u-_ ‘stretched’ (Kroonen 2013: 551; MLG _don_ ‘tight’, MHG _don_ ‘stiff, tight’; OS _thona_ ‘tendril of a plant’, OHG _dona_ ‘tendon’). MDu. _duen_ ‘tight, stiff’ mainly occurs in Hollandish sources. Kiliaan (1599) has _doon_ ‘right away’, ‘next to’, and there is also _doon_ with Marnix van Sint Aldegonde. In the seventeenth century, all literary texts by Hollandish and Zealandish authors have _deun_. In modern dialects, we find _deun_ for ‘close by’ and ‘stingly’ in North and South Holland. Zealandish has _donne_ ‘close by; stingy’ on Schouwen (_WZD_), and North Hollandish adds _don_ ‘tight, stiff’ (already in 1631). The short vowel in _don, donne_ is not easily explained, unless it results from contamination with _dun(ne)_ ‘thin’, on which see § 15.2.1, nr. 3. Enschede in Twente has _don_ ‘drunk’. The expression ‘close by’ is _doon bie_ or _doeën bie_ in many modern dialects of East Limburg, and _doon_ has tone accent 1. In adjacent Ripuarian dialects, the word is realized as _doon, daoën, doeën_ (see _RhWb_ s.v. _don_). These Limburgian and Ripuarian realisations show the local reflex of WGm. *au before _n_. The vowel may have been conditioned (that is, probably, lowered) by the following _n_, as is shown by the next word.

gewoon ‘usual’ < *_ga-wuna-_ (OS _giwuno_). Map 36, drawn on the basis of _GTRP_, is nearly identical to the map _wonen_ ‘to live’ (_FAND II/III, Map 53_). We find a front vowel /ø:/ or /yø/ in all of Flanders, parts of Zealand, in traditional dialects of South Holland and in a few of the archaic North Holland villages. The majority of inland Dutch has no _i_-mutation, which points to a preform *_gawuna-_ , with lengthening to /o:/ in inland Dutch and unconditioned fronting in coastal Dutch. The _FAND_ comment to _wonen_ ‘to live’ notes that the reflexes in southern Brabant and Limburg are identical to that of _boon_ ‘bean’ < WGm. *bauna-. Put differently, in ‘wonen’ and ‘gewoon’ the reflexes of *au and of *_u_ + open syllable lengthening have merged in this area. _FAND II/III_: 116 tentatively explains this merger from a preference of Dutch for falling diphthongs, which would have caused a change of expected */wu:/

or */wo:/ to /(w)uə/ or /(w)oə/. Yet w- is not normally lost from these words in the southeastern dialects, so that the explanation remains conjectural. In combination with the evidence for doon ‘close by’ discussed above, it might instead be argued that the following n caused a lowering of Early MDu. *-ōn- to *-ɔ̄n-, the same vowel as resulted from *au. A clear difference between ‘gewoon’ and ‘wonen’ lies in the presence of a fronted vowel in the adjective in eastern Limburg. For a tentative explanation of this phenomenon see de Vaan 2014c.

heuning beside honing ‘honey’ < *xunanga-. There is no i-mutation factor in the oldest stages of the cognate languages. Early Middle Dutch has only honech with loss of the velar nasal through dissimilation. The first forms containing -ng- appear in the fifteenth century, but honich, honig remains the dominant spelling until the 1800s. Literary ue-spellings start to appear in Flanders in some numbers around 1500, but also in the Liesveldt Bible (1526) from Brabant. In the seventeenth century, heunig can also be found in Hollandish texts. The modern dialect variants are mapped in TNZN Map 3.9. In western Dutch, front vowel variants such as (h) euning, (h)eunik are found in most of southern Brabant, East Flanders, Zealand,
southern South Holland, Scheveningen, ’t Gooi, and a number of North Hollandish dialects, including Wieringen. West Flanders mostly has the heteronym zeem, but eunink is also sporadically found. We may assume that all of coastal Dutch had heuning in Middle Dutch (cf. Kloek 1950: 87). The remainder of South Holland and North Holland nowadays has honing, honig except for Zandvoort (hunning) and Texel (huning, the Frisian form; but Jansen 1993 mentions only heuning). As to the eastern dialects, they show either fronting to hunning (Groningen, Drente, western Overijssel, also the central Campine), or a back vowel in honing (Limburg, Betuwe), honnig, honning (Twente, Achterhoek, northeastern Brabant), or hoeni(n)g (Veluwe, eastern Campine, North Limburg). Since hunning occurs in an area which productively fronts short rounded back vowels, the eastern dialects agree among each other in the absence of i-mutation. It follows that western (h)euni(n)g is the result of unconditioned fronting of *u.

kunnen, dial. konnen ‘to be able’ < *kunnan. Instead of the inherited short vowel, we find evidence for a lengthened vowel in Early MDu. 2P.IND. conet, Late MDu. coent and 3P.IND. co(e)nen. These forms occur in South Brabant and Flanders beside more usual conen. Thus, they have either /ø:/ or /øː/. Franck (1910: 82 and 138–139) ascribes the rise of the forms with a single n to the influence of the paradigm of ‘shall’ (sg. *skal, pl. *skulun) on ‘can’ (sg. *kann, pl. *kunnun). One of Franck’s arguments is the geographical spread: we find conen mainly in Brabant, which also has solen. In Early Modern Dutch, c/kuenen, c/keunen are found in literary sources of West Flemish, Zealandish and Hollandish origin. In modern dialects, keunen is found in the Ms. – Kool of the eighteenth century for North Holland, in Pannekeet (1984: 164), and it is found in West Flemish beside kunnen just like jeunen ‘to grant’ beside junnen (de Bo 1892). According to an unpublished dialect map in Kaartenbank,148 the vowel /ø/ of keunen ‘they can’ is found in the western half of East Flanders and the adjacent area around Kortrijk. In Zealandish, keunen is only found in Westdorpe in Zeeuws Flanders (WZD).

steunen ‘to support’ < *stunōjan. MDu. stonen. Explicit front vowels occur in stuenen (Leiden, 1419), Early MoDu. stuken ‘to oppose’ (in Flemish texts of the 1500s), and steunen (from Plantin and Kiliaan onwards). According to an unpublished map from Kaartenbank, steunen ‘support’ had /ø/ in all dialects of the Netherlands (with minor local variants), with the exception of Katwijk steene, which must be due to confusion with stenen = steunen ‘to moan’. The eastern data suggest that the verb had i-mutation.

wonen ‘to live’ < *wunēn-: see above s.v. gewoon.

The modern dialects show a back vowel in the southeast and the centre of the Dutch linguistic area, as expected, but a front vowel in nearly all of Flanders and Zeeland, and in most of the traditional Hollandish dialects from Goeree-Overflakkee to Texel. The form zeun(e) in these areas is best explained from unconditioned fronting of an earlier back vowel, as per FAND II/III, p. 104 and Map 47.

9.

kool ‘coal’ < *kula(n)-. All modern dialects have a lengthened back vowel, with the exception of Bruges /ko.ə/, the regularly fronted local variant (GTRP).

zool ‘sole (of the foot)’ < Lat. sola (G. Sohle). The GTRP database shows a lengthened front vowel /ø:/ in northern French Flanders and West Flanders, in many parts of Zeeland and on Overflakkee. All other dialects have a (long) back vowel.

zole ‘plough’, zeulen ‘to drag’. The verb is only attested with eu and only since 1598. It is clearly derived from the noun for ‘plough’, Early MDu. suele (WFla., 1291), also in the PN Soelwiel ‘Plough’s Wheel’ (EFla.), MDu. sole, Early Modern Flemish zeule, zulle, soole, from WGM. *sulx- (cf. OE sulh, pl. sylh). For ‘plough’ or a specific part of the plough, Modern Flemish has zole in French Flanders and western West Flanders, zeule beside zoole in northern West Flanders, and zeul beside zool in southern East Flanders (WVD). Similarly, modern Zealandish has mostly zeule (on Walcheren, Beveland, Tholen, Overflakkee, in western Zeeuws Flanders), but also zole, zool (Schouwen-Duiveland, Goeree), and zolle. The verb ‘to plough’ is generally zolen in French Flanders and southwestern West Flanders. For want of eastern reflexes of this word, we cannot say whether the stem would have had i-mutation in Old Franconian. The safe bet seems to be that it would have had a singular without i-mutation and a plural with it. In any case, the peripheral location of the oo-variants in French Flanders and northern Zealand suggests that zole is older and zeule more recent, which implies that zeule has spread at the expense of zole.

10.

boor ‘drill’, MDu. bore < *buran (OHG bora), derivative of the verb boren ‘to drill’, MDu. boren < PGM. *burōjan-. No front vowel forms are attested except in East Flanders, where they correspond with the regular reflex of *au (see FAND II/III Map 31). In some other regions, too, boren has joined the reflexes of *au.

gloren ‘to shimmer, glore’ < *gluzVn, derived noun gloor. These words are not attested before 1584 in Spiegel’s Tweespraak. Verb and noun are usually found with a back vowel in the seventeenth century. In modern North Hollandish they have oo, elsewhere they have mostly disappeared.

goor ‘dirty’, MDu. gore r., also gorre ‘dirt, mud’, goor n. ‘dirt; fish-seed’ < *gurwa-. Through reinterpretation, the noun has become an adjective in Modern Dutch. It is never attested with a front vowel.
bekoren ‘to charm’, MDu. becoren ‘to taste, test’ < *kurōjan-. In the meaning ‘to test’, early modern authors of Flemish and Hollandish descent also spell becueren, bekeuren. It is homonymous with bekeuren ‘to arrange, fine’ which is denominal to the noun keur ‘choice; statute’. Since the simplex keuren ‘to examine’ had a front vowel at the latest in the sixteenth century, it cannot be determined whether the eu-variant of bekoren was taken from keuren or represents an independent fronting of the oo in bekoren.

schoren ‘to shore, support’, schoor ‘support’ < *skurōjan-. No front vowels are attested in literary Dutch nor in modern western dialects.

smoren ‘to suffocate, braise’ (OE smorian) < *smurōjan-. Early MDu. versmoren ‘to suffocate’, Early MoDu. smooren. Hexham’s dictionary (1648) has smeuren ofte smooren ‘to evaporate, consume away in smoke’. For versmeuren, WNT cites a few occurrences of versmeuren in sixteenth-century works from Antwerp and Holland. In de Castelein’s Rhemoriken from 1555, the author of which came from Oudenaerde, we find versmueren ‘to drown’, which is given as versmooren in de Bo’s dictionary of West Flemish and as versmôre(n) in WZD.

spoor ‘track’ n. < *spura- (Kroonen 2013: 471), MDu. spor and (with oo taken from the oblique case forms) spoor. Most Modern Dutch forms have a back vowel, but we find speur in a Flemish ordinance from 1613, with the Zeelandish author de Brune (17th c.), and with Carel van Mander. Speur is both ‘footstep’ and the ‘track’ of a car in modern West Flemish and in Zeeuws Flemish (WZD 909), whereas the remainder of Zealand and North Holland have spoor.

spoor ‘spur’ m. < *spuran- (OHG sporo), MDu. spore. West Flemish has spoor(e) or sporre. I found no forms with a front vowel.

vore ‘furrow’ < *furxō-. Beside usual literary vore, voor, we find veur with Cats (Zealand, 17th c.) and Berkhey (Holland, late 18th c.). In West Flemish, veur(e) is usual but western French Flanders preserves vore. In modern dialects of Zealand and southern South Holland, veur(e) is the usual form (WZD). North Holland has voor but in Assendelft veur (Boekenoogen 2004). The other usual form in North Holland was vurg.

See § 15.3.4 for a survey and interpretation of the results of this section.

15.3.3 Etymological variation between /u/ and /ü/

door ‘through’, dial. deur (< *þurx and *þuri). Map 44 in FAND II/III provides the modern distribution of dialect variants. All of Flanders, Zeeland, nearly all of Brabant, Gelderland and the northeastern dialects have a front rounded vowel such as /ø./ or /œl/. Much of Limburg has a long back vowel or diphthong, and the same is true for northern South Holland and a number of dialects in North Holland. In their comments on Map 44, the authors of FAND argue that deur is more original than door in Holland. This is supported by the data of the thirteenth century as per
Mooijaart (1992: 123), and by _duer_-spellings in North Holland in the fourteenth century (CRM14).

Historically, the Limburgian _door_-forms can be linked to the German type _durch_, i.e. *þuru < *þurux < *þurx. The front vowel of the other inland Dutch dialects requires *þuri. It seems likely that this vocalism was due to analogy with *furi ‘for’. The Hollandish and Flemish form _deur_, on the other hand, must be due to unconditioned fronting of earlier *u.

The back vowel in standard _door_ still remains to be accounted for: where would _oo_ have come from if coastal and inland Dutch (except Limburg) both had _eu_? In my view, the Early Middle Dutch evidence shows too many _oo_-spellings in Flanders and Brabant to maintain that the word only had /ø:/-vocalism in these areas. Therefore, I propose that Late Old Dutch had both *þuru (the inherited variant, attested as _thuro_ in the Wachtendonck Psalter) and *þuri (renewed on the basis of *furi). MDu. _door_, shortened _dor_, and MoDu. _door_ can then continue the unmutated form in *-u whereas inland Dutch _deur_ will represent *þuri. Coastal Dutch _deur_ remains ambiguous: if it underwent unconditioned fronting, it may reflect either *-o or *-i.

_Jood_ ‘Jew’ < Continental WGM. *judjan- and *judan- from Latin _Iudaæus_ (OS judeo, jutheo, OHG judeo, MHG jüde, OFri. juda, jotha, MoWF joad), adopted in Germanic with the weak inflexion like other ethnic names such as _Franko_ and _Sahso_ (see Hofmann 1982 for a discussion of the variation in ‘Jew’ in the Old Germanic languages and for the reconstruction). The word is attested in Early Middle Flemish as _juede_ with an explicit front rounded vowel, more rarely as _joede_, but in West Brabant mostly as _Ijoe(de)_ or _Jode_ (which may hide _i_-mutation, since the _i_-mutated _adj_. *judiska- ‘Jewish’ is found in West Brabant as _ijo(e)dsch_ ‘Jewish’). The first reliable instance of a back vowel is _Jood_ in a text from Holland from ca. 1440. In Early Modern Dutch, _Jode_, _Jood_ is the prevailing form in Holland, but occasional _eu_-spellings in farcical plays and other texts suggest that the lower registers said _Jeud(e)_ (e.g., _Jeun ‘Jews_ (Dordrecht, 1569), _Jueden_ (1622, W. D. Hooft), _leud_ ‘Jew’, _jeud-werk_ ‘fine sowing work’ (1642, Tengnagel), _Jeude-kerk_ ‘Jews’ church’ (1654, Schellinx). Kiliaan (1599) has _Iode_ and _Iodsch_ and modern dialects confirm that _Jood_ is the Brabantish form. This suggest that Middle Flemish and Early Modern Hollandish _Jeud(e)_ is due to unconditioned fronting.

Map 37 renders the responses for ‘Jood’ in the Willems enquiry of the 1880s. I have concentrated on Brabant, Limburg, and southern Guelders, because that is the area where _i_-mutation would show up. Flanders and Zeeland have not been included in the map, and the Willems enquiry contains little evidence from the dialects north of the Rhine. We find long /o:/, sometimes realized as low /ɔ:/ or shortened to /ʌ/, in East Flanders and all of Brabant (except for its northeastern part, for which data are lacking) and in the Betuwe. This is consistent with the western and standard form _Jood_, and contains the regular reflex of short *o or *u in open syllable, as in _gescho-ten_ ‘shot’ or _vogel_. In Limburg and adjacent parts of North Brabant and Guelders,
however, we find two different reflexes: high back /u/ and front rounded /ö/, both in short and long variants. The distribution of the Limburgian reflexes /u:/ and /u/ does not match any single one of the inherited vowels, since WGm. *ū would normally yield a front vowel in westernmost Belgian Limburg, and would not be shortened to /u/ so pervasively. The spread of the fronted vowels also does not match any known distribution: it is too restricted to represent an old instance of i-mutation, and the variation between long and short vowel in southeast Limburg is unusual. Map 38 zooms in on the province of Dutch Limburg and provides the data from the SGV enquiry at the beginning of the twentieth century. It shows that /jōt/ was dominant in northern Limburg, and /jōt/ beside /jüt/ in South Limburg, whereas Central Limburg mainly has umlautless /ju(:)t/. Some of the instances with short /u/ in the central area probably hide long /u:/, because the transcriptions often do not allow us to make the relevant length distinction. A small area south of Roermond has the i-mutated variant /y:/ of /u:/ and the word has tone accent 1 as far as we can tell, in accordance with the loss of the Middle Dutch unstressed syllable after *d.
The same variation as in Limburg is found in the adjacent parts of Germany, cf. Hofmann 1982: 300–2. For Ripuarian and the Cleves/Guelders area, Rheinisches Wörterbuch regards sg. /jyt/ or /jøt/ as the main variant, occasionally with a long vowel. Besides, sg. /jut/, pl. /juːdə/ also occurs. Some dialects have /u/ and /y/ side by side in the singular.

Hence, the evidence points to *judan- (in Brabantish /joːd/) and *judjan- > *jüddan- (in Limburgian and Ripuarian /jyd/) as inherited stems. Furthermore, it is possible that Latin Iudaeus and High German Jude influenced the vernacular forms at different moments throughout history, causing restoration of /u(:)/.

over, southeastern euver ‘over, about’ < *uberi (OHG ubar and ubiri, ODu. our, MDu. MoDu. over). All of Modern Dutch has a back vowel except for the city of Bruges (where fronting is probably secondary) and the dialects and Limburg and the extreme southeast of Brabant, which have euver, uuver or their unrounded
counterparts. Although the southeastern forms must be due to the inherited $i$-mutation factor, the absence of $i$-mutation from other eastern dialects suggest that Old Dutch had two variants of the preposition/adverb, viz. one with and one without $i$-mutation; compare OHG $ubar$ next to $ubiri$. This means that western Dutch $over$ can represent either the unmutated Old Dutch variant, or the adoption of Old Franconian $ubir$ with loss of the mutation factor.

$voor$, dial. $veur$ ‘for, before’ < $*furi$ and $*fura$ (ODu. $furi$, $fure$ and $fora$, $fore$). West Germanic inherited two variants of this word, of which $*furi$ regularly acquired an $i$-mutated vowel (G. $für$) whereas $*fora$ did not (G. $vor$). In modern dialects, the GTRP database shows a front vowel in all central and eastern dialects (see Map 39) as against a back vowel in the western dialects. The conspicuous role of the state border in northwestern Brabant ($veur$ to the South, $voor$ to the North) and the sporadic attestations of $veur$ in Zealand and Holland suggest that $voor$ encroached on $veur$ with the aid of the standard language.

Map 39. Front vowel in $voor$ ‘for’ (data GTRP)
15.3.4 Summaries

We have reviewed ca. 360 Dutch etyma with West Germanic *u, including Latin loanwords with u or o, and some with Old French o. Coastal Dutch has a fourfold reflex of these short vowels: (1) short front rounded (as in Modern Dutch u), (2) short back rounded (MoDu. o), (3) long front rounded (MoDu. eu), (4) long back rounded (MoDu. oo).

As sketched in § 15.1.1, several different hypotheses have been put forward to account for the origins of the coastal Dutch distribution. The main explanatory models are the following:

Hypothesis 1: The distribution reflects the presence or absence of vowel mutation factors.

Hypothesis 2: The distribution is due to unconditioned fronting of Old Franco-

Hypothesis 3: The distribution depends on the consonants preceding and/or fol-

Hypothesis 4: The distribution can be explained from a combination of the above factors: vowel mutation, unconditioned fronting, and/or the consonantal en-

In order to decide between these options, I will summarize the evidence in four different subsections, according to the following criteria:

a. The presence or absence of a WGm. i-mutation factor.

b. The distinction between OFra. *u and *o, as far as it depended on the vowel in the second syllable.

c. The consonants preceding or following WGm. *u.

d. The dialect geography of the coastal Dutch reflexes.

Evidence which was judged to be uncertain or irrelevant in the course of the investigation has been excluded from the enumerations below. This concerns, for instance, words for which we do not have enough data from western Dutch, words where analogy with cognate forms may have played a major role, and words which are suspect of influence from the written language. 149

149. In this section, I use the following, reduced abbreviations: F = Flanders, FF = French Flanders, WF = West Flanders, EF = East Flanders, ZF = Zeeuws Flanders, Z = Zealand, H = Holland, SH = South Holland, NH = North Holland, U = Utrecht. The word “only” in front of an abbreviation means that the word is not attested in relevant dialectal sources of the other areas, “spor.” means “sporadically” and “arch.” means “archaic” (from the viewpoint of modern dialects).
Summary 1. The coastal Dutch distribution compared with WGM. i-mutation

The presence of an i-mutation factor often goes hand in hand with a front vowel reflex in coastal Dutch, either in all dialects or in a subset. Conversely, of those words which have a back vowel in all coastal dialects, only *brommen* and *om* may have had i-mutation in Old Germanic, whereas the remaining ca. 120 lexemes with a back vowel did not have i-mutation. This distribution could suggest a causal link between i-mutation and coastal Dutch fronting, but two other facts seem to contradict such a link.

Firstly, around a dozen words have vowel fronting throughout but did not have i-mutation. This group includes some very frequent words, such as *zeun* 'son', *weunen* 'to live', and *veugel* 'bird'. Compare:

With i-mutation factor in West Germanic:
- *kreupel*, *kubbe*, *lubben*, *deuvel*, *deuvik*, *heus*, *heuvel*, *geut*, *keutel*, *neut*, *nutte*, *schut-schuttel*, *beul*, *kudde*, *mudde*, *reu*, *bus(k)*, *kust*, *lust*, *reuzel*, *schutten*, *stutten*;
- *Beunen*, *deun*, *deunen*, *dreunen*, *kunnen*, *keuning*, *munnik*;
- *hulde*, *hulst*, *zult*, *beuren*, *deur*, *keur*, *speuren*, *stug*, *vleug*, *vlug*, *gehuucht*, *vluchten*, *zucht*, *zuchten*.

No i-mutation factor in West Germanic:
- *beuter*, *reuden*, *dus*, *kust* 'coast', *heuning*, *steunen*, *geweun*, *weunen*, *zeun*, *bul* 'bull', *veugel*, *zeug*, *buchel*.

Secondly, the words with a geographically restricted front vowel reflex are distributed fairly evenly between West Germanic forms with and without i-mutation. If i-mutation were the decisive factor, we would not expect this distribution. Compare:

With i-mutation and partial fronting:
- *dreupel/dropel*, *druppen/droppen*, *schuppe/schoppe*, *zeup/zoop*, *tubbe/tobbe*, *schubb-be/schobbe*, *euvel/o Evel*;
- *dreumel/drommel*, *dreum/drom*;
- *butte/botte*, *geut/goot*, *dutten/dodden*, *sleutel/slotel*, *schudden/schodden*;
- *busse/bosse*, *bussel/bossel*, *kussen/kossen*, *mus/mosk*, *mussel/mossel*, *bleuzen/blozen*, *euzie/oozie*, *kneuzen*, *neus*;
- *bun/bon*, *begunde/begonde*, *bundel/bondel*, *zunde/zonde*, *munt/mont*;
- *heul/hol*, *veulen/vool*, *vullen/vollen*, *bulgen/verbolgen*, *schuld/schoud*, *wullen/wollen*, *zeule/zole*, *scheur/schoor*;
No i-mutation and partial fronting:

- pup/pop, up/op, schuppen/schoppen, schup/schop, bubbel/bobbel, dubben/dobber, dubbel/dobbel, lub/lob, tup/top, duf/dof, juffer/joffer, keuvel/kovel;
- gum/gom, keumen/komen, krum/krom, nummer/nommer, zeumer/zomer;
- but/bot, dudder/dodder, gut/god, mudder/modder, zdde/zodde; kusten/kosten;
- dunder/donder, plund/plond-, nun/non, slunse/slons, tun/ton, zun/zon, zundag/zondag, zunder/zonder;
- but/bot, krul/krol, vul/vol, bulster/bolster, kulk/kolk, pul/sols, sulfer/solfer, stulp/stolp, wul/wol, zeul/zool, wulf/wolf;
- smeuren/smoren, speur/spoor, veur/voor ‘furrow’;
- buk/bok, juk/jok, kreuken/kroken, puk/pok, plug/plog, teugen/togen, bucht/bocht ‘dirt’,
  lucht/locht, uchtend/ochtend, vrucht/vrocht;
- dunken/donken.

This survey contradicts the view that i-mutation was the only or the decisive factor in the fronting of *u. But it does not necessarily imply that i-mutation factors were completely irrelevant to the distribution observed.

Summary 2. The coastal Dutch distribution compared with West Germanic a-mutation

West Germanic a-mutation, or, as it is sometimes termed, high/low mutation, governs the distinction between Old Dutch *u, which occurred before *u, *i, *i, or *j in the next syllable and in monosyllables, and Old Dutch *o, occurring before a following mid or low vowel. Buccini 1995 specified the main factors in the following way:

*/u/ in the environments CuCi, CuCj, CuCu, CuNCV in all West Germanic dialects.
*/u/ or */o/ in the environments CumV, CunV, C[lab]uC in Anglo-Frisian.
*/o/ in the environments CoCa, CoCō, CoCē, in all West Germanic dialects.

Old Dutch */u/ in the environment CuCi/j has already been discussed in the previous summary. Here is an overview of the distribution in the remaining environments, with NC divided into the two subcategories nT (n plus dental obstruent) and nK (n plus velar obstruent). The evidence is grouped according to whether the coastal dialects always have a front vowel, always a back vowel, or a front vowel in part of the dialects (“partly”).

A. WGM. *CuCu
   Always front: zeun, lust.
   Partly front: lucht/locht, vrucht/vrocht, deun/donne, uchtend/ochtend.
   Always back: none.

B. WGM. *CunTV
   Always front: none.
Partly front: begunde/begonde, bundel/bondel, zunde/zonde, munt/mont, plund-/plond-, sluns/slons, zunder/zonder.
Always back: grond, blond, gezond, hond, honderd, mond.

C. WGm. *CunKV
Always front: none.
Partly front: dunken/donken.
Always back: dronk, donken, honger, donker, jong, tong, vonk.

D. WGm. *Cum(C)V
Always front: none.
Partly front: dreumel/drommel, dreum/drom, keumen/komen, krum/krom, zeumer/zomer.
Always back: brommen, hommel, om, dom, kom, lomp, som-, stum, stomp, vroom.

E. WGm. *CumV
Always front: Beunen, deun, deunen, dreunen, kunnen, keuning, munnik, heuning, steunen, geweun, weunen.
Partly front: bun/bon, deun/donne, dunder/donder, zundag/zondag, nun/non, tun/ton, zun/zon.
Always back: none.

F. WGm. *C[lab]uC
Always front: beuter/butter, beul, bult, m(e)ul, beuren, speuren, beugel, bus 'wood', bul 'bull', veugel 'bird', buchel 'hump'.
Always back: boven, mot, pot, poten, gebod, bode, bodem, mos, most(erd), post, spot, bot, vos, bol, mol, molm, volgen, volk, wolk, spoer 'spur', boog.

G. WGm. *CoCa
Always front: reuden (only F), bul 'bull', veugel 'bird', buchel 'hump'.
Always back: dop, hop, kloppen, knop, kop, koper, nop, open, sop, soppen, stoppen, stop, dobbé, kobbe, schrobben, slobben, stobbe, doft, grof, hof, lof, offeren, schoft, slof, stof, boven, loven, oven, stoof; lat, mot, otter, pot, poten, gebod, bode, bodem, drost, mos, most, os, post, slot, snott, spot, vloot, vlot, genot, bot, vos; bol, dol, hol, knol, kool, mol, schol, kolf, molm, zolder, volgen, volk, wolk; goor, schoren, spoor; blok, klok, knook, kok, koken, lok, lokken, rok, schokken, slók, spinrokken, sok, stok, stoken, vloot, wrok, boog, drog, nog, rog, trog, zog, dochter, kocht.

H. Old French loanwords with /o/
Always front: kust ‘coast’.
Partly front: dubbel/dobbel, gum/gom, nummer/nommer, num/non, tun/ton, sulfer/soller, kusten/kosten.
Always back: koppel, som, stof ‘stuff’, zot, mosterd, pomp, blond, rond.

I. Uncertain whether ODu. *u (*CuCi/j) or *o (*CoCV)
Always front: geut ‘pouring’, bus ‘forest’.
Always back: stoppel.

Some of these data allow for tentative conclusions. The sequence *CuCu is too rare to permit a strong generalization, although we note that there are no words with only a back vowel reflex. The combination *CunKV clearly favours the retention of a back vowel in coastal Dutch. The same is probably true for *CunT as far as monosyllabic forms are concerned (grond, blond, gezond, hond, hond-erd, mond). In polysyllables (MDu. begonde, bondel, zonde, munte, plund-, slonse, zonder), we find fronting to u at least in some dialects, with a varying distribution. Thus, it is conceivable that the syllable structure played a certain role, favouring fronting in, e.g., bon-del with n in coda position, but favouring retention of the back vowel in bond, with syllable-final nd.

Before m, the syllable structure may also have played a role, viz. as regards open and closed syllables. Whereas fronting to eu can happen in open syllable in northern dialects (H dreumel, dreum, H keumen, HZ zeumer; an exception is the religious word vroom), there is no fronting if *u was originally followed by *mp, *mb or *mm (brommen, hommel, om, dom, kom, lomp, stomp, stomp). In som- ‘some’, we must assume an original alternation between nom.acc. *som and obl. *somV-. Conversely, in front of single n or original nn, we never exclusively find a back vowel. The vowel is either always fronted (especially if a lengthened vowel has
resulted), or it vacillates between front and back (bun/bon, deun/donne, dunder/donder < *punar, zunne/zonne, zundag/zondag, and the French loanwords nunne/nonne, tunne/tonne), in which case fronting is found particularly in Flemish.

In conclusion, some of the categories distinguished here seem to be relevant for the outcome of the vowel. Mostly, this concerns the following consonants. The vowel of the following syllable may be relevant in the sense that a following low vowel rarely combines with fronting throughout in coastal Dutch, and that a following *u always provokes fronting or partial fronting (but the evidence consists of only a few words). Since the main features of the West Germanic consonants which are most relevant (m, n, nC) did not change between West Germanic and Middle Dutch, this consonantal condition may refer to events that took place in Old Dutch or at a later stage. In that sense, this result takes us to the next subsection.

Summary 3. Vowel distribution according to the following consonant

The subcategories for the following consonant in this section are the same as in § 15.3.1 and § 15.3.2, but I have slightly modified the order of the consonants. Here, I distinguish labial obstruents (A), m (B), dental obstruents (C), n (D), n plus dental consonant (E), l (F), r (G), velar obstruents (H), and n plus velar stop (I).

A. Before labial obstruents

Always u, eu or unrounding:

- p kre(u)pel
- bb kubbe, lubben.
- v de(u)vel, de(u)vik, heusch, heuvel/huffel.

Always o, oo:

- p koper, open.
- pp dop, droppel, hop, kloppen, knop, kop, koppel, nop, sop, stoppen, stoppel, strop.
- bb dobbe (SH,NH), kobbe (F), schobbe, slobben (F also oe), stobbe.
- f(f) doft, grof, hof, oferen, schaft, slof, stof ‘dust’, stof ‘cloth’.
- v boven, loven, oven, stoof.

Both attested:

- p dreupel (F) / dropel, zeup (F) / zoop (H).
- pp druppen / droppen (H), pup (F) / pop (FF,Z,H), up (F) / op (Z,H), schuppen (F) / schuppen (Z), schup (EF) / schop ‘kick’, schuppe (WF) / schop (FF,H).
- bb bubbel (FF,WF) / bobbel, dubben (MDu.) / dobber, doebelen, dabbel (H) / dobbel (F,SH), lub (NH) / lob(be), tubbe (WF) / tobbe (EF), tup (Z,NH) / top (F,H).
- f(f) duf / dof, joffer / juffer, knoffelen / knuffelen.
- v e(u)vel / ovel (H), keuvel (F,Z) / koovel (H).
In open syllables, pandialectal fronting is relatively frequent but not omnipresent: we find *kreupel, deuvel, deuvik, heuvesch, heuvel*, and, in modern dialects, *euvel*, versus a back vowel always in *koper, open, boven, loven, oven, stoof*. Four other words have fronting in Flemish but not in Hollandish (nor, sometimes, in French Flanders), viz. *dreupel, zeup, euvel* and *keuvel*. In closed syllables, a majority of forms has the back vowel, whereas the pervasive *u* of *kubbe* and *lubben* is not very significant since both words are poorly attested. A number of words with vacillating vocalism occur before *pp, bb* and *ff*, with fronting mostly concentrated in Flanders, but sometimes in Holland (*top, lub, dubbel*).

### B. Before m

There are twelve common words (*om, dom*, etc.) which always have a back vowel, and not a single word has a front vowel throughout. The seven vacillating words are *krom/krum* (*krum* only in southeastern Flanders), *gum* (a minority form, maybe from North Brabant), *nummer* (idem), with a short vowel, and *dreumel, dreum* (in Holland), *keumen* (Holland) and *zeumer* (Zealand and Holland) with a long one. Thus, we can clearly see that *m* favours the retention of *o* in a closed syllable. As for open syllable, the majority of the forms has fronting.

### C. Before dental obstruents

**Always u, eu or unrounding:**

- *t* butter (FF,H) / beuter (WF,Z), geut ‘pouring’, neut.
- *tt* nutte, schuttel, schutten, geschut, stutten.
- *d* beu(de), reu(de), reuden (F).
- *dd* kudde, mudde.
- *z* reuzel.

**Always o, oo:**

- *t* poten, vloot.
- *tt* lot, mot, otter, pot, slot, snot, spot, vlot, zot, genot, bot ‘bone’.
- *d* (ge)bod, bode, bodem.
- *dd* slodderen.
- *s* drost, mos, most(erd), os(se), post, vos.

**Both attested:**

- *t* geut (H)/goot, sleutel/slotel (FF,WF,Z).
- *tt* but (WF,ZF)/bot, butte/botte.
- *dd* dutten/dodden, dudder (FF)/dodder, gut (H)/god, mudder (NH)/modder, schudden/schodden (Z,H), zudde (H)/zodde.
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s  busse (WF,Z,H)/bosse (EF,Z,H), bussel (EF,Z,H)/bossel (H), kussen/kossen (Z,SH) 'kiss', kussen/kossen (Z,SH) 'cushion', kusten (NH)/kosten, muske (F)/mosk (Z,H), mussel (F,WF)/mossel.

z  bleuzen (F,Z)/blozen, euzie (EF)/oozie (FF,WF,NH), kneuzen/cnoosen (H), neus/noos (NH).

In closed syllables, the back vowel tends to be better preserved in monosyllabic words (lot, mot, drost, most, etc.) than in polysyllabic ones (nutte, schuttel, kudde), but there are exceptions to both of these tendencies. In open syllable, there seems to be a slight preference for fronting (beuter, geut, neut, beul, reu, reuden vs. poten, vloot, bode, bodem). In Flanders, the number of fronted forms is higher than in Holland.

D. Before n

Before n, we find vacillation in bun, beun (Z,H) vs. bon. There are no forms with only a back vowel, whereas there are no less than twelve words which always show fronting of the lengthened vowel: Beunen (F,H), deun, deunen, dreunen, heuning, keunen (F,Z,H) / kunnen, keuning, munnik / meuninck, steunen, geweun, weunen, zeun. Thus, what is a weak tendency before labial obstruents and m is almost a rule before n, such that fronting is the dominant outcome in open syllable.

E. Before n plus dental consonant

Always u:
none.
Always o:
blond, bond, gezond, grond, hond, honderd, mond, rond, stonde.

Both attested:
\[\text{nd} \begunde (FF,WF)/begonde, \text{bundel (H)}/\text{bondel (F)}, \text{plund- (WE,NH?)}/\text{plond-}, \text{dunder(dag) (FF,WF,Z)}/\text{donder(dag) (H)}, \text{zundag (F,H)}/\text{zondag}, \text{zunde (H arch.)}/\text{zonde}, \text{zunder (SH?)}/\text{zonder}.\]
\[\text{nt} \ munt/mont (SH).\]
\[\text{ns} \ slunse (F)/slons.\]
\[\text{nn} \ tun (FF,WF,Z)/\text{ton}, \text{zun (FF,WF,Z)}/\text{zon}, \text{num (WF,NH)}/\text{non (Z)}.\]

The words with o are mostly monosyllables, as we have observed in summary 2. In most of the twelve originally polysyllabic words with vowel vacillation (zunne/zonne 'sun', etc.), Flanders (sometimes with Zealand) has the front vowel, viz. in begunde, dunder(dag), munt, nunne, plund-, slunse, tunne, zunne, zundag. Hollandish has the front vowel in bundel and zunde.
F. Before l

Always u, eu:

1 heul ‘ditch’ (F,Z,H), Keulen, m(e)ul.
2 bul ‘bull’, hulle ‘case’, hullen ‘to cover’.
1C bult, gulden, hulde, hulst, zult.

Always o, oo:

1 kool.
2 bol, dol ‘thole’, hol ‘hollow’, knol, mol, schol.
1C kolf, molm, zolder, volgen, volk, wolk.

Both attested:

1 heul (SH) / hol ‘den’, meulen (F,Z,H) / molen (H,U), veulen (EF,SH) / vool (Tholen,NH), zeul (F,Z,SH) / zool, zeule (F,Z) / zole (FF,WF,northern Z).
2 dul (F,Z) / dol ‘mad’, krul (F,Z,H) / krol (H), vul (F) / vol, vullen / vollen (H), wullen (MDu.F) / wollen.
1C bulgen (F,Z,H) / verbolgen, bulster (F,H) / bolster, kulk (SH) / kolk, puls (F?) / polys, schuld (F) / schoud (H), sulfer (WF,Walch.) / solfer (Z,SH), stulp / stolp (NH), wulf (F) / wolf.

Before l, lengthened vowels show a preference for fronting to eu, which is either found always (in heul, Keulen, meul) or in a larger number of dialects, particularly in southern coastal Dutch (heul, meulen, veulen, zeul, zeule). Before ll and 1C, wherever the vocalism vacillates between u and o, we find the front vowel in (part of) Flanders, sometimes also in Zealand and South Holland. As regards 1C, there is a complementary distribution between l plus dental obstruent and l plus labial or velar consonant. In the former context, the vowel is either always fronted (bult, etc.; with the exception of zolder < *zolre), or it is fronted in a large part of the dialects, particularly in Flemish (bulster, puls, schuld). Before 1P and 1K, however, the vowel has remained a back vowel everywhere (kolf, etc.), or at least in part of the dialects, in particular, in Holland (sulfer, stolp, wolf, kolk).

G. Before r

Only eu:
beuren, deur, keur, keuren, speuren, steur.

Only oo:
gloren, goor, schoren, spoor.

Both attested:

Again, where we find vacillating fronting, it is mostly Flanders that has the front vowel (scheur, scheuren, speur, veur), and especially West Flanders.
H. Before velar obstruents

Always u, eu:

- k  break, kneukel, neuken.
- kk  drukken (F).
- g  beugel ‘clasp’, deugd, heugen, jeugd, veugel, vleug, zeug.
- gg  stug (only Z,H), vlug (F,H).
- ch  buchel ‘hump’, berucht, gehucht, gerucht, vluchten, zucht ‘disease’ (F).

Always o, oo:

- k  knook, koken, stoken.
- kk  blok, brok, klok, kok, lokken, rok, schokken, slok, spinrokken, sok, stok, vlok, wrok.
- g  boog.
- gg  drog, nog, rog ‘ray’, trog, zog ‘wake’.
- ch  dochter, kocht.

Both attested:

- k  keuken / kook (Goeree), kreuken / kroken (Z,H), peuken peuk (WF,H) / poken, reuk / rook (Z,SH), spreuk / sprook (H).
- kk  buk (F) / bok, bukkken (F) / bokken (Z,NH) ‘to stoop’, druk (F) / drok (Z, NH), juk (H) / jok (F,Z), jeuken, jukken (F,Walch.) / jokken, joeken (FF,Z,SH), geluk (NH) / lokken, gelok (Z,SH), plokkken (Z,SH,NH, spor. F) / plukken, puk (H) / pok, pukkel / pokkel, rukken (F,Z) / rokken (Z,SH,NH), sukkel(en) (F,H) / sokkel(n) (Z).
- g  leugen / loogen (arch., SH), meug (F) / moog (Z,H) ‘may’, teug / toog (NH), teugel / toel (NH), teugen / togen, vleugel / vlogel.
- gg  lugge (F) / log, mug / mog, mohhe (Z,H), plug (F,NH) / plog (Z), rugge (FF,WF) / rogge ‘rye’.
- ch  bucht (WF,Z) / bocht ‘bend’, bucht (F) / bocht ‘dirt’, klucht (Z) / kloft, klucht (NH), lucht (F) / locht (Z,H), mucket (F) / nochter (Z,NH), (n)uchtend (F) / (n)ochtend (Z), tucht (F) / tocht (H), vucht (Early MoDu.) / vocht, vrucht (F,H) / vroch (SH,U), zuchten / zochten (SH).

Vowels in open syllable yield eu, either in all dialects (viz. break, kneukel, neuken, beugel, deugd, heugen, jeugd, veugel, vleug, zeug) or at least in West Flanders (viz. in jeuken, keuken, kreuken, reuk, spreuk, leugen, meug), and often also in Zealand and Holland (peuken, teug, teugel, teugen). The exceptions are knook, koken, stoken, and boog, which always have a back vowel.

If the vowel is short, we find a predilection for fronting before cht. Where the vowel vacillates between front and back, front u is found in Flanders and sometimes also in Zealand (bucht, bucht, klucht, lucht, mucket, nochter, nuchter, tocht, vucht, vrucht, zuchten) whereas Holland and often also Zealand mainly show o.

In closed syllable, the back vowel has a stronger position, with invariant o in many words. Where there is variation, u is more frequent in Flanders than in Holland, viz.
in buk, bukken, druk, jukken, plukken, rukken, sukkel before kk and in mug, lug, plug, rugge before gg. Note that North Holland sometimes has the same variant as Flanders, as in plug and kluit. Fronting is the only attested variant in stug and vlug.

I. Before n plus velar stop
Here, the evidence is quite straightforward. Retention of the back vowel is the rule, which is only broken by Hollandish dunken beside donken ‘to think’. No word has a front vowel everywhere.

J. Conclusions
Fronting is found more frequently in lengthened vowels than in short vowels. This tendency is very clear before single n (Beunen, deun, deunen, dreunen, heuning, keuning, meunenck, steunen, geweun, weunen, zeun) and before k and g (breuk, kneukel, neuken, beugel, deugd, heugen, jeugd, veugel, vleug, zeug vs. knook, koken, stoken, boog). Fronting is furthermore dominant in open syllables before labial obstruents (kreupel, deuwel, deuvik, heuesch, heuvel, euvel, vs. koper, open, boven, loven, oven, stoof), and before l (heul, Keulen, meul vs. kool). Before dental obstruents, the preference for fronting in open syllables is less pronounced but still visible (beuter, geut, neut, beul, reu, reuden vs. poten, vloot, bode, bodem), and the same is true before r (beuren, deur, keur, keuren, speuren, steur vs. gloreun, goor, shoren, spoor).

Where the lengthened vowel vacillates geographically between front and back, eu is often confined to Flemish (and not always to all of Flemish), viz. before labials (dreueu, zeup, eueil, keuvel), l (heul, meulen, veulen, zeul, zeule), r (scheuren, smeuren, speur, veur), and velars (jeuken, keuken, keuvel, reuk, spreuk, leugen, meug). Fronting is more typically Hollandish before m (dremel, dreumel, keumen, zeumer).

Retention of o is the rule in closed syllables before labial obstruents, before m, mostly before LP and IK (particularly in Holland, less so in Flanders), and before nK. The back vowel also tends to be retained before dental obstruents, but only in monosyllabic words (blond, bond, gezond, grond, hond, honderd, mond, rond, stonde), but fronted to u in most of the polysyllabic words, at least in Flanders (begunde, dunder(dag), munt, nunne, plund-, slunse, tunne, zunne, zundag). Before kk and gg, short o is also dominant; where there is variation, u is more frequent in Flanders than in Holland (buk, bukken, druk, jukken, plukken, rukken, sukkel, mug, lug, plug, rugge).

Fronted u is the general reflex before IT (bult, gulden, etc.), sometimes only in Flemish (bulster and others). Before cht fronting is also the dominant development (buchel, berucht, gehucht, gerucht, vluchten, zucht vs. dochter, kocht), but in a number of forms, Flemish u contrasts with Hollandish o (bucht, bucht, klucht, lucht, nuchter, nuchtend, tucht, vucht, vrucht, zuchten).
This section, then, has yielded a reasonably clear result. Open syllables generally favour fronting to eu, whereas closed syllables favour the retention of o at least before labial and velar consonants, including the clusters Ip, Ik. Dental obstruents and the clusters nT, nn favour retention of o in a closed syllable too, but if the cluster was split over two syllables (i.e., followed by a vowel), fronting is found. Fronting is also dominant before cht. In general, Flemish shows many more fronted exceptions to these rules than Hollandish.

Summary 4. Geographic distribution of the fronted vowel reflexes
The preceding summaries have already yielded some indications as to the geographic distribution of fronting. Here is a more fine-grained division:

A. Fronting in all of coastal Dutch:
\- kreupel, deuvel, deuvik, euvel, heus, heuvel; beul, keutel, neat, reu, scheut, butter/beuter, geut; neus, reuze; buig, breuk, deugd, heug(en), jeugd, kneukel, kreukel, neuken, vleug, zeug, teugen, veugel; weumen, heuning, keunen, zeun, beun/bun, deun, deuwen, dreuwen, keuning, geweun; heul, beuren, deur, keur(en), sleuwen, speuwen, steur, deur;
kubbe, luben; kunde, madde, nutte, geschut, schutten, stutten, schutte; stug, vlug; berucht, gehucht, gerucht, klucht, vlucht(en), buchel, vlucht, zucht 'disease'; dunken; kunde, nun, zundag, munik; bult, dulden, gulden, hulde, hulde(n), hulst, m(oo)ul, schuld, zult, bul, bulgen, bulster, krul; dus.

B. Fronting in most of coastal Dutch but not in North Hollandish:
teugel.

C. Fronting in (all of) Flemish, most of Zealandish and maybe (part of) South Holland:
\- druppen; rukken; vullen, meulen, veulen (traces of oo on Tholen and in WF), zeul 'sole'; tun, zon, dunner; veur 'furrow' (but oo in FF).

D. Fronting in (all of) Flemish but not further North:
\- schudden, reuden; kussen 'kiss', kussen 'cushion', mus(k); bukken, druk, drukken, geluk, mug, sukkel(en); reuk; mucher, ichtend,ucht; vul, wulle; scheur(en); zeup.

E. Fronting in (central) Flemish, maybe also southern Zealand, but not in all dialects of Flemish:
\- busse, bussel, bus, musel, bleuzen; druppel (F except westernmost FF, Z, NH); schuppen (Ghent, Waasland), up, pup, schup, schuppe; schubbe, bubbel, tubbe; keuvel; plukken, buk, rugge 'rye', bucht 'bend', bucht 'dirt', peuke 'a thrust'; but (a fish); krum (SE-F); begunde, sluns; dul, puls, sulfer, wulf, zeule; speur 'track'.

F. Fronting in Zealandish and Hollandish but not in Flemish:
zeumer.
G. Fronting in (South and) North Hollandish but not in Flemish:
   *dubbel, lub; gut!, sleutel; mudder, zudde; kusten ‘to cost’; kulk, stulp; dr(e)um, ke-
   umen.*

H. Fronting in many dialects, especially in Flanders and North Holland, but relic
   forms with back vowel especially in SH and FF:
   *vrucht (vrocht only in rural SH); munt (mont in rural SH); mug (moch in SH); lucht
   (locht in northern Z, SH islands and rural SH); jeuken, jukken (back vowel in FF, Z,
   rural SH); keuken (oo in Goeree); leugen (oo in Aalsmeer, Moordrecht).*

I. Otherwise:
   *zonde (zunde in rural SH); top (tup in central Z and NH); plund- (F and NH); euzie
   (EF, H?); dudder (only FF).*

J. Conclusions
   Clearly, Flanders, and particularly West Flanders, represents the core area of
   fronting. French Flanders is excepted in a number of cases, which can only
   be interpreted as the retention of the back vowel in dialects which had be-
   come peripheral with regard to the main urban centres of West Flanders in
   the Middle Dutch period (Ryckeboer 1991). In East Flanders, some words join
   West Flanders in the fronting of *u, whereas others show a back vowel in some
   or all dialects, increasingly so as one goes east. It seems certain that, in a number
   of words, all of Flanders originally had a front vowel which was pushed back by
   the general Brabantish influence on East Flemish after 1500. But it is unclear
   whether this applies to all words, or whether some East Flemish words never
   had fronting in the first place.

   The islands of Zealand for the most part join West Flemish in the vowel
   fronting but there are some exceptions. Sometimes, Zealand (and occasionally
   also more archaic dialects of Holland) preserve the back vowel, just like French
   Flanders, as in jeuken, lucht. Conversely, there are also some words where Zealand
   (with Holland) has fronting as opposed to Flanders, as in zeumer ‘summer’.

   The standard language has greatly influenced the geographic distribution,
   especially in the Netherlands.

15.3.5 Interpretation

We have seen that none of the main factors which may have influenced the outcome
of *u was decisive. Neither *i-mutation, nor a/u-mutation, nor the syllable structure,
nor the surrounding consonantism can on their own explain the attested distribu-
tion. Nevertheless, a few tendencies were found: a majority of around 80% of the
*i-mutated words shows fronting throughout; a following *u also favours fronting,
as opposed to a following *a; lengthening in open syllable often combines with
fronting to eu; and closed syllables favour the retention of o at least before labial
and velar consonants and before IP, IK. Dental obstruents and the clusters nT, nn
also favour retention of o in a closed syllable, but if the cluster was split over two
syllables (i.e., followed by a vowel), the vowel is fronted. Fronting is also dominant
before cht.

The main factor: Old Dutch *u
Most scholars agree on the importance of the distinction between WGm. *u and *o
for the unconditioned fronting in western Dutch. Fronting would have taken place
only in words which retained stressed *u in Late Old Dutch, and not in words where
the vowel was lowered to *o. The distribution of WGm. *u in the early-medieval
western Low Countries would have been more of the Anglo-Frisian and Old Low
Franconian kind, with *u after labial consonants (wulf, veugel), before single nasal
consonants (zeumer, leunen), and before high *u in the next syllable (zeun, lust).
The influence of i-mutation is judged differently by different scholars, but it is clear
that i-mutation factors and *u share the articulatory feature of [+high], which may
explain the retention of stressed high *u in both cases. It would be unremarkable
if stressed *u remained a high vowel both before a front high vowel (*i, *j, *ī)
and before *u. Another condition which is often discussed in this respect is that
a preceding labial consonant could have had the same effect as a following nasal
consonant. In other words, the lowering of *u to *o could be blocked by i-mutation,
by u-mutation, by the influence of labial consonants, and by following nasals.

We can now investigate whether the exceptions that we found for each of the
conditioning factors discussed above (in summaries 1 to 4) can be understood using
one of the other likely factors for the retention of *u.

a. i-mutation
In summary 1, we have seen that thirteen words which have fronting through-
out did not have an i-mutation factor, and that fifty-six words without an
i-mutation factor have partial fronting. Table 41 indicates whether the relevant
words can be explained via one of the other potential *u-conserving factors.
The words dus and up are given under u-mutation because they did not have
a following vowel, so that they were not subject to lowering by a-mutation.

b. Preceding labial
In summary 2, we have found twenty-one words with a labial consonant preced-
ing *u which never show fronting. None of these words had an i- or u-mutation
factor or a following nasal:
boven, mot, pot, poten, gebod, bode, bodem, mos, most(erd), post, spot, bot, vos,
bol, mol, molm, volgen, volk, wolk, spoor ‘spur’, boog.
c. In open syllable

In summary 3, it was found that lengthened vowels in open syllable very often yield eu. In Table 42, we investigate whether the nature of the West Germanic vowel in the unstressed syllable was also influential:

Table 41. Absence of i-mutation combined with factors favouring *u

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>u-mut.</th>
<th>P_</th>
<th><em>N</em></th>
<th><em>NC</em></th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
<td>dus, zeug</td>
<td>beuter, geweun, weunen, bul, veugel, buchel</td>
<td>heuning, geweun, steunen, weunen, zeun</td>
<td>kust (&lt; French), reuden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partially</td>
<td>up, lucht, vrucht, uchtend</td>
<td>pup, bubbel, but, mudder, vul, bulster, puls, wul, wulf, smeuren, speur, veur, buk, puk, bucht</td>
<td>keunen, zeumer</td>
<td>dunken, krum, gum, nummer, dunder, plund, nun, sluns, tun, zun, zundag, zunder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42. Open syllable lengthening combined with factors favouring and disfavouring *u

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fronting</th>
<th>i-mutation</th>
<th>u- or a-mutation</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
<td>kre(u)pel, de(u)vel, de(u)vik, heusch, heuvel, neut, beu(de)l, reu(de), reuzel, beuren, deur, keur, keuren, speuren, steur, scheur, scheuren, Beu(e)n, deu(n), deuen, dreu(n), keuning, munnick / meuninck, heul, Keulen, m(e)ul, breuk, kneukel, neukn, beugel, heugen, vleug, rek, sprek</td>
<td>u-mutation: zeun, zeug, deugd, jeugd</td>
<td>beuter, heuning, keunen, steunen, geweun, weunen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partially</td>
<td>dreupel, zeup, e(u)vel, keuel, dreum, dreumel, sleutel, geut, bleuzen, euzie, kneuzen, neus, meulen, veulen, keuken, leugen, teug, teugel, vleugel</td>
<td>a-mutation: speur, veur, smeuren, kreuk, peuk, teug</td>
<td>keunen, zeumer, reuden, heul, zeul, zeule, veugel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td></td>
<td>a-mutation: koper, open, boven, loven, oven, stoof, poten, vloot, bod, bode, bodem, kool, gloren, goor, schoren, spoor, knook, koken, stoken, boog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 42 shows that the majority of the long-vowel forms with fronting have \(i\)-mutation or \(u\)-mutation, or (in the column ‘others’) a preceding labial or a following single nasal consonant. Conversely, the long-vowel forms with a back vowel throughout mostly contained a low vowel in the next syllable in West Germanic. The table thus confirms that the early-medieval distribution of \(u\) and \(o\) according to the criteria found in Anglo-Frisian and in Old Saxon is a more plausible explanation for the unconditioned fronting than any of the individual factors discussed in the summaries to to 4 above. Those words that kept \(u\) and resisted lowering to \(o\), were later most liable to be fronted in western Dutch by the “unconditioned” fronting. The exceptions in this table (\(kreuken\), \(peuken\), \(teugen\), \(reuden\), \(heul\), \(zeul\), \(zeule\)) are few, the etymology of the exceptions is not always completely certain, and not all of them are reliably attested in old texts and/or in a larger part of the western dialects.

**Geography**

Geographically, Flemish in general shows many more fronted exceptions to these rules than Hollandish. It is another matter whether unconditioned fronting was less frequent in Holland than in Flanders to begin with. This is assumed by van Loon (2014: 168), and it seems the evident conclusion at least for those words which are not even found with fronting in all of Flemish. In other words, there would have been a West Flemish core area of unconditioned fronting, as argued also by Taeldeman (1971: 228, 266). But there are also words in which fronting is found in Holland but not in Flanders; and within Holland, fronting is beating the retreat on a number of accounts. Hence the difference between Holland and Flanders in matters of fronting of \(u\) may in, say, 1200, have been much smaller than in later centuries.

**Relative chronology**

Van Loon (2014: 169–70) assumes that the fronting of \(u\) pushed the old \(\ddot{u}\) to be unrounded to \(\i\) in the type \(brigge\), etc. Because he tentatively dates unrounding of \(\ddot{u}\) to the ninth century, the fronting of \(u\) would have to be dated a bit earlier or contemporaneously (2014: 170). Yet I have arrived at a different, more restricted explanation for the coastal unrounding of \(\ddot{u}\) in § 15.2.5, which implies that it was not causally linked to the general fronting of \(u\). Also, whereas the eastern isogloss of both changes appears originally to have been the same (the Dender-Scheldt-border between Flanders and Brabant), the western isoglosses do not coincide, because fronting of \(u\) did not always spread to westernmost Flanders, Zealand or Holland, whereas unrounding of \(\ddot{u}\) is found in all of coastal Dutch in exactly the same words. On geographical grounds too, therefore, I regard fronting of \(u\) as the more recent phenomenon.
I agree with van Loon that the eastern limit of fronting of *u may well be due to the existence of morphological i-mutation in inland Dutch, which blocked a general merger of *u and *i there (p. 173).

A different explanation is given by Van Loon on p. 207–8, where he proposes to link the fronting of *u to the general lowering (or, as it is sometimes called, centralization) of Old Dutch *i, *i, *u to [ɪ, ʌ, ʊ], the forerunners of the modern pronunciations of these phonemes. Van Loon roughly dates this tendency to the eleventh century, starting earlier before r and spreading latest to prenasal position, where the high vowel [u] has been retained or restored in a number of dialects. In the standard language, *u and *ø have merged, but in many Dutch dialects, they are distinguished, either because they remained different, or because they first merged and then underwent a secondary split (Goossens 2010). Van Loon now explains the western, “unconditioned” fronting of *u as an alternative direction in which the vowel developed in order not to merge with old *ø. The vowel was not lowered to *v but (lowered and) fronted to *ʌ. This would amount to a knock-off change in order to avoid too much lexical load of the phoneme /o/ (p. 208). This would have happened in the eleventh to twelfth centuries, and the fronting would have to be dated before open syllable lengthening for two reasons: (1) After open syllable lengthening, the pressure on the phoneme short /o/ had diminished (open, boven, etc. acquired a long vowel); (2) If *u had first become [o] in *sumar, *sunu, etc., lengthening would have yielded /o:/ across the board (as it did when Old Dutch *o was lengthened in boven, open, etc.) and not /ø:/ as in zeumer, zeun, etc.

On the other hand, it seems likely that fronting of *u post-dates the lowering of *ulT to olT, thereby predating the l-vocalization of *olT to ouT, which in Flanders took place around 1150 (van Loon 2014: 235). For instance, MDu. scout ‘guilt’ < *skolt < *skuldi-, scounder ‘shoulder’ < *skolder < *skuldrō-, etc. had a mid back vowel o when l was vocalized around 1170 in Flanders. Of course, we cannot be certain that *u in this position would otherwise have been fronted, but certainly in Flanders, we later observe fronting before lC (as we observe in gulden, puls, bulgen, etc.).

Since vowel mergers are frequent events, and since languages have no teleological capacities, I object to van Loon’s claim that *u was fronted in order not to merge with *ø. Instead, I propose the following scenario. In a number of dialects, the opposition between *u and *ø had become one between [ʊ] and [ɔ]. The higher member of this pair was then fronted to [ʌ] or [ʏ] in many words, particularly in open syllable and (in closed ones) before dental consonants. There could have been two major causes of this fronting. (1) The fronting may be a systemic consequence of the fronting of long *û to ĭ in Flemish (on which see the next chapter). The latter fronting must at least predate the year 1187 (van Loon 2014: 214), but may well have been a century or more earlier. In this scenario, the short-vowel system would have imitated changes occurring in the long-vowel system. (2) Certain consonants, such as dentals, can have a palatalizing effect on vowels.
The preponderance of fronting in lengthened vowels may just be an indirect reflex of the fact that \( i - \) mutation and \( u - \) mutation are much more frequent in open syllables than in closed ones, e.g. in light \( i - \) stems and \( u - \) stems, in \( ila - \) derivatives, in part of the paradigm of \( jan - \) verbs, etc.

However, there may also have been a more systematic background. In Old and Middle Dutch, the long-vowel system was more crowded than the short-vowel system. Especially among the back vowels, where there is less oral space for differentiation than among the front vowels, this can lead to centralization or fronting of one of the members of the system. Before fronting of \( * \bar{u} \) to \( \bar{y} \) and before open syllable lengthening, Dutch dialects had three different rounded back vowels as reflexes of Wgm. \( * \bar{u} \), \( * \bar{o} \) and \( * au \) (of which the second or the third often had a diphthongal character, such as \( [uo] \)), to which open syllable lengthening of \( * u \) and \( * o \) would have added a fourth and, in some dialects, a fifth long rounded vowel.

It is not unusual for long back vowels to be fronted while their short counterparts remain backed. In the dialect of Hasselt in Belgian Limburg, which productively unrounds old front rounded vowels that resulted from \( i - \) mutation, Wgm. \( * u \) and \( * o \) are reflected as /o/, /u/ when they remained short, e.g., /vos/ ‘fox’, /mond/ ‘mouth’, /sxup/ ‘spade’, /hoxt/ ‘wood’ (with \( l - \) vocalization), but in open syllable, unmutated \( * u \) and \( * o \) have been fronted to long /øː/: /vøːl/ ‘bird’, /bøːv/ ‘above’. Similarly, Wgm. \( * \bar{u} \) has been fronted to /œː/, and Wgm. \( * aw \) has been monophthongized and become /œː/, /dœːf/ ‘pigeon’, /strœːk/ ‘bush’, /røː/ ‘raw’ (Staelens 1989). This fronting is part of a general tendency in the productively unrounding dialects of Belgian Limburg to centralize and front all Early Middle Dutch long back vowels, a development probably due to the disappearance of the earlier front rounded vowels by unrounding (Goossens 2013: 41–6). Other examples of fronting being restricted to long vowels include many Lombardian, Piemontese and Ligurian dialects of Italian, e.g. the Milan dialect, where Romance \( * \varphi \) is retained as such in closed syllables (except before palatal consonants) but fronted to \( \bar{o} \) in open syllables: \( \textit{fòk} \) ‘fire’ (\( * \textit{føki} \)), \( \textit{kòs} \) ‘cooks’ (\( * \textit{køki} \)), \( \textit{jòra} \) ‘outside’ (\( * \textit{føra} \)) vs. \( \textit{kørno} \) ‘horn’, \( \textit{sopp} \) ‘cripple’ (Rohlfs 1966: 142).

I thus arrive at the following relative chronology of changes for western Dutch:

1. Loss of unstressed \( a - \) vowels
2. Phonologization of \( */u/ \) versus \( */o/ \)
3. Loss of unstressed \( * j \) and (short) \( * i \)
4. Lowering of \( *[u] \) to [v].
5. Lowering of \( *[v] \) to [o] before \( lT \), ca. 1100–1150 (MDu. \( \textit{scout}, \textit{scouder} \)).
6. Fronting of \( *[v] \) to [\( \lambda \)] or [y].
7. Open syllable lengthening of short vowels.
General conclusion
I conclude that the “unconditioned” fronting of WGm. *u only took place in words which had retained the high vowel *u in the Old Dutch period, as opposed to other words where lowering to *o had taken place. The main factors which favoured the retention of high *u were, (a) the presence of *u in the next syllable, (b) the presence of an i-mutation factor in the next syllable, (c) a preceding labial consonant, (d) a following nasal consonant. The geographic distribution of the fronted and un-fronted vowels can to a large degree be explained by assuming that (West) Flanders was the core area of the innovation, and that, after ca. 1100, Holland lost previously fronted variants to a larger degree than Flanders.

It follows from the relative dating that the fronting of *u cannot be the direct result of a language shift of speakers of a different L1, such as Proto-Frisian or Gallo-Romance, to Old Franconian around the ninth or tenth century. Since the distribution of *[u] which we assume for Old Dutch is very similar to that found in Old English, Old Frisian and Old Saxon, the Dutch developments could still be explained as the result of a language shift from Proto-Frisian to Old Franconian, with the imposition of the former’s distribution of *u and *o onto the latter (as assumed by Buccini). But there is no pressing need to posit a substrate and a language shift. Instead, we could assume that the western dialects of Old Low Franconian developed the same (originally allophonic) distribution of *u and *o as did Old Saxon and Proto-Frisian, their neighbours in the Low Germanic dialect continuum. In fact, there would have been several centuries, roughly between 450 and 900, for this similarity to develop. Consequently, the western Old Dutch distribution of *u, which in turn predicts which words get unconditioned fronting to [ʌ] in Late Old Dutch and Middle Dutch, is the result of an internal, western Dutch development.
The modern dialect map with the Dutch reflexes of WGm. *ū essentially shows three stages of development, viz. the preservation of /u:/ (in eastern Dutch), its fronting to /y:/ (in central and western Dutch), and the diphthongization of the latter to ui in central Dutch (ANKO 1977: 16–29, FAND II/III: 150). The modern situation suggests that the back vowel was first fronted in all of western and central Dutch and subsequently diphthongized in Brabant, Utrecht and Holland, at the same time when MDu. ī <ij> was diphthongized to /ɛi/. The main issues to be discussed here are (1) the time at which *ū became /y:/, (2) the earliest geographic distribution of this fronting, (3) the alleged presence of oe-relics in coastal Dutch.

16.1 Period and conditioning of the fronting

It is disputed in which period the fronting of *ū to /y:/ took effect, and it is also unclear what its original geographic domain was. Van Loon (2014: 213–9) dates the fronting in the southwest to the second half of the twelfth century, but a precise chronology cannot be given since the spelling <u> is uninformative. He thinks that open syllable lengthening, which increased the number of long back vowels in the system, may have been the ultimate cause of the fronting of *ū.

It may be useful to recall the difference in phonology and graphemics between eastern Dutch – where rounded back vowels systematically had a front rounded counterpart due to secondary i-mutation – and western Dutch – where i-mutation of *u did not apply. As a result, the Latin letters <o> and <u> were used for a larger number of phonemes in the east than in the west (Goossens 1997: 167–9), and they were partly used for different etymological vowels. Before vowel length was systematically conveyed by the spelling, western Dutch, as exemplified by the graphemic system of the Ghent Leprosy documents of 1236, used <o> for short /o/, long /o:/ (from *au), long /o:/ (from *o, *u with open syllable lengthening),

150. The fronting of /u:/ to /y:/ and its further diphthongization are among the most frequently discussed sound changes of Dutch. In 1927, Kloeke built his theory of the eastward Hollandish expansion on the progress of the shift of oe to uu and ui. The topic has since been discussed in every handbook on the historical phonology of Dutch, as well as in many articles.
and for the diphthong /oə/ (from WGm. *ɔ́), at least in open syllable; and it used the grapheme <u> for short /y/ and long /y:/ (Larsen 2001: 319–27). As we can see, the sign <u> is not used for a phoneme with /u/-quality, since in fact such a vowel did not exist in the system. Very differently, the Munich fragments of the Servatius legend, which can be dated to around 1200 and represent southeastern Dutch, have <o> representing the phonemes short /o/, long /o:/ (from *ɔ́), /ɔː/ (i-mutation of the previous vowel), /ɔː/ (*au), and /ɔː/ (i-mutation of *au), and they employ <u> for short /u/ and /y/, for long /u:/ (from *ʊ́) and /y:/ (from *iu and from i-mutation on *ʊ́), and for the diphthongs /uo/ and /yø/; see Goossens 1992b: 40–43. In the course of the subsequent centuries, there is a gradual increase of the explicit notation of vowel length (usually by adding i or e, e.g. <oi> or <oe> for /o:/; digraphs of the type <oo> were slower to develop), and the graphemic separation of front and back rounded vowels (e.g. ue for /y:/, ou or oe for /u(ə)/). The latter difference only acquired systematic expression in spelling in the sixteenth century.

As to the geography, the modern, structural dialect border between /y:/ and /u:/ as reflexes of PGm. *ʊ́ now lies quite far east, especially in southern dialects (see Map 15 in van Loon 2014: 215). Limburg and eastern North Brabant belong or used to belong until recently to /u:/-territory, as does northeastern Dutch to the east of the IJssel river. However, there are clear indications that /u:/ used to be indigenus further to the west. For southeastern Brabant, where spellings indicating /u:/ are found in Middle Dutch, this is unsurprising. But the place names Zoersel in the province of Antwerp, between Antwerp and Turnhout (1247 Sursele, 1336 Zoersel), and Zoerle-Parwijs, between Aarschot and Herentals (1286 Zuerle, 1560 Soerla), may well contain Old Dutch *sūr-, either from WGm. *sūra- ‘sour’ or from *sūþra- ‘southern’. Van Loon (2014: 214) suggests that the back vowel was retained longer in particular before r, judging also from Brabantish goetgheboers (surname, Leuven, 1278) lit. ‘good neighbour’ and ouenboer ‘oven hut’ (Leuven, 1372–73), which contain *būra- ‘dwelling’.

An important exception to the general fronting of /u:/ to /y:/ was the position before w and in absolute auslaut, where we find /ou/ in Brabant and Holland and /y/ in Flemish.¹⁵¹ nou, nu ‘now’, jou, MDu. jou, ju ‘you’, MDu. dōu, du ‘thou’, douwen, duwen ‘to push’, bouwen, buwen ‘to build’ (< *bū(w)an-). Since Limburgian dialects retain /u:/ in ‘now’, ‘thou’ and ‘build’, it seems certain that the Brabantish reflex ou reflects a direct diphthongization of *ʊ́, and did not go through a stage /y:/.

¹⁵¹ Heeroma (1946: 124, fn. 4) reckons with the possibility that West Flemish and Zealandish /y:/ before w – where Brabant does not have /y:/ – is the result of hypercorrect Brabantization (or/and East Flemish influence) of these sequences into coastal Dutch.
to the west of ’s-Hertogenbosch, Tilburg and Turnhout. There is no counterpart in northern French for the positional variant of /u:/ before auslaut or w. The first written indication of this diphthongization to ou in Dutch is found in the verb ‘live’ in the Egmond Willeram (ca. 1100): 2sg. bouwest, 2pl. bowet, ptc. pres. bowunde. In the thirteenth century, the object form of ‘you’ is found with <ou> sometimes in Flanders and Holland: Dordrecht iou (1284), Bruges jou (1272), ou (1280); cf. Van Loon 2014: 217. This contradicts the conclusion of Heeroma (1946: 123), viz. that Holland, and perhaps even Utrecht, may have been /y:/-areas before they became ou(w)-areas. Heeroma based himself on Hollandish sluw ‘sly’ (*slûxa-, MoWF slûch), to which one may add the evidence of ruw ‘rough’ (< *rûxa-, MoWF rûch). But these words inherited *x which may still have been a consonant in Late Old Dutch when the preconsonantal fronting of /u:/ to /y:/ presumably took place.

In order to correctly judge the available evidence, note that the diphthongs *ew and *iw also yielded StDu. uw, ouw in a number of cases, and that some western dialects developed oe(w) from such combinations. Possibly, the reflex of *ō before w must be included as well (via *uow and simplification to *uw?). Examples are Dutch vlouw (flouw), Kil. vlouwe, also vlouw ‘drift net’, Zeelandish vloe (< *fleuwa(n)–); Dutch klouwen, kluwen ‘clew’ beside kloen in Holland and adjacent areas (< *kliwina–), cf. Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 63). See Heeroma (1946: 124–9) for an extensive discussion of the evidence. I disagree with his interpretation of the historical background (p. 123–4), when he states that word-final /-u:/ > /-y:/ was a specific instance of the general fronting of *ū. This fronting “is van Frankische (Vlaams-Brabantse) oorsprong en heeft het oorspronkelijk Ingwaeoonse Hollands pas later veroverd. Als bij iedere expansie zijn er ook hierbij achterblijvers geweest.”152 It seems to me that the merger of *ow with *-ū(w) as /u(:)/ points to a different scenario. In all likelihood, word-final *-ū, just like word-internal *-ūw- (as in bouwen), initially escaped the fronting to /y:/ in all of southern Dutch. Later, it did become /y/ in Flanders and most of Zealand, but was diphthongized to /ow/ in Brabant, and remained /u/ in Zealand, and, possibly, Holland too.

Note that the occasional oe-relics in Zealand mentioned in the literature are restricted to exactly these positions, viz. in auslaut and before w. In the latter position, *ūw has merged with *iw, which shows that this is a secondary development, like the one sketched in the preceding paragraph. Examples of this merger are found on West-Voorne (van Weel 1904: 36–7 mentions joew ‘your’, schoewe ‘shy’, noe ‘now’) and Overflakkee (Landheer 1951: 30 has roe ‘rough’, schoe ‘shy’). At most, we may regard ‘rough’ and ‘now’ as relic forms, which were able to preserve /u/ in absolute auslaut, but note that the vowel is short here, as opposed to long /u:/

152. “it is of Frankish (Flemish-Brabantish) origin and conquered the originally Ingwaeonic Hollandish only later. As with each expansion, there were stragglers here too”.
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from *i\-w. The \textit{oe}-timbre may therefore have been preserved because of the short quantity, in which case the words would not count as evidence for the absence of a shift from /u:/ to /y:/ in coastal Dutch. The \textit{MAND} database shows /nu/ for ‘now’ in nearly all localities from Goeree-Overflakkee to Walcheren and Tholen, and also here and there in Zeeuws Flanders. None of the larger dialect enquiries, nor for instance Kloeke 1927: 54–55, mention back vocalism for *ū in general in Zealand. Van Ginneken (1928 I: 238) claims that one can occasionally find \textit{hoes}, \textit{kroes}, \textit{loes} in Zealand for StDu. \textit{huis}, \textit{kruis}, \textit{luis} ‘house, cross, louse’, but gives no references.

16.2 \textit{Oe}-relics in coastal Dutch toponyms

A number of Standard Dutch words show /u/ for WGm. *\-u, e.g. \textit{kroes} ‘crisp’, \textit{snoet} ‘snout’, \textit{snoeven} ‘to sniff’. As a by-product of his well-known investigation of the sequence \textit{oe} > \textit{uu} > \textit{ui} in Dutch published in 1927, Kloeke (1926b) proposed that the lexical \textit{oe}-relics such as \textit{kroes} and \textit{snoet} showed that Holland and Zealand were originally \textit{oe}-areas, viz. before \textit{uu} /y:/ started to spread from Brabant and East Flanders. It was soon objected by other scholars, such as de Vries and van Haeringen, that much of Kloeke’s evidence was unreliable. Subsequently, in a small monograph, Schönfeld (1932) invoked the evidence of place names to salvage Kloeke’s idea of a relic area with /u/ in Holland and Zealand. De Vries (1932) wrote an extensive review of Schönfeld’s argumentation, all but annihilating the case for western \textit{oe}-relics in toponymy. However, Schönfeld’s conclusions were canonized in his handbook of Dutch historical grammar (Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 85), and have consequently become more widely accepted. It is therefore necessary to review his data once more, with the focus on North Holland. As Schönfeld (1932: 28) realized himself, most of the toponymic evidence comes from North Holland, where Frisian was widely spoken until the thirteenth century. It comes as no surprise that most of the \textit{oe}-relics are found in that area, and they may be regarded as straightforward Frisianisms rather than as Hollandish \textit{oe}-relics. De Vries therefore excludes them from his review, but this restriction may actually have undermined the acceptance of his general conclusions.

1. \textit{Armoederhoek} was a district on the island of Schouwen, mentioned in a description of Zealand from 1753. Schönfeld 1932 interprets it as *\textit{Arnemoederhoek}, which would show the earlier \textit{oe}-vocalism of the second element in \textit{Arnemuiden}. This explanation has been objected to by Rentenaar (2006: 193) because the existence of the river Arne itself cannot predate the year 1014 for geophysical reasons. In Rentenaar’s view, this renders it unlikely that it could still be used in combination with a form */mu:da/ ‘mouth’. Even if this argument does not
seem compelling (the simplex moede could have been retained, and combined with the new river Arne after 1014), it still seems more likely that the toponym Armoederhoek contains the noun armoede ‘poverty’, since ‘poor’ is a frequent element in field names.

2. The element Buik- occurs in a few toponyms between Amsterdam and Zaandam: ‘Buiksloot’ (1544 Bukesloot, 1632 Buycksloot, 1750 “vanouds wel Boekesloot genaamd” [“of old called Boekesloot”]), ‘Buikhorn’ (1600 Boeckhorn, 1635 Buyckhorn; Boekenoogen 2004), ‘Buikeland’ (1639 Buicke lant), ‘Buksland’ (1584 bucklant, 1599 bucxlant, bocxlant, 1754 Boxland), ‘Boekakker’ (1635 Boeckacker). Note the introduction of genitival -s in Buksland between 1584 and 1599. Schönfeld (1932: 10) assumes that <oe> was the older spelling and that Boek-, Buke- render a personal name *Būko, with contraction from earlier *Budiko; a variant *Bodiko can be seen in Bodokenlo (889 copy 1206–26 copies 14th-15th c.) ‘Boekel’ near Heiloo in North Holland. To my mind, even if Schönfeld’s etymology were correct, it would still leave the variation between <u(y)> and <oe> unexplained, since ODu. *Budiko would normally yield Early MDu. *Boeke whence with d-syncope Middle Dutch *Bøke or *Bōke. Hence, it seems safer to base our explanation solely on the name *Bodiko > Boecke-. This would mean that the forms Buik-, Buik- are due to folk etymology.

3. Duivendrecht (near Amsterdam; 1308 Doe vendrecht, 1346 Douendrecht, 1386 Doe vendrecht, 1426 Dove ndrecht; but from 1580 onwards Duventrecht, Duyvendrecht) is linked to a personal name Doeve by van Berkel & Samplonius 2006: 112 (compare the name Reyner Doeven soen, Haarlem 1370). Indeed, the spellings <oe> and <o> would be unexpected for an etymon containing *ū in Holland in the fourteenth century. This explanation leaves unanswered the question of how the name changed to Duivendrecht by the late sixteenth century. A possible solution is the fact that like Doeve, Duive also occurs as a personal name, e.g. from CRM14: duuen isebuts huis (1315, Delft), will duyue (1348, Leiden), syman duue soen (1380, Leiden). This renders it conceivable that Doe vendrecht was replaced by Duivendrecht on folk-etymological grounds, either because Duive had become a more common name than Doeve or – and this may be more likely – because the toponym was not associated with any person anymore but with the bird duif ‘pigeon’ (cf. van Osta 1996). Schönfeld’s solution (1932: 11) that MDu. <oe> was used to render [u:] and that Douendrecht is a scribal mistake for <oe> is very weak. In the end, Schönfeld himself assumes analogical influence from duif ‘dove’.

4. Loet refers to ‘low-lying, bad (i.e. wet) land’ in North Holland (Boekenoogen 2004: 305), and was also found in medieval Flanders (e.g. loete, 1294–1300, near Maldegem in East Flanders). As shown by Schönfeld (1932: 14), it also occurs in a petrified form in toponyms elsewhere, e.g. Loetcamp near Gameren
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(Betuwe) and De Loete (South Holland). Focusing on the meanings ‘rake, hoe’ of the Middle Dutch apppellative loete < WGm. *lōt(j)ō-, Schönfeld rejects an etymology of toponymical Loet(e) as *lōt-, arguing that, instead, we must derive it from *lūtō- ‘low place’ to PGM. *lūtan- ‘to stoop’ (Kroonen 2013: 345; cf. OE lūtan ‘to bend, fall’, OHG lizēn ‘to be hidden’, MHG līze ‘hiding-place’). Yet Schönfeld’s rejection of an etymology as *lōt- is unwarranted. Middle Dutch loete is a ‘tool consisting of a handle and a broad, iron front part, used for scraping or scratching’, and a West Frankish form *lōtja ‘spoon’ is reconstructed by ONW as the input for Old French louce ‘ladle’ and loche ‘spade’. A spoon is characterized by a broad, hollow blade at the end of the handle, and typically gathers liquid in the blade. I therefore propose to regard loet(e) ‘low-lying, bad land’ as a metaphorical extension of loete ‘spoon, spade’, viz. as a place which, being lower than its surroundings, was always relatively wet. In a similar way, the word pan ‘pan’ is used metaphorically in MoDu. duinpan ‘dune valley’.

5. Moes- beside Muis- ‘mouse’ < *mūs-. The number of western Dutch Moes-toponyms mentioned by Schönfeld (1932: 9) is really small. West Flemish Moesbrouck (1592, Veurne-Ambacht), which Schönfeld compares with a different place Muysbrouck (1729, Tielt-Buiten), may contain a different word, such as MDu. mos(i)e, moes(i)e ‘midge’ or moes ‘food’, or it may have a different history. South Hollandish Mosyenbroec (1412) can also be interpreted as ‘Midgebrook’, see de Vries 1932: 26. The names Moesbergen on the originally frisophone island of Texel and near Doorn (southeast of Utrecht) may have had /u:/ in the Middle Ages. The history of Moesbosch on Walcheren, attested since the late sixteenth century, is unknown.

6. North Hollandish oeterdijc (Krommenie, 1355), Oeterdijck (Enkhuizen, 1380), Ooterdijc (Westzaan, 1412), beside Uyterdyck (1402, etc.), euterdijck (17th c.) and eeterdijck (15th c.), for ‘outer dike’, see Boekenoogen 2004: 120, Schönfeld 1932: 5. An even earlier attestation is oeterdijc in a 1298 document from the province of Utrecht referring to Breukelen (VMNW). It is not easy to make sense of this variation if we start from WGm. *ūtara- ‘outer’. The spelling <oe> beside <oo> probably represents /o:/ or /o.ə/, while euterdijck could reflect either unconditional fronting of /o:/ or i-mutation, with ee- as its unrounded counterpart. Van Berkel & Samplonius 2006: 345 s.v. Oterleek in North Holland derive oter- from Frisian oter ‘outward’, with a short first vowel, and indeed *utar- would yield MDu. /o:ter/ with a long vowel. The same preform *utar- was already proposed

153. I skip Schönfeld’s discussion of the elements Hoen- (where no western Dutch evidence for <oe> from *ū is adduced) and Koer- (where only the farm Koerland near Velsen is adduced, of which no old forms are known). The forms in Groe(n)n- will contain groen ‘green’. Rumst and Rumpt in the Betuwe have *rūm- ‘spacious’ plus i-mutation factor (de Vries 1932: 27).
by de Vries (1932: 25) in his review of Schönfeld 1932. The existence of an Old Dutch preform with short *u- is confirmed by dialectal etirsten ‘outmost’ in Bree (Belgian Limburg), cf. Dupont 1914–1920: 183. This form shows i-mutation from the superlative suffix. Whereas the PGm. ra-adjective seems to have been *ūtara- (OS -ūtar, OHG āzar, OFri. āter, OE ūtor, ON útar), the variant *utara- may have been formed on the model of *uz- ‘out’. Alternatively, we could posit a shortening of *ūtr- to *utr- in Old Dutch oblique case forms. At any rate, oeterdijc represents no evidence for the unchanged retention of original *ū-.

7. Roet in North Holland refers to a ‘strip of reed along a piece of land’ (Boekenoogen 2004: 430), also in some local toponyms. Northeastern Dutch dialects generally have ruit, roet for ‘weeds’, and EWN posits *xrūda-, cf. MDu. ruyde, Zealandish dial. ruë, reu ‘dodder’, etc. Modern Westerlauwers Frisian has rút for ‘weeds growing by the waterside’. Possibly, then, North Hollandish roet is a direct borrowing from Old Frisian *rūt in North Holland.

8. Souburg [ˈsʌbʌrx] (Walcheren, Zealand; 1162 copy 17th c. Sutburch, 1198 copy 16th c. Sutburg, 1247 copy 1307 Westsubborgh, 1335 Wester Zubburgh, 18th c. Zouburg) contains zuid- ‘South’ < *sūþ-, with early shortening of the stressed vowel in the compound. The personal name van subburgh, van subborgh, occurring in Holland in the thirteenth century (see VMNW s.v. subborgh), confirms the shortness of the first vowel. A variant with <o>, Sobborgh, is also attested from the late thirteenth century on. The pronunciation [su-] must be due to a later development under the influence of the following b, as outlined by de Vries 1932: 22, or it could be due to restoration on the basis of the written language. In any case, Souburg is unreliable evidence for the normal development of *ū in Zealand.

16.3 Oe-relics in the Standard Dutch vocabulary

There is a sizeable number of Standard Dutch words that are claimed to reflect WGm. *ū as Dutch oe /u(ː)/. In most cases, these words coexist or coexisted with words in ui or uu containing the expected western Dutch fronted reflex of the same etymon. Well known instances of this phenomenon are snoeven ‘to boast’ beside snuiven ‘to sniff’ and boer ‘farmer’ beside buur ‘neighbour’. Some pairs of words show a more restricted, metaphorical meaning for the oe-form, e.g. in snoeven ‘to boast’, snoet ‘face’, versus more general semantics for the ui- or uu-form, in snuiven ‘to sniff’, snuit ‘snout, beak’. This difference would fit with general tendencies of word replacement: words with more restricted, geographically less wide-spread semantics can be relic forms from an older stage or borrowings from the local substrate (van Bree 2012).
As explained in the previous section, the collection of forms for which this oe-relic status is claimed goes back to a proposal made by Kloeke (1926b). Although other scholars were quick to point out that the evidence hardly ever ensures that the oe-forms are indeed original to Holland, Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 85–6) and, most recently, van Loon (2014: 216), retain the basic idea, viz. that some of the unexpected oe-words in Standard Dutch represent relic forms of coastal Dutch dialects, especially from North Holland. Other oe-words must have been taken over from eastern Dutch dialects which regularly preserved /u:/ as in *ōt. It is usually said to be impossible to tell the difference between a western and an eastern origin of an oe-form. This uncertainty alone would, strictly speaking, invalidate the whole collection as proof for the existence of western oe-relics.

A renewed investigation of the evidence adduced in the handbooks leaves circa fifteen relatively convincing cases for the co-occurrence of oe- and ui- or uu-forms for the same *ū-etymon in western and/or contemporary Standard Dutch. In at least part of these cases, a western or eastern origin of oe seems probable. To what extent these oe-forms prove that coastal Dutch did not front ODu. *ū remains to be seen. If the oe-forms came from North Holland, they may in theory reflect local borrowings from Old Frisian, which means they would not represent relic forms within Hollandsich.

1. boer ‘farmer’ next to buur ‘neighbour’. The cohabitation of these two words in standard Dutch (and, for a few centuries, in many dialects) has a disputed origin. The most straightforward etymology for both of them is WGm. *būra- ‘dwelling’, as continued in OHG būr, pūr n. ‘house’, MLG būr n. ‘workshop, cage’, OE būr ‘house’. A collective noun *ga-būra- yielded OHG gibūr ‘member of the household, neighbour, fellow citizen, farmer’ and gibūro ‘id.’, see EWAhd IV: 222. The a-stem has cognates in OS gibūr, OE gebūr and MDu. gebuur. Deprived of the prefix ge-, the latter noun yields MoDu. buur ‘neighbour’. 154

Heeroma (1943b) argues that the form with /u:/ is indigenous in Flanders, Brabant, and Holland. This statement is true for the twentieth century, since boer has /u:/ in nearly all Dutch dialects (GTRP), including the areas which usually have fronting. For instance, one would expect ODu. *būr to yield buur in West Flanders and buur in East Flanders, but in reality we find boer. Heeroma

154. Another interesting word is Dutch buurman ‘neighbour’. An early instance is the gen. pl. burmanne ‘inhabitants’ (Haastrecht, 1289). With unequivocal /y:/-spelling, we find buyrman (Holland, 1514), buerman (North Holland, 16th c.) ‘inhabitant’, feeding into the Modern Dutch word. With a back vowel, boerman ‘farmer’ is attested in Antwerps Liedboek (1544), in van Vaernewijck’s description of the upraising in Ghent (1566–68), and in a number of farces from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In general, boerman seems to be used as a stylistic variant of boer ‘farmer’.
implicitly claims that boer escaped the fronting to /y:/ because of its etymology *būwarja ‘who works [the land]’ > *būere > būr. The formation would match OHG bū(w)ārī ‘farmer’ (to būan), MHG būwære, buwer ‘inhabitant; farmer’. Dutch buur would then show the straightforward reflex of *būra-, whereas boer would go back to *būwere, which escaped the change of *ūw to ou found in the base verb bouwen ‘to build’. Note, however, that the noun bouwer is already attested in East Flemish of the thirteenth century, in the name Hannekin willem sbouuers sone (Oudenaerde, 1291). Hence, Heeroma’s explanation does not work for this area.

Boer is not attested in Dutch texts as ‘farmer’ before the early sixteenth century. The usual word for ‘farmer’ in Middle Dutch was dorper, dorpman, huusman or landman. In fact, the designation of a ‘farmer’ as a separate profession makes less sense when farming is the default occupation. It was urbanisation which created an opposition between city-dwellers and farmers, leading to the introduction of the word boer which was borrowed from the people that identified themselves as such. As stressed by Franck & van Wijk (1912) and van Haeringen (1936), the different lexemes used in Middle Dutch for ‘farmer’ strengthen the idea that boer is a loanword from more eastern dialects. Nonetheless, we may credit Heeroma (1943b: 51) for stressing that buer is already found in various derivatives and compounds in the dictionary Dasypodius by Antonius Schorus from 1542, which has the entries boer ‘farmer’, boerachtich ‘like a farmer, coarse, ill-mannered, unwise’, boerenhof ‘farmstead’. Heeroma argues that a word with such an impressive countenance must be indigenous, “onwrikbaar als de boerenstand zelf!” [“as unshakable as the peasantry itself!”].

A slightly earlier, western attestation is Hobbe Scoutens die turffboere ‘H. B., the peat merchant’ in a city account from Gouda from 1437. The spelling <oe> before r in this document can represent /o:/ or /u:/, The ending -e is interesting: although syntactically a dative, all nouns in the same structure in the same text have the nominative-accusative form, such as bakker, mandemaker, etc. This use of boer for ‘farmer who comes to town to sell his products’ has been retained in the modern language, e.g. visboer ‘fishmonger’, melkboer ‘milkman’, groenteboer ‘greengrocer’. The form turffboere is potentially very important, as it might help to salvage Heeroma’s explanation of western boer. Let us assume that *būwere existed in Dutch (as it did in High German), and that it yielded ODu. *bouwere (as attested in 1291 s-bouuers) before /u:/ was fronted to /y:/.

Whereas nouns of this rhythmic structure usually apocopated final schwa in

Holland (see Marynissen 1995: 184–94 for the nouns in -ere), it is conceivable that *bouwere instead syncopated the internal schwa, giving *bou(w)re. Since /ow/ did not otherwise occur before r at this time, the sequence /owr/ may have been reanalysed as /u:r/ automatically, or maybe *o was phonetically raised before *w, much like the sequence *iw gave short /u/ in Zealand and Holland (see § 16.1 above). This solution would explain why turffboere in Gouda retains its e whereas other agent nouns in -er in the same text have lost it. Semantically, it would also be preferable to explain boer ‘merchant’ as a direct derivative of bouwen ‘to build, cultivate’, rather than from *būr ‘neighbour, farmer’, though the latter of course cannot be completely excluded.

I have no ultimate answer to the question whether boer was borrowed from eastern dialects, or whether the standard language might have borrowed it from North Hollandish dialects. In North Holland, boer could have been an Old Frisian borrowing, compare OFr. būr ‘1. neighbour, 2. citizen with property, 3. (pl.) community’ (Hofmann & Popkema 2008), MoWF boer /bu.ər/. It is striking that the surname de Boer is most frequent in (western) Fryslân and North Holland, especially along the Zuiderzee coast, but of course this may reflect a development of the last few centuries only.

2. doffer ‘cock-pigeon’ beside duif ‘pigeon’, from MDu. duver (WGM. *dūbaran-m., compare *dūbōn-f.). Kiliaan (1599) calls doeff er /dufr/ a Hollandish word. In modern dialects, the male pigeon retains a long vowel in West Flanders (duwer) and some southeastern dialects (doever), whereas doffer with a short vowel is found in dialects of Zealand, Holland, central-northern Dutch and the northeastern dialects (see TNZN Map 1.6). Its ff reflects devoicing of v before r (*dūvr- > *dufr-) while o reflects short *u which resulted from shortening before fr (*dāfr- > *dufr-) before ū was fronted to /y:/.

3. kroes ‘crisp, frizzy’ beside kruis(bes) ‘gooseberry’, kruize(munt) ‘water-mint’ from WGM. *krūsa- ‘entangled’ (MoHG kraus). The word *krūsa- seems to be an ablaut variant of *krausja- ‘intestines’ whence MDu. kroos ‘bowels’, for which Kiliaan gives the variants kroos, kroes, kroost, kroest in “German, Saxon, Sicambrian, Hollandish”. There is also kroos ‘duck-weed’, for which Kiliaan similarly gives as variants kroos(t) and kroes(t) in Hollandish and Guelrish. Hence, it cannot be excluded that kroes ‘crisp’ is the reflex of *kraus- from any dialect in which *au > MDu. oo was raised to oe.

4. loeren ‘to lour’ < *lūran- beside (unrelated?) gluren ‘to glower’ < *glūr-. The verb loeren is mainly found in eastern Dutch dialects, and in western Dutch it is not attested before 1578 according to EWN. Its absence from literary medieval Flemish and Hollandish is somewhat surprising for such a basic word. There is a 1514 attestation of the agent noun luerer from Holland which shows the expected western /y:/-vocalism. Also, loeren ‘lour’ does not occur in Boekenoogen
2004. It seems safest, therefore, to assume that *loeren was introduced into western Dutch from eastern dialects.

5. poes, Early MoDu. *poes 'she-cat' < *pūs-. The ui-vocalism is original to Holland, including North Holland (cf. Boekenoogen 2004 s.v. *pūsje). An older word is poesele (Kiliaan) 'fat girl', MoDu. poezelig 'chubby'. It may be derived from *pūs- 'to swell, inflate', cf. poesten 'to blow', puist 'pimple' (MoHG bausen, bauschen 'to swell'). The Early MoDu. verb poesen 'to kiss', in northern dialects poezen 'to spill water', may also be related. Its oe may be onomatopoetic.

6. proesten, MDu. and Early MoDu. pruysten 'to sneeze; explode with laughter' (MLG prūsten 'sneeze'). Proesten is called Hollandish by Kiliaan; in literary texts, it does not occur with oe before 1746, and it is then found several times together with hoesten 'to cough'. This suggests that proesten may – in lower sociolinguistic registers? – owe its oe to the rhyme with hoesten, and/or to the continued onomatopoetic association with 'sneezing' (WNT).

7. smoel 'mug, face' beside Early MoDu. smuyl, MDu. coesmule 'cow’s head' (1343). One of the earliest attestations with <oe> is smoel spoken by the maid Angeniet in Bredero’s Moortje (1615): Houwt den smoel toe ‘Keep your mouth shut!’. Verbal derivatives include moddermule 'to give sticky kisses' (1524), smodder-muyleen 'id.' (16th c.), MoDu. meesmuilen 'to smile ironically' < mees-muilen. Smuyl is a variant of muil 'mouth (of an animal)', G. Maul, with s- probably taken from *smīlan, cf. OHG smīlan, English smile. In fact, the verb smuylen is glossed as 'to smile' in Kiliaan (1599); it disappeared from the language soon afterwards. It seems certain that smoel contains the original Hollandish vocalism. As there is no indication that smoel came from North Holland; most likely it was introduced from eastern dialects and/or Low German.

8. snoet 'snout' (usually of a person) beside *snuit 'snout, muzzle' < WGm. *snūtō-. The variant *snuit is the more neutral denomination in the standard language, whereas snoet is often used as a term of endearment. Snoet is first attested in 1665 in snoetdoecken 'tissues for wiping the mouth' (in a Brabantish text, WNT s.v. voorschoot), and very sporadically in literary texts of the eighteenth century (1722 in the farce Medea by Rosseau, printed in Amsterdam; in 1779 in Berkhey). The dialects of Flanders and Zeeland have snuut(e), as expected from *snūtō- (WZD, WVD). The form snoet must come from eastern dialects.

9. snoeven 'to breathe audibly; boast' beside *snuiven 'to sniff' < *snūban-. The earliest instance of snoeven <snouven> is found in a Flemish text from 1548, and there are other attestations showing that the oe-form was not originally confined to North Holland. Kiliaan has snoeven, snuyven, snoffen 'to breathe (audibly)', with dialectal variants of possibly the same preform *snūven, and the expression sonder snoeven wt drincken 'to drink up without taking a breath'. In view of the onomatopoetic meaning, it is quite possible that oe was preserved
or restored in this verb more often because of the association with the sound of breathing heavily.

10. *soezen* ‘to doze’ beside *suizen* ‘to buzz, sigh’. For Kiliaan, *soesen* and *suisen* both mean ‘to rustle, hum’. The meaning ‘buzz, rustle’ is still attested for *soezen* in the seventeenth century, but the verb has since specialized to ‘doze’. Probably, *soezen* was kept for onomatopoeic reasons.

11. *stoer* ‘sturdy, stalwart’ beside *stuuurs* ‘surly’ < WGm. *stūra-. Stoer is first attested in literary texts from North Holland in the eighteenth century. It replaces Middle and Early Modern Dutch *stuur* ‘strong; surly’. In the meaning ‘surly’, *stuur* is replaced by its derivative *stuurs(ch)*, though *stuur* survives in many southern dialects. In dialects, *stoer* is also known in all of northeastern Dutch. Thus, it is impossible to determine whether *stoer* entered the literary language via North Holland or from eastern dialects.

12. *stoet* ‘loaf of bread’ (thus in North Holland and in northeastern dialects, cf. Jobse-van Putten 1980), versus West Flemish *stuite*, Waaslandish *stuut*, from *stūtō-. Stoet cannot be ascribed to the standard language since it is a dialectal word. Still, it would be relevant to know whether it can be explained as a Frisian loanword in North Holland. Frisian has *stūt*, with /y/ from Early Modern Westerlaauwers Frisian fronting of Old Frisian û before dentals. The occasional attestation of *stūt, stoete* (WFT) shows the old vowel. Hence, North Hollandish *stoet* could be a loanword from Old Frisian. The standard language has *stoethaspel* ‘clumsy person’ (first attested in 1782 in North Holland), which may also belong to *stoet* ‘loaf of bread’.

13. *stoetelen* ‘to act clumsily’, a North Hollandish dialect form of unclear origin. It has been explained as a frequentative in -elen to *stuiten* ‘to stop, impede’, but the latter verb continues *stautan*.

14. *stroef* ‘stiff, rough’ (of a surface) beside MDu. *struuf* < WGm. *strūba-. The former is not attested before 1750, and initially occurs mainly in texts by Hollandish authors (WNT). Probably *stroef* was introduced from eastern dialects.

15. *toet* ‘face’, also ‘sow’ in North Holland, beside *tuit* ‘spout, nozzle’ < *tūtō-. The oldest attestation of *toet* is from a 1655 farce from Amsterdam.

16. For *toeten* (first attested in 1600), *toeteren* beside MDu. *tuten*, MoDu. *tuiten* ‘to resound, play a wind-instrument’, one may invoke onomatopoeic preservation of the sound [u:]. Still, *toeten* may well have entered the standard language because it was preserved in North Holland.
16.4 Conclusion

In § 16.1, it was established that there is no coastal Dutch dialect with traces of a general retention of $\ast \hat{u}$ as /u:/ and we can see that word-final $\ast \hat{u}$ has merged with $\ast iw$ to give short /u/, and that this is preserved as such in Zeelandish. We have seen in § 16.2 that there is no reliable evidence for coastal Dutch oe-relics in toponyms. At most, the North Hollandish word roet may have been borrowed locally from Old Frisian. The appellatives which were thought to be western oe-relics fall into the following categories:

- onomatopoeia: 5. poes, 6. proesten, 9. snoeven, 10. soezen, 16. toeten
- not a (direct) reflex of long $\ast \hat{u}$: 2. doffer, 3. kroes, 13. stoetelen
- not found in (North) Hollandish and therefore probably taken from eastern dialects: 4. loeren, 7. smoel, 8. snoet, 14. stroef
- possibly a North Hollandish word, but uncertain whether it entered the standard language from North Holland: 1. boer, 11. stoer, 15. toet
- North Hollandish dialect word which may have been borrowed from Old Frisian: 12. stoet

I conclude that there is no reliable evidence for the retention of $\ast \hat{u}$ as /u:/ in Zealand or Holland at the time when Flanders and Brabant underwent fronting of this vowel to /y:/ and of course, that does not exclude the possibility that Zeeland and Holland lagged behind in this change – but if they did, they must have caught up before 1200 when written sources set in, and when <u> and <ue> are used as spellings for /y:/.
**WGm. *ea, *eo and *ō**

The mid diphthongs *ea* (traditionally reconstructed as *ē₂, *ea) and *eo and the mid monophthong *ō of West Germanic eventually yielded high vowels such as /iː/, /iə/, and /uː/, /uə/ in Flemish, Zeelandish and Hollandish. Yet there are traces of the mid vowel stages in old and modern texts. The investigation will concentrate on the coastal provinces, Brabant, Utrecht, and southern Guelders. Monophthongal /eː/ is found in all periods in East Limburg and in the northeastern dialects, where it forms an integral part of the Low German /eː/-area (Pijnenburg 2005: 113–4).

### 17.1 Coastal Dutch ee for StDu. ie

The Old Dutch reflex of *eo has been discussed by Gysseling (1992: 46–79) and Tavernier-Vereecken (1968: 574). Whereas the general evolution in Ghent is from <eo> via <iø> to <ie> by the tenth century, and then mainly to <i>-spellings by the twelfth century, there is minority of tokens with <e> in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Tavernier-Vereecken mentions examples such as *Letbert* for *Liod-berht* and *Gerlef* for *Gair-leof* (11th c.), *Levilt* beside *Livild*, *Thetbaldus* for *piotbald-* (12th c.), and the West Flemish toponym *Ledegem* from *leod-* (Liedenghem 1085 copy middle 12th c.; *Lidengim* 1111 copy 1126–50; *Lidegem* 1187; *Ledenghem* 1205).

In the modern period, *ea* (as in brief ‘letter’) and *eo (as in vliegen ‘to fly’) have yielded /iə/ in French and West Flanders but /i(,)/ in the other coastal Dutch dialects. It is generally thought that these vowels reflect an Early Middle Dutch diphthong /iə/ which was monophthongized everywhere except in West Flanders. See FAND II/III, maps 89 brief, 90 vliegen, 94 vier, and – with various regional complications – maps 91 spiegel, 92 nieuw, 93 knie.

A mixed bag of Middle Dutch evidence for <e> instead of <ie> is discussed by van Loey (1980: 44). As it turns out when we check the corpus of the thirteenth century, there is very little clear evidence for stressed /eː/ in the coastal dialects. An isolated ee-form of lief ‘dear’ is the dat.pl. leuen (WHol., 1282). For drie ‘three’, a

---

156. The relevance of her other example for *eo yielding <e> = /eː/ is uncertain: in East Flemish Leeuwergem < *leodwaringa-haim- (Leevergem ±1177, Leeverghem 1285), *dw may have assimilated at an early stage, yielding *lewaringahēm.
few ee-variants occur here and there: dren and dreen in Arkel (SE-Hol.) and Utrecht, and the dative dren in Oostwinkel-Zomergem (EFla.). Te(e)n ‘ten’ is found once each in Bruges, Brussels and Holland, as against hundreds of tokens of ti(e)n. The derivative ‘tithe’ is found as teinde and theinde in a single West Hollandish charter from 1280–87. Prester ‘priest’ occurs once in Antwerp, versus usual pri(e)ster in all of Early Middle Dutch. For liedien ‘people’, a variant -lede(n) occurs especially in compounds such as onsleden ‘us’, hemleden ‘them’ in Flanders (see Berteloot 1984a: 90 and Map 124). Hence, -leden probably represents a specific development in unstressed syllable. The name ‘Peter’ is usually written as Pieter in Flanders, Zealand and several other places, but Pe(e)ter is quite regular in South Brabant and in North Holland (but in the latter area, only in a handful of forms). Also, Peter is more frequent than Pieter in the Hollandish count’s charters from The Hague. Unfortunately, influence from Latin Petrus can never be excluded, so that the attestations of Peter remain inconclusive for our investigation.

Some preterites of strong verbs with *ea are spelled with single <e> in Early Middle Dutch (van Loey 1980: 19), mainly in Holland. The evidence concerns ghenc ‘went’ (2x, WHol., EHol.) for usual ghinc; held, helt occasionally in Flanders and West Holland for hi(e)ld ‘held’ (see Berteloot 1984a: 80 and Map 103); veel (1x WFla., 1285) for viel ‘fell’, also vel (WFla., Rijmbijbel, rhyming with spel ‘play’), dat ghevel ‘it happened’ (5x in WFla.) for gevel; and ontveinch (WHol., 1280–87), ontfe- ing (WHol., 1299) for usual ontfinc ‘received’. From Late Middle Dutch we can add henck ‘hung’ in Der Minnen Loep by Dirc Potter and heng in Heraut Beyeren (Hol., 1450–70). Since we are dealing with a short vowel (as shown by the rhyme of vel), we may assume that <e> in these strong preterites represents a western shortening of /iə/ or maybe of earlier /e:/ before two consonants. If the latter is true, ghenc, helt etc. would prove an earlier stage */e:/ . The Leiden Willeram form gieng (p. 107, line 01) suggests that the shortening did not occur before the twelfth century, in which case it is more likely to go back to /iə/ than to /e:/, but we cannot be absolutely sure.

Spiegel ‘mirror’ often has <e>. It is a loanword from Gallo-Romance *spēglu which may date from between 600 and 800 (Gysseling 1992: 25). We find Early MDu. spegel (WFla., 1287, Der Natueren Bloeme), dat.sg. speghelkine ‘little mir- ror’ (Bruges, 1281, 1298), and later speghel with Jan Praet (WFla., 1401–50) and in other Flemish texts. The map spiegel in FAND shows that the modern dialect word behaves differently from the other ie-words in French and West Flanders, in that it has /e:/ rather than /iə/. In this region, /e:/ is the expected reflex of lengthened *e in open syllables. Hence, the FAND commentary (p. 200) suggests that the West Flemish word could be a more recent borrowing. This is possible, but the precise restriction of this other borrowing to western Flanders, which borders on the francophone area, would remain enigmatic. A different solution may be preferable. It is conceivable that Romance *spēglu, when it was borrowed, was adopted with a
short vowel by the (West) Flemish dialects, yielding MoFle. /e:/ by open syllable lengthening. The same Romance word may have been incorporated into the inland dialects with a long vowel /e/. Note a similar vacillation in the vowel quality and quantity of the Latin or Romance borrowings feeding into StDu. *tegel, tichel ‘tile’ (Lat. *tegula) and *regel, richel ‘rule’ (Lat. *rēgula), cf. § 9.2.1.

The sound law *ierC > *eerC found in the historical grammars of Dutch is modified by Pijnenburg (2005) in the following way. Rather than being a general Old Dutch development, it originated, according to Pijnenburg’s investigation of the Middle Dutch forms, in Brabant in the thirteenth century. In texts from Brabant, StDu. *deerne ‘girl’ (*þewerno-), *veertien ‘fourteen’ and *veertig ‘forty’, as well as MDu. *veerdel ‘quarter’ (from *fewwar ‘four’) – all of which have <ie> in Late Old Dutch – are first attested with a spelling <e(e)r>, viz. in the second half of the thirteenth century: *derne once in the Liege Diatessaron (EBrab., ca. 1300), *veer- in the numeral ‘40’ in Mechelen (5x), and *ver- in Geertruidenberg (1x) and the Liege Diatessaron (1x). In the fourteenth century, Pijnenburg (2005: 113) finds *veer- in ‘14’ and ‘40’ in many places in Brabant, from Zoutleeuw (1300), Tongerlo (1311), and Brussels (1312) in the south to Den Bosch (1348) and Oisterwijk (1349) in the north, with a focus in the southeast of North Brabant. Probably, the lowered vowel first spread to Limburg, as in *veirtin (Brustem, 1338), *vertich (Maaseik, 1343). From the CRM14 corpus, we can add *veerdel (Cuijk 1391, Hasselt 1396, Lummen 1397) and *verdel (Hasselt 1396, Tongeren 1396) ‘quarter’. The reflexes of these words in the north-eastern dialects are irrelevant to us, since Westphalian generally has <e> from *eo. For instance, *vertich ‘40’ is also found in Overijssel from ca. 1340 onwards.

It remains to be seen which phonetic scenario best explains the given forms. Pijnenburg assumes that ODu. *ie was shortened before rC in Brabant (and Limburg), as is suggested by spellings with <i> such as virde ‘fourth’. It would have merged with the similarly shortened reflexes of *ärC (e.g., *irste ‘first’) and *ērC (e.g., van wirte ‘from Weert’) into a short mid-high vowel [ɪ]. The latter vowel then took part in the more general lengthening of short vowels before r plus consonant of the type *woord ‘word’, *aarde ‘earth’, *erve ‘heir’, yielding *deerne and *veertien. I am not sure that we need the detour of a specifically Brabantish shortening of *ie before rC, if only because we find ‘fourth’ spelled as virde also in Cleves/Guelders, Dordrecht, Ghent and West Flanders in the thirteenth century, whereas the town of Mechelen already has *veertich in the same period. Probably, long and short-vowel forms of these compounds co-occurred in the thirteenth and fourteenth century in many Dutch dialects.


158. That such a shortening is plausible, but did not always yield [i], is suggested by Houten, Utrecht, vortinnacht (1295); cf. South Holland dorde ‘third’ in Early Middle Dutch.
Altogether, no reliable evidence remains for assuming that coastal Dutch had a systematic mid-vowel reflex of *ea or *eo at any time after 1000, or, in any case, not to a greater extent than is found in some etyma in inland Dutch dialects.

17.2 Coastal Dutch oo for StDu. oe

For WGM. *ö, there are several indications that it originally remained a mid vowel in coastal dialects. At the same time, many of the Middle Dutch spellings cannot be interpreted in an unambiguous way. For this reason and others to be explained below, the phonetic and geographic details of the reflexes of *ö remain disputed.

Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: §68) list a number of arguments for the view that a mid vowel value applied to western reflexes of *ö in Middle and Modern Dutch:

– Middle Dutch <o>-spellings (see also Mooijaart 1992: 138);
– Middle Dutch rhymes of *ö with *au (e.g. doe 'then': also 'thus');
– North Hollandish <oo>-spellings;
– claims of Erasmus and Hollandish grammarians of the seventeenth century to the effect that oe must be read as ö;
– occasional mention of dialectal foms such as kookje 'cake', voet 'foot', vroog 'early', broor 'brother' in South Holland;
– petrified toponyms such as Moordrecht (to moer 'moor');
– Middle Flemish spelling variation.

A further indication for a mid vowel value in Middle Dutch are the mid vowel relics in modern western dialects, which we will discuss below.

Van Loon (2014: 154–57) thinks that the Old Dutch value may have been [o:], based on a number of clues: (1) Before the glide j, Middle Dutch retains the spelling <o> rather than <oe> until the sixteenth century: vloyen 'to flow', groyen 'to grow', etc.; (2) Most of the Old Dutch names and toponyms have <o>, whereas only a minority has <uo> (see Gysseling 1992: 38–41); (3) The spelling <oe>, which is first attested in 1161 for Moer near Antwerp, soon becomes the most popular spelling in closed syllable. The same spelling is used in Early Middle Dutch for the low back vowel /ɔ:/ from *au. This identical spelling suggests – though it does not prove – that the vowels /o:/ and /ɔ:/ were relatively similar; (4) Dutch retains /ɔ/ in some words and suffixes in which WGM. *ö was shortened before it was diphthongized and/or raised. Examples are tot 'until' < toe + te, zocht 'sought' < *sōxte, the suffix -dom '-hood', Robbrecht 'Robert' < *Hrōd-berxt-. The occasional Old Dutch uo-spellings in Flemish place-names (e.g. Gruononberg and Buosingahem in French Flanders) are dismissed by van Loon as possibly non-local spellings.
17.2.1 The Middle Dutch situation

The investigation into the Early Middle Dutch realization of *ō is complicated by the large number of graphemes which can represent /o:/, /u:/ or a falling diphthong starting in /o/ or /u/. The most frequent variants are <o>, <ó> (rarely), <oe>, <oo>, <oi>, <ou>, <owe>, <uo>, and there are others which are not found in western texts. The statutes of the Ghent Leprosy from 1236 show an early stage of transition from ODu. <uo> or <o> to MDu. <oe> (Larsen 2001: 228–30). In this document, the vowel *ō is spelled with <uo> in 9% of the 195 tokens, as in behuof ‘need’, bluod ‘blood’, stuol ‘stool’, guode, guoder ‘good’. The spelling <o> is found in nearly 70% of the tokens, with a preference for open syllable (90% of all open-syllable spellings have <o> as against 44% of the closed syllables), whereas <oe>, conversely, is found in 20% of all tokens but in 37.5% of all closed syllables. This confirms that <oe> was probably first used in closed syllables. One possible reason for this distribution could be that diphthongization to /oə/ happened earlier or was better preserved in closed syllables. But a more likely explanation is that the scribes wanted to indicate the vowel length in closed syllables (where /o:/ was opposed to short /o/ or /ɔ/). In open syllable, regular lengthening of *o and *u meant that every <o> naturally indicated a long vowel.

Mooijaart (1992: 139) observes that <oe> in broeder (ODu. *brōder) is found in nearly 100% of the instances in Flanders and Zealand, but only in 50% of the cases in Holland. She hypothesizes that this might point to a phonetic difference. If so, it would mean that Flanders had a diphthong such as /oə/ whereas Holland had /o:/.

But it might alternatively be interpreted as a sign that open syllable lengthening had not yet developed to the same extent as in Flemish.

In the second half of the thirteenth century, the clearest indication for a diphthongal value of <oe> is the variant <owe> in southwestern Brabant, viz. in Brussels, Mechelen and Sint-Pieters-Leeuw in doe ‘then’, hoe ‘how’ and toe ‘to’: er … towe, daer towe ‘thereto’ (Brussels, 1277, 10x; Mechelen 1x), daer touwe, hijr touwe ‘hereto’ (Sint-Pieters-Leeuw, 1298), dowe ‘then’, howe ‘how’, er towe (Brussels, 1276). Note that this phenomenon is restricted to word-final *-ō and may be due to a specific phonetic development in this position. Van Loey (1980: 73) interprets these sequences as /-ouwə/ and gives some additional evidence from the word *kō ‘cow’ in southeast Brabant: couwestrate ‘Cow’s street’ (Tienen, 1451), couwe ‘cow’ (Tienen, 1422), touwe (Zoutleeuw, 1472). The main distributional patterns and the possible phonological background of the other spellings in the thirteenth century have been discussed by Mooijaart (1992: 134–42).

Leaving aside <o> and <oe>, which cannot be interpreted unambiguously, I move to the spellings <oi> and <oo>, which are more reliable renderings of a monophthong /oː/. In western Dutch, <oi> is almost only found in closed syllables.
Most of the tokens come from West Holland, thus supporting the view that this region had /o:/.

The spelling <oo> is even rarer, and is mainly found in West Flanders.

Van Haverbeke (1955: 44–7) assumes that Bruges still had /o:/ during most of the thirteenth century, though the vowel may have been raised before labial and velar obstruents by the end of that century.

### 17.2.2 Mid vowel relic forms in western dialects

The modern distribution of reflexes of *ō in coastal Dutch dialects is given by FAND II/III, and has been discussed in some detail by Taeldeman 1992: 439–42. Most of the dialects of East Flanders and Zealand, as well as most of Holland, show /u/ in all surroundings, but long /u./ is found in eastern East Flanders and on the border of West and East Flanders. Not surprisingly, in Zealand and Holland the long vowel is more frequently found before resonants, as in *groen, voelen, koel*, and *roeren* (see the maps in FAND).

Many dialects show a complementary distribution between the reflex of *ō in front of dental obstruents and resonants, on the one hand, and labial and velar consonants, on the other hand (Taeldeman 1979: 68). Western Flanders opposes a long reflex /u.a/ before dentals to short /u/ before labials and velars; in a small triangular area in the southeast of West Flanders and the southwest of East Flanders, the opposition is between /u/ and /ou/. Willemyns (1971: 110) assumes that the frequent spelling <ou> in Bruges in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries before labials and velars (*begrouwen* ‘buried’, *zoucken* ‘to search’, etc.) – which contrasts with <oe>, <o> before dentals – decidedly points to [u]. The Middle Dutch data from the town of Oudenaarde show the gradual rise in the thirteenth century and until 1450 of a sharp distinction between <ou> before labials and velars and <oe> in other positions (Hoebeke 1968: 382–401). In the sources from the thirteenth century, <oe> and <o> are found to alternate before dentals, but <oe>, <o> and <ou> all occur before labials and velars: *bloeme, bloume* ‘flower’, *brouc-, broec, broc* ‘wetland’,

159. In alemoissen ‘alms’ (WHol., 1297), broic ‘brook’ (WHol., 1280–87, Rijnsburg, 1294), broider ‘brother’ (Dordrecht), g(h)oit, goid ‘good(s)’ (EFla., 1292; WHol., 1280–87, 1298; WBrab. 1293, 1296, 1298; Utrecht 1296), groit ‘greets’ (WHol., 1282), moider ‘mother’ (EFla., 1293), moitwille ‘intent’ (NBrab., 1277), voreghenoimt ‘aforementioned’ (WBrab., 1298–99), ondoit ‘undoes’ (WFla., 1287), poil ‘pool’ (WHol., 1280–87), goinsdach, scoindages ‘Wednesday’ (EFla., 1293), woistinen ‘wilderness’ (EFla., 1212–23).

160. In boof (23x in Bruges, vs. 800+ times boef. 1x in Mechelen) ‘necessity’ (MoDu. behoef), groone ‘green’ (1x WFla., 1287; in the same line as grone and groenened ‘greenness’), goot ‘good’ (1x Oudenaerde 1291–1300), roost ‘rust’ (WFla, 1287), voreghenoomt ‘aforementioned’ (Ghentbruges, 1293).
bouf, boef ‘behest’, etc. Like Willemyns, Hoebekoe regards <ou> as a rendering of a monophthong [u], as against other scholars who have assumed a diphthongal value [uo]. One of Hoebekoe’s arguments is that, among thousands of tokens with *ō before labials and velars from the Oudenaerde region before 1600, not a single instance of an unambiguous diphthong <au> has been found (Hoebekoe 1968: 399). Whatever the precise phonetic value was, Oudenaerde in any case points to a conditioned split of *ō already in the thirteenth century.

Further north, a complementary distribution along the same lines can be found in more traditional dialects of Holland, such as those of Goeree, Scheveningen, Katwijk, Noordwijk, Zandvoort, Marken and Huizen. It takes the shape of /u/ before dentals versus /o./ before labials and velars in Marken and Scheveningen (according to Heeroma 1935: 77–78; in FAND, /o./ has ceded to /ou/ or merged with /u/), and of /u/ versus /o.u/ in Zandvoort, Noordwijk, and Katwijk (as per Heeroma 1935: 77–8 and FAND). For Assendelft, Boekenoogen (1897: xxxi) mentions vróger ‘previously’ and dó ‘then’ as archaic but contemporary forms with /o./.

The same conditioned split of *ō can be retrieved for earlier stages in Holland, where the farces by van Santen from 1617 and 1620, which are staged in Delft, spell oe before dentals but frequently oo in front of labial consonants and oo and ou before velars (Crena de Jongh 1959: 48–53): bedrooft ‘sad’, hoven ‘to have to’, toven ‘to stay’, ro(o)pen ‘to call’, bloom ‘flower’; genooch, ghenouch ‘enough’, koocken ‘cakes’, bouck ‘book’, vroug ‘early’, etc. These spellings are confirmed by documents from the Delft archives. Crena de Jongh regards <oo> as the regular variant before labials and <ou> as original before velars. Traces of /o:/ are found throughout the earlier literature, too. In the charter corpus of CRM14, I found thirteen <oo>-spellings in Holland and Zealand. 161 A relic form which survived into the modern standard language is the adjective loom ‘sluggish, languid’ < WGm. *lōma/i-. It surfaces as MDu. loeme ‘hole in the ice’ (Ghent, 1336–49; Kiliaan, 1599), loemen ‘to destroy’ (Brabant, 1390–1410), adv. ghelome ‘abundantly’ (Jan Praet, Fla., 1401–50), and after 1600 only loom ‘sluggish, languid’.

For our purposes, the main question is whether the conditioned split of *ō can go back to the Old Dutch period, and whether it arose at the time of the putative shift from Proto-Frisian to Old Franconian. Unfortunately, contemporary sources from Old Dutch do not provide enough information. In modern dialects,

161. In behoof ‘behest’ (Leiden, 1372), Roopen sone ‘Roop’s son’ (Middelburg, 1378), Haghebrooc (toponym in -broek ‘brook’ near Wassenaar, The Hague, 1400), toot ‘to’ (Delft, 1356), coostrate ‘Cow Street’ (Gouda, 1324), PN Hoon (Haarlem, 1372; if hoon means ‘hen’), woonsdagh-s ‘Wednesday’ (Gouda, 1353), voerghenoomde ‘aforementioned’ (The Hague, 1400), vorreghenoomt (Aardenburg, 1396), vornoomt (Heinkenszand, 1352), scoomakers ‘shoemaker’ (Haarlem, 1390), eyghendoom ‘property’ (Alkmaar, 1348), Jan Doomsdach ‘Doomsday’ (Middelburg, 1396).
a parallel split development of long back vowels can be observed in Flanders, which points to a probable system-internal cause of the conditioned split. This parallel split concerns the Flemish reflexes of West Germanic long *ẽ and lengthened *a in open syllable. Both vowels appear to have merged in Late Old Flemish /a:/, but the modern reflexes depend on the place of articulation of the following consonant (Taeldeman 1979: 61–62). Again, before dentals we find a closed long vowel or a diphthong, whereas labial and velar consonants do not cause the same shift. For instance, we have /zo.ət/ ‘seed’ vs. /a:k/ ‘hook’ in West Flemish, /zu.ət/ vs. /uk/ in southeastern Flanders. For WGm. *au, a similar distinction between /o.a/ before dentals and /o.ə/ before other consonants is found in western Flanders (Willeyns 1971, Taeldeman 1979: 71). Thus, the Flemish reflexes of ODu. *ā, *ɔ̄ (from *au) and *ō allow for the generalization that long back vowels were more closed before dentals than before labials and velars (Taeldeman 1992: 441; also the next section). By contrast, the latter position was more prone to preserve mid monophthongs or to cause the rising diphthong ou (Taeldeman 1992: 440–2).

There is no apparent link with putative language contact of the Merovingian or Carolingian periods. Modern West Frisian shows a similar conditioned split of OFri. *ō, which becomes /ua/ in closed syllables before dentals but was monophthongized to /u:/, and sometimes shortened to /u/, before labials and velars (Siebs 1901: 1415, Hoekstra 2001: 726; before p, t, k and m, the vowel is mostly shortened to o): goes [gu.əs] ‘goose’, hoed [hu.ət] ‘hat’, foet [fu.ət] ‘foot’ but boek [bu(:)k] ‘book’, droech [dru(:)x] ‘carried’, groef [gru:f] ‘dug’, toevje [tu:vje] ‘to stay’. However, this split does not go back to Old Frisian but represents a secondary development on the basis of a general Late Old West Frisian diphthongization of long mid vowels. The late date of the split is borne out, among other things, by the absence of a conditioned split in the dialects of Schiermonnikoog – which have /ya/ in fyat ‘foot’, bryok ‘trousers’, hyop ‘hoop’ (Spenter 1968: 223–33) – and of the town of Hindeloopen. Versloot (per email, 18 November 2013) therefore dates the conditioned split in Frisian to the sixteenth or early seventeenth century. In his view, it might well be another instance of Westerlauwers Frisian adopting a Hollandish dialect feature, in the same way as was proposed by Versloot (2012, especially p. 112) for the raising of OFri. ā to MoWF ea and for several other phonological and morphological features.

17.2.3 Shortening to o

Long *ō has a short reflex /ɔ/ in a number of cases, in particular before m, voiceless obstruents and consonant clusters.
Before \( m \)

Van der Meer (1927: 2) holds that \( m > mm \) occurs especially after rounded vowels. Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 29) simply state that vowels were often shortened, at least in some Dutch dialects, before \( m \). Van Bree (2016: 369) considers “de relatieve sterkte van deze nasaal” [“the relative strength of this nasal”] to be a possible factor, and Schrijver (1999: 31–2) claims that MDu. \( m \) “counts as a geminate”. Typologically, such a rule has parallels elsewhere. For instance, in northern Italo-Romance (i.e., the dialects of the northern half of Italy plus Swiss Ticino), the general lengthening of Classical Latin short vowels in open syllables has not applied to vowels before \( m \), which suggests that \( m \) counted as \( mm \) (Loporcaro 2014: 197–9). The short reflex of Classical Latin long vowels before \( m \) in southern Italo-Romance (e.g., Neapolitan *fummo* ‘smoke’) suggests the same (Rohlfs 1966–69 I: 310–1). In his 1999 paper, Schrijver argues that British Celtic substrate may have induced lengthening of \( m \) (because \( p \), \( t \), \( k \) and \( m \) counted as geminates in Early British Celtic), but it remains striking that most cited examples from Dutch concern the vowel *ō*.

The sequence *-ōm- occurs in seven Middle and Modern Dutch stems and their derivatives: MDu. *bloeme* ‘flower’, *doem* ‘doom’ (also in the suffix *dom*), *loeme* ‘hole in the ice’, *loemen* ‘to destroy’ (MoDu. *loom* ‘sluggish’), *noemen* ‘to name’, *roem* ‘fame’, *sloemen* ‘to slumber; to binge’, and *wloemich* ‘turbulent’. The last two stems are rarely attested and yield no evidence for shortening. The stem *loem-/loom-* is rare in Middle Dutch, but in modern dialects *loom* does appear with shortening (according to *WNT*). *Lom* is found in Zaanstreek (Boekenoogen 2004) and in a few earlier literary attestations, e.g. in Sluyter (1688) from Amsterdam. The noun *loeme* has a variant *lomme* in West Flemish (de Bo 1892: 564–5). The word is not attested well enough to draw further conclusions.

This leaves the four remaining stems: *bloem*, *doem*, *noem- and *roem*. Already in the thirteenth century, *-ōm* appears as <omm> in a number of lexemes, which implies that the vowel must be read as short (Mooijaart 1992: 139–41). A clear case is the suffix *-dom*, which has shortened tokens in the DAT.SG. *vriehindomme* (Bruges, 1287), *eghindome* ‘property’ (Bruges, 1288), *eyghindomme* (Middelburg, 1294), *heighindomme* (Assenede, 1298), *scoutedomme* ‘sheriffhood’ (Houtave, WFla., 1299), *scependomme* ‘aldermanhood’ (Bruges, 1300), *wiisdomme* ‘wisdom’ (Sinaai, 1299), and *wisdomme* (Duffel, 1300). Of course, the modern suffix *-dom* is the reduced variant of a second compound member *dōma-* in Old Germanic; hence, just as other heavy suffixes show reductions (e.g. the plural *-heden* of the sg. *-heid*), shortening to *dom(me)* may have been favoured by the unstressed position of the syllable.

Another instance is the verb *noemen* ‘to name, call’, where *vornommens* (Mechelen, 1297; from *vorenōmedens*) ‘aforementioned’ has a short vowel. A number of other western Dutch attestations of *vor(e)nom(e)d* as <vornomd(-)> suggest a short vowel alternating with preserved length in *vornomed-; but we cannot be certain.
More evidence can be found in subsequent centuries. In the Bruges texts from between 1400 and 1600, Willeyns (1971: 99–101, 113) finds a shortened vowel in *blomme(n) ‘flower(s)’, *ghenompt ‘named’, *voornom(p)t ‘aforementioned’, (be) *rommen ‘to fame’, *verdomde, *verdomt ‘damned’, and *verdommenesse ‘damnation’.

In Late Middle Dutch, there is also shortening in *rom ‘fame’ (StDu. *roem) in Flemish (Jan Praet, Jehan Yperman) and Hollandish texts (*rom rhyming with he-lichdom in Brendan’s Voyage), *blomme ‘flower’ (Flemish; for Oudenaerde, see Hoebeke 1968: 218), *berommen ‘to fame’, *verdomde, *verdomt ‘damned’, and *verdommenesse ‘damnation’.

The map *bloem (FAND II/III, Map 98) shows short /ɔ/ reflecting MDu. *blomme in the modern dialects of northern West Flanders, Zeeland, western North Brabant and coastal Hollandish. Yet southern West Flanders, French Flanders, and most of North Holland have short /u/ as expected for <oe>.

No such wide-spread shortening can be observed in *duim ‘thumb’, MDu. *dume (FAND II/III, Map 73), not even in dialects in which *ū is reflected by a back vowel. The element domme- in *dommekracht ‘jack-screw’, dialectally also *duimkracht (in Kampen *doenkracht), is generally regarded as a shortened by-form of *duim ‘thumb’ < *þūman-. The instrument *dommekracht is first attested in a text from 1652–62. *Dom also occurs as a variant of *duym ‘thumb’ in Kiliaan’s dictionary (1599), who calls dom “Sicambrian”. Yet whether dom is due to a Dutch shortening of *ū seems uncertain, since the Proto-Germanic word for ‘thumb’ had two vowel variants, one in *ū and one in *u. Kroonen (2013: 550) reconstructs the noun as *þūman-, with *þūman- being the West Germanic variant and *þuman- the North Germanic one. Compare, with a short root vowel, Icel. *þumi m. ‘thumb’, Norw. *tomme m. ‘inch’, ODan. *thumæ m. ‘thumb, inch’ < *þuman- m., OSwe. *þum m. ‘thumb’, Norw. *tomme m. ‘inch’, OE *þum ‘inch’ < *þu-ma-; furthermore ON, Ic. *þumall, Far. *tummil, Nw., Da. *tommel ‘thumb (of a glove)’ < *þumala-; and, with a long vowel, OE *þūma, OFri. *þūma, MLG dūm(e), MDu. dume, OHG *dūmo ‘thumb’ < *þūman-. Early MoDu. dom ‘thumb’ and the dialectal word for ‘nave, hub’ (see below) provide evidence that *þuma- existed in West Germanic, too. If these words go back to a PIE root *teum- (thus Kroonen), the form *þūm- represents an innovation of West Germanic, which may be explained as a case of secondary ablaut (see Kroonen 2011: 287–9). The explanation that dom- in *dommekracht goes back to a form with short *u was already preferred by Franck & van Wijk 1912. At the very least, the existence of PGM. *þum- means that Kiliaan’s dom and the compound *dommekracht cannot be used as evidence for an inner-Dutch shortening of *dūm- to *dum-.

Moreover, one of the heteronyms for ‘nave, hub of a wheel’ in modern Dutch dialects (see TNZN, Map 3.6) is the lexeme dom, also *domp. Its various reflexes
dominate the semasiological map of ‘nave’ for most of central Dutch, including South Holland, western Utrecht and southwestern Gelderland, all of North Brabant, Antwerp, South Brabant and most of Belgian Limburg. The variants doem (with regular South Brabantish short /u/ before nasals) in Antwerp and South Brabant and domme on Tholen (an area which did not apocopate -e) suggest an Early Middle Dutch form *domme, 162 which is unattested as such. We can be certain that *domme ‘nave’ represents a metaphorical development of ‘thumb’, the finger which can be regarded as the ‘pivot’ or ‘hinge point’ of the hand. 163 Note that the same dialects that have dom(me) ‘hub’ generally preserve ‘thumb’ with (the regular reflex of) long *ū, which further disqualifies the explanation of domme-kracht from an inner-Dutch shortening of *þuman-. Finally, in order to yield short /ɔ/ in domme-, *þūm- would have been shortened before *ū was fronted to /y:/, that is, well before 1200. In that case, the uniform character of the shortening in all Central Dutch dialects would make it different from all the shortenings of *ô before m. All told, we must conclude that domme ‘thumb; hub’ did not result from vowel shortening before m but continues West Germanic vowel variation in the etymon ‘thumb’.

A likely instance of shortening before m is the Flemish verb drommen ‘to throng’ from MDu. dromen, the denominative to droom ‘joy, crowd’ < *drauma-. Middle Dutch mostly has dromen ‘to throng, insist, chase’, but also drommen, with a derivative drummere ‘pillar’ in Ghent. Early MoDu. dromen with a long vowel occurs next to drommen (in Flemish, according to Kiliaan) and drummen, mainly in Flemish and Hollandish sources. De Bo gives the verb as drummen for West Flemish, WZD has drummen for Walcheren and Zeeuws Flanders, and drommen elsewhere. Most likely, drommen resulted from shortening of MDu. /o:/ before m, with subsequent fronting in Flanders to drummen. MDu. dromen has been derived from *þrumi- ‘crowd’ (see below), but it is more attractive to connect it with OS drôm ‘mirth, noise’, OE drēam ‘joy, jubilation’, of which the Middle Dutch cognate droom ‘crowd’ is a hapax. This noun points to WGm. *drauma-. It may go back to earlier *draug-ma- ‘host, group’ to the verb *dreugan- ‘to join a band, do a duty’ (Kroonen 2013: 102, Seebold 1970: 167) whence also OE ga-drēag ‘host’ (*ga-drauga-) and PGM. *druxt- ‘host, retinue’. Whether MDu. dromen continues *u or *au could be decided by modern dialect variants, but the word is not very reliably described. For West Flemish, de

162. The required WGm. preform of *domme is *þuman-, which is slightly different from *þuman- as attested in North Germanic. In line with Kroonen’s explanation (2011) for vocalic ablaut ū vs. u in similar pairs of words, it would not be difficult to imagine that *þuman- : *þuman- was remade into *þūman- : *þumman-, with the frequent alternation between *VVC and *VCC.

163. Inner-Dutch support for this metaphor comes from the noun duim itself, which features in the Middle Dutch and Early Modern Dutch expression iet(s) draait op (minen, dinen, etc.) duim ‘(I, you, etc.) have a say about something, (I, you, etc.) have in (my, your, etc.) power’. Compare also one of the technical meanings of modern duim, viz. ‘hinge, hook of a door’ (WNT s.v. duim).
Bo gives *drum, drom, druim, droom, dreum* for a ‘tight crowd’, of which the variants *druim* and *dreum* are more compatible with *drauma*. In many Dutch dialects, a short vowel is found in *kommen ‘to come’* as against StDu. *komen*. In Early Middle Dutch, written evidence for *commen* is restricted to East Flanders, see Berteloot 1984a, Map 108. Hoebek (1968: 218) notes that Oudenaerde has *comen* until 1338, but then gradually shifts to *commen* which later becomes the only variant of the verb. For Modern Dutch, FAND II/III: 76 comments that the long vowel of StDu. *komen* is not supported by a lot of dialects, being restricted to South Holland, southwestern Utrecht, parts of Brabant, and large tracts of Limburg. In Flanders, Zeeland, coastal South Holland, North Holland and northeastern Dutch, we find a short vowel. As many have seen, *kommen* may have analogically got its short *o* from other forms of the paradigm, such as *jij, hij komt ‘you come, he comes’* and *komt ‘come’!*

In *zomer ‘summer’* (*‘sumar*), we find no general tendency for vowel shortening, but some modern dialects do have a short vowel, especially in eastern North Brabant and in the northeast. In these regions, the shortening (or: the absence of lengthening) was clearly caused by the cluster *Cr*, as is the case, for instance, in *boter ‘butter’* and in comparatives in *-er*; see FAND II/III: 112.

The position before *Cr* may also explain the frequent shortening in StDu. *jammer ‘pity, shame’* from ODu. *jāmar* (OHG *jāmar, OE *geōmor ‘sad’*). The word is found as *iammer* in Flanders and South Brabant in the thirteenth century, and West Flemish still has or had *jamer* beside *jammer*. In Limburg, *jaomer/ jɔ:mər/* continues a long vowel. The intrusive *b* of MDu. *jamber* (e.g. *iamber*, EFla. 1290) must have arisen in the cluster *mr*, that is, in inflected forms such as *jamres* or in the verb *jamaren > *jamren*. The same position before *mr* would of course also have been conducive to shortening of the long vowel. Modern High German has introduced the same shortening in *Jammer*. Note that shortening before *mC* is more common in Modern High German than in Standard Dutch: *Himmel – Du. hemel, Sommer – Du. zomer, Hammer – Du. hamer, etc.*

---

164. The shortening in *‘eo-mēr ‘ever-more’* > ODu. *iomer* > Early MDu. *immer*, *ommer* (eastern dialects), *emmer* (western dialects) > MoDu. *immer ‘always’, immers ‘for’, can be due to several causes. Firstly, the second member is sometimes still spelled in full as *meer*, and can occur with main stress until early modern times; the reduction of the first member may then be due to lack of stress. In support of this, note that reduction of the stressed vowel in the indefinite compounds of *‘eo-‘ occurs until early modern times. In *iemand ‘someone’, the data of VMNW show a clear correlation between retained *ie-‘ plus the reduction of the second member to *men*, on the one hand, versus the reduction of *ie-‘ to *e-‘ or *i-‘ plus unreduced *man*, on the other. Secondly, variants such as *ember* suggest the rise of *emr-‘ (e.g. in pleonastic Early MDu. *emmermee ‘ever more’*), a cluster which would have stimulated vowel shortening before it. Thirdly, the negative *nimmer, nemmer ‘never’ < *ni-eo-mīre* may also have influenced the positive.
Before obstruents

Before voiceless obstruents and consonant clusters, the more recent shortenings must be separated from the Old Dutch instances of the type kocht ‘bought’, bracht ‘brought’, etc. The latter type usually encompasses all or nearly all dialects and seems to result from a strong tendency to remove syllables ending in a long vowel plus one or more obstruents from the language. Instances of this Old Dutch shortening are bracht, dacht ‘thought’, dicht ‘tight’, vocht ‘moist’, gerucht ‘rumour’, verknocht ‘attached’ (literally ‘buttoned’), zocht ‘sought’, kocht, all before /xt/. There are other cases of shortened long vowels which also look old: vet ‘fat’, elf ‘eleven’, stond ‘stood’, vrind ‘friend’, and compounds such as bongerd ‘orchard’ < *boom-gaard, lichaam ‘body’, vent ‘broke’, wingerd ‘vineyard’, wimper ‘eyelash’, etc.

Shortening before consonant clusters such as st and cht is difficult to assess in Middle Dutch because short and long vowels are not consistently distinguished in spelling in this position. Still, shortening of the kind moeste > moste ‘had to’ can be compared with that in *sōhte > zocht ‘sought’ and with that of long vowels in compounds in its spread and its age. The form most- ‘had to’ as opposed to usual moest- is in the thirteenth century characteristic of West Brabant, both in literary texts (Lige Diatessaron) and in charters (in particular, from Brussels), and in view of this precise geographic restriction, most- may well represent a short vowel /ost-/. Similarly, 3SG.PR.SB. motte and 2PL.PR.IND. motti, with a probable short vowel /ot/, are only found in the Life of St. Lutgart, ms. K, from West Brabant. In the fourteenth century, most- appears in charters from Utrecht (1302) and Egmond (1303) (CRM14). Early MDu. wo(e)stine ‘wilderniss’ is frequently found as wostine in Flanders, and in particular in van Maerlant’s Der Natueren Bloeme, but beside weostine, which also survived into later Flemish. For Early Modern Dutch, Crena de Iongh (1959: 51) finds shortening in the farces by van Santen before st in gekostert ‘cherished’ and most(en) ‘had to’, and WNT adds Flemish wostine (Ghent, 1548), berosten ‘to cover with rust’ (WFla., 1569–78), rostigh ‘rusty’ (Ghent, 1548), and Hollandish verwostigheyden ‘destructivenesses’ (1583).

Boekenoogen (1897: xxx–xxxi) mentions for North Holland the shortened variants grôp (beside groep) ‘gully in a stable’, genog ‘enough’, vrog ‘early’, most ‘had to’, wos ‘washed’ (for *woesch), and, in texts from around 1700, slogh ‘hit’ (for sloeg), voorspot ‘prosperity’ (StDu. voorspoed), welvernoght ‘happy’ (for welvernoegd). For Overflakkee, Landheer (1951: 27) also mentions genocht ‘enough’, motte ‘to have to’.

Conclusions

Shortening before m is only found with some frequency with * ķ, but not with other (back) vowels. This suggests that the cause may not only lie in the (length of the) m (alone), but also depend on the vowel. The resulting [o] in benommen etc. shows that the shortening was active either when the long vowel was still ODu. [o:], or when it
had diphthongized to *uo and already become [oə] – which was then shortened to [o]. For distributional reasons, I would favour a more recent origin of the shortening over a more ancient one. For instance, blomme is not found in southwestern Flanders or North Holland, which suggests that it was not a general form of all coastal dialects in, say, 1200. The occurrence of shortening in the other ōm-forms is even more sporadic. If we assume that shortening took place at the stage when the sequence was phonetically [-oom-], the shortening implies the absorption of the schwa-like second element of the diphthong. In this particular position between two bilabial sounds [o] and [m], the schwa may have been more prone to loss than elsewhere.

The shortening before voiceless stops is in accordance with the general typological tendency of vowels to be shorter before voiceless stops and fricatives than before voiced ones. Within modern Dutch dialects, such shortening is a very frequent but also a very variable phenomenon, cf. FAND II-III: 212–5 on roepen and hoek. By extension, shortened vowels before voiceless -ch (genoch, vrog) can be due to the same phonetic cause.

All of this leaves little room for an explanation from language contact. First of all, note that the distribution of the western Dutch shortenings, as in blomme or moste, is not clearly restricted to the coastal dialects. As observed in the preceding section, Modern West Frisian has shifted OFrI. *ō to /uə/ in closed syllables before dentals but to /u/ before velars and labials, where it was sometimes shortened to /u/ or (before p, t, k, m) to /o/: goes [gu.əs] ‘goose’, hoed [hu.ət] ‘hat’, foet [fu.ət] ‘foot’; boek [bu(:)k] ‘book’, groef [gru:f] ‘dug’; blom [blom] ‘flower’, rom ‘fame’. Again, the shortening before m must be dated fairly late (into the modern period), and may rather be due to Hollandish influence than vice versa. Whereas the wider application of shortening before m and voiceless stops is acknowledged by Schrijver (1999: 32–3), he still regards these shortenings as “untrivial”, and ultimately explains them from a British Celtic substrate in the western Low Countries. In British Celtic, *m and the voiceless stops counted as long consonants, and Schrijver assumes that these values may have been imposed on the Germanic dialects to which the previously Celtophone population shifted.165 Aside from the uncertainty surrounding the shift from Celtic to Germanic, or from Celtic via Romance to Germanic (thus Schrijver 2014: 152–7), it seems to me that this implication is too far-fetched. Vowel shortening in the said positions is in fact trivial.

165. Schrijver (1999: fn. 69) also considers the possibility, suggested to him by Kortlandt, that the British Celtic substrate helped preserve the inherited consonantal length of PGm. *p, *t, *k, which is testified by various consonant changes in the Germanic languages, such as the High German consonant shift.
Chapter 17. WGm. *ea, *eo and *o

17.3 Coastal Dutch eu from *o without mutation factor

Van Loey (1976: 52) adduces three Middle Dutch words from Hollandish texts which spell <ue> for the back vowel which is normally written as <oe>. The rhyme seems to show that <ue> was pronounced as a front vowel [ø:], though van Loey himself harbours some doubts, cautioning that it may have been the optical identity of the written verse-final words which counted for the scribes. In modern dialects, there is widespread evidence for unconditioned fronting of *o in the words ‘Wednesday’ (discussed by Kloeké 1936) and ‘beech’. Verdenius 1943 discusses some additional seventeenth-century forms with eu for usual oe. He concludes that i-mutation formerly reached further westward into traditional Hollandish dialects than can presently be seen. Taking a different stance, Schrijver (2008: 198) adduces some of the evidence discussed below to claim that “part of eastern Zuid-Holland and Utrecht” show lexical relics with unconditioned palatalisation of *o > ø > ø". Here is the relevant evidence:

1. beuk ‘beech’. It is impossible to determine the exact West Germanic predecessor of each of the cognate forms. For instance, OHG buocha may reflect WGm. *bökō- or *bökjōn- (cf. EWAhd II: 437–42). The Dutch dialectal forms show a unique distribution which has been repeatedly discussed in the literature. In very general terms, we find i-mutation in central and eastern dialects: beuk, buuk, etc. In Flanders, Zealand and Holland, Standard Dutch beuk is the expansive form, which is opposed to back-vowel forms such as boek, book, which are on the retreat. Taeldeman (1992: 450–7) offers what seems to me the most comprehensive and most satisfactory discussion so far. He compares the different dialect enquiries from the nineteenth and twentieth century and shows that important changes have recently taken place in the western dialects which are relevant to our investigation. In the oldest data – which in Holland stem from the Kern enquiry of 1879 and in Flanders from the Willems enquiry of 1885 – we find boek in seven Hollandish dialects, among which is Oude Tonge on Goeree, and book in Scheveningen. In the RND from the middle of the twentieth century, the meaning ‘beechwood’ is still given with a back vowel oe for 18 – mainly village – dialects in North and South Holland, once in

---

166. This geographic restriction is not clear to me. For instance, Weensdag is found in Zealand and in western dialects of South Holland.

the province of Utrecht, and four times in Zeeuws Flanders. Boekenoogen (2004: 48) confirms that boek used to be the normal North Hollandish word for ‘beech’. By the time of the GTRP database, in the 1980s, only beuk is found in Holland and Zealand. A similar ousting of boek, book by beuk can be detected in Flanders. In earlier enquiries, such as that of Willems and another one from 1921, most of West Flanders and western East Flanders have a back vowel in ‘beech’ and its compounds. The same is true for the RND, as shown by the map in Taeldeman (1992: 451); see also PLAND s.v. beuk for a complete collection of dialect enquiry data. But in the GTRP database, back vowel forms survive only sporadically in French Flanders, southern West Flanders, and the southwest of East Flanders. Conversely, Taeldeman has found that i-mutated forms of the type buuk, unrounded biek, were originally at home in the eastern part of East Flanders. In Flanders, too, beuk is in the process of ousting the deviant forms.

This distribution is confirmed by older attestations. A back vowel surfaces in bouke /bu:ka/ and boeke (rhyming with bezoek ‘visit’) in Maerlant’s Der Natueren Bloeme (WFla., 1287). The evidence of place-names with ‘beech’ as their first member is ambiguous, such as the East Flemish toponym boukle, boekle (13th c.) ‘Boekel’ < *bōkō-lauxa- and modern names such as Boekhoute (EFla.), Boechout (Antwerp), Bocholt (Limburg), Boekel (North Brabant), Boekelo (Twente), all with back vowel realizations in the modern dialects (Debrabandere et al. 2010: 46, van Berkel & Samplonius 2006: 64–5). Since the eastern dialects show no i-mutation here, the preform probably lacked an i-mutation factor. For Kiliaan (1599), both boecke and beucke were current forms.

I follow Taeldeman in his historical interpretation of the data. Firstly, we may assume regular i-mutation from *bōkjōn- in inland Dutch beuk(e), and the equally regular absence of secondary i-mutation in the original coastal Dutch reflex *bōkə > boeke, booke. Secondly, the form beuk – which has been ousting the back vowel variants from the western dialects since the Late Middle Ages – did not arise through spontaneous fronting of /o:/, but represents the actual i-mutated form of the eastern neighbours of coastal Dutch (Taeldeman 1992: 453). The regular presence of i-mutation of *ō in the Gooi region, e.g., in Huizen and Laren, not far from Amsterdam, shows that beuk was indigenous in the easternmost parts of Holland. The presence of i-mutation in eastern East Flanders has been demonstrated by Taeldeman. Taeldeman also gives a possible extra-linguistic reason for the large-scale adoption of an inland Dutch word for ‘beech’ by the coastal dialects (p. 456). The beech tree was originally at home in the higher areas of the central and eastern Low Countries, but in the west, it only occurred in larger numbers in the dunes. Hence, when beechwood became much more sought after in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, it had to be imported from the woods in i-mutating beuk-areas.
2. *boezem* `bosom’. I was unable to find eu-forms for *boezem* `bosom’ < *bōsma-* in literary texts. *Beusem* `bosom’ does occur in the modern dialect of Hoeksche Waard (HWW 64) in South Holland. Other oe-words in this dialect, however, either retain oe or have a back diphthong ou (i.e. before velars and labials).

3. *broer* `brother’ is found as *breur* and in the compound *kittebreur* `tippler’ with Bredero (at least ten times), as well as with other Hollandish farce authors and poets of the seventeenth century. The word can stand both within and outside of the rhyme. In all cases, *breur* means `male direct relative’, not ‘monk’. The maps of Dutch dialect forms in van Ginneken 1932–33 and TNZN 5.4 show a rounded front vowel in most of central and eastern Dutch with the exception of Limburg: Groningen *bruier*, Utrecht, northern Guelders, Overijssel, Drenthe *breur*, southern Guelders, Brabant *bruur*. The border between this area and the western dialects with *broer* (Holland, Zealand), *broere* (Flanders), roughly follows the same course as the isogloss between *groen* and i-mutated *greun/gruun* from *grōni-. The absence of i-mutation in Limburg (and, more generally, in Germany except Clevens/Guelders) is striking. Van Ginneken ascribes the fronting in the other dialects to the combined influence of the preceding and following r’s, but that would imply that fronting took place after the loss of intervocalic d, generally after 1400, which renders the wide spread and the similarity of the western limit to the general i-mutation isogloss difficult to explain. Hence, we must probably be dealing with i-mutation after all, from an alternating paradigm of which Limburgian generalized the unmutated variant. Whereas there originally was no i-mutation factor in WGm *brōϕar*, i-mutation was analogically introduced in the plural in Middle High German (*brüeder*, Paul, Klein, Solms & Wegera 2007: 189) and in Middle Low German (Lasch 1914: 203). Apparently, the central and eastern Dutch dialects shared in the development of a paradigm with sg. *bruoder*, pl. *brüeder*.

The form *kittebreur* is a pejorative denomination, and it might be suggested that the word *breur* was taken in this form from rural dialects of Gooi or further east, where *breur* was native. Was *breur* so succesful in Amsterdam because of lexical differentiation between ‘male relative’ and ‘monk’? For Delft, where *breur* is found in van Santen’s *Graefs-wandelpraetje* from 1626, Crena de Iongh (1959: 52) assumes that it was not a local dialect form for two reasons: because it may have been used by van Santen to convey an eastern ‘couleur locale’ to the text, and because the grammarian Montanus from Delft (in his *Spreeckonst* from 1635) attributes *breur* to the city of Dordrecht. The latter location would match with the observations of Brouwer (2001: 202–3), i.e. that fronted variants of ‘brother’ survive in surnames in South Holland and adjacent western Dutch dialects. The name *Breur* belongs to the delta of the Waal, Merwede and Meuse (Rotterdam, Hardinxveld-Giessendam, Overflakkee), with the
variants Breure (from Rotterdam to North Beveland) and sporadically Breuren (south of Amsterdam). Jongebreur is especially found in southeastern South Holland (where it is already attested in Nieuwerkerk aan de IJssel for a man born in 1533), Bestebreur in Hoekse Waard and Bestebreurtje in Rotterdam – IJsselmonde. Thus, for Brouwer, Breur is a relic form which confirms that a front-vowel variant of broer used to be current in parts of South Holland.

The question then to be answered is whether breur was imported from Brabant and Guelders, or whether it arose internally from earlier *brō(de)r. In CRM14, texts from Holland and Zealand generally spell ‘brother’ as <bro(e)der> with a probable back vowel and with retained d; Overijssel, Guelders, Brabant and eastern East Flanders mostly have <bru(e)der>, which we can interpret as the fronted reflex on the basis of the modern reflexes. This – and the absence of breur from names in North Holland and northern South Holland – means that breur must have arisen in South Holland and northern Zealand between 1400 and 1600. It seems unlikely, then, that breur reflects an Old Dutch, coastal fronting of *ö – although we can never be absolutely sure.

4. geneugte ‘joy, pleasure’, ongeneucht ‘sadness’. Originally these represent two different nouns, viz. *(un-)*ga-nōg-idō- and *ga-nuxtī- (OHG ganuogida vs. ginuht). An early western form with front vowel appears in a poem by Willem van Hildegaersberch (South Holland, first half of the fifteenth century): Het waer een onghenuecht / lieve gasten te sien onthuecht ‘it would be sad to see dear guests saddened’, where onthuecht belongs from the verb ontheugen, literally ‘to de-joy’. However, the same word ‘saddened’ also occurs as onthoocht in another poem by the same poet, and the oo-vocalism may be historically older in western Dutch. In his poem nr. 111, we find the lines 5–6 Dat maect int leste onghenuecht. / Werck ic salicheit nochte duecht ‘That will eventually bring dissatisfaction. / If I accomplish bliss nor virtue’, where the rhyme with duecht leaves no doubt about the /oː/. But in poem 100 ‘Van ghenoechten’, the word is always spelled with <oe>. With <eu>, ongeneucht(e) is found in the seventeenth century with authors such as Hooft, Vondel, De Brune, Cats, and Roemer Visscher. This renders it at least possible that the eu-forms co-occurred with oe-forms in the speech of van Hildegaersberch, and that he could use either variant depending on his needs. In Modern Dutch, geneugt(e) has become the standard form. Verdenius (1943: 205) holds that the variant genoegte was replaced by the noun genoegen ‘pleasure’, while geneugt(e) was kept in the literary language because it was useful in rhyme.

5. groep ‘group’. I was unable to find the form greup cited by Schrijver (2008: 198). Since groep was borrowed from Italian gruppo or French groupe in the sixteenth or seventeenth century, any dialect having greup in its place would show that the eu is of recent origin. A different word seems to be reflected by the hamlet
Greup in Hoeksche Waard, attested as Group in 1639 and Groep in 1866 (van Berkel & Samplonius 2006: 157). The word may be identical to MDu. groepe which survives as dialectal groep ‘gutter for cow’s dung’ in the area (HWW) and as groepe in Zealand. Thus, it appears that the change oe > eu in greup in Hoeksche Waard was very recent.

6. moei ‘female relative’, mostly ‘maternal aunt’, sometimes ‘niece, mother-in-law’ (< WGm. *mōjō-, cf. MLG mōie, OHG holz-muöia ‘witch’). The three instances from Holland in the thirteenth century have moye, moie. Fronted forms only appear in Holland after 1600, e.g. with Coster (1615, 1619) as meuy, with Bredero (1613) and Cats (1635) as petemeuy ‘godmother’, with van Santen (1620, 1626; see Crena de Iongh 1959: 52) as meuy, meutgen and meutje, with Westerbaen (1653) as the diminutive meute, and also in later texts, such as van Effen (1732) meuytje, Wolff and Deken (1793) meu. The word is not found in Boekenoogen 2004 but appears in Pannekeet 1984 as meut ‘old aunt, old woman, busybody’ for West Friesland, and in HWW 170 as meu ‘aunt, great-aunt’, meuzegger ‘nephew, niece’ (lit.: ‘aunt-sayer’), meut ‘elderly dressed girl, old tart’ for Hoekse Waard.

7. The family name van Meurs, adduced by Schrijver (2008), refers to the city of Moers near Dusseldorf. The surname Meurs, which might indeed be due to palatalization from a patronym Moor-s, as surmised by Schrijver, concentrated in Guelders and West Friesland. Hence, it does not belong to western Dutch.

8. roekeloos ‘reckless’ < *rōkō-laus-, with i-mutation in eastern dialects taken from the verb *rōkjān-, cf. ruecklois in Teuthonista. The word is found with a front vowel as ruekelois in Dirc Potter’s Der Minnen Loep (I, 1123, not in rhyme), which may well be due to the German coloration for which this text is famous. In the seventeenth century, a front vowel is more frequent, though it is still less frequent than roekeloos.

9. roeren ‘to move’ < *xrōzjan (OFri. hrēra, MoHG rühren, ON hrēra). In modern dialects, central and eastern Dutch have i-mutation whereas Flanders, Zealand and Holland show a back vowel (FAND III, Map 108). But in North Holland, reuren is the normal form in traditional dialects (Boekenoogen 2004). In Early Middle Dutch, Flanders and Holland spell the vowel as <o>, <oe> or sporadically <ou>, but never as <ue> or <eu>, which suggests that they had a back vowel all along. Similarly, in the charters from Holland of the fourteenth century, we find only ro(e)ren. In the fifteenth century, rueren starts to appear with some Hollandish authors, such as Dirc van Delf, Dirc Potter, Melis Stoke and Willem van Hildegaersberch. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, several plays published in Haarlem and Amsterdam have rueren, reuren, and Jan van Hout (Leiden, late 16th c.) has (be)rueren. These occurrences suggest that the ue-spellings in the fifteenth century were not only due to German coloration, but represent actual Hollandish forms of the period.
10. toeven ‘to spend time, stay in’ < *tôbjan, normally with a rounded front vowel from the province of Utrecht (along the Vecht) eastwards. It is also found as teuven ‘to wait; stop’ in traditional dialects of North Holland (Bouman 1871, Boekenoogen 2004: 527), with no variant toeven beside it. Teuven also occurs in Hooft’s Warenar, where the eu-sound is confirmed by the rhyme (Verdenius 1943: 202). In Potter’s Der Minnen Loep (in a ms. from 1470–90), we read so tuefdén si ‘thus they halted’.

11. voegen ‘to fit; decide’ < *fôgjan. In Der Minnen Loep, the verb voegen occurs with <oe> and <ue>. The latter variant is often – but not exclusively – found to rhyme with genoegen ‘to please’ and the nouns genoecht(e) ‘pleasure’ and deugd ‘virtue’.\(^{168}\) However, the variant with <oe> is also twice attested in rhyme.\(^{169}\) Although the vacillation between <ue> and <oe> for the vowels /oː/, /uː/ and /øː/ is in itself a current phenomenon in Middle Dutch manuscripts, the preponderance of <ue> for a verb that usually has a back vowel in the west is striking. Furthermore, it is well known that Dirc Potter has introduced a large number of Germanized forms in his text, as part of the so-called “German coloration” of manuscripts written in The Hague in this period of Bavarian overlordship (ca. 1360 to 1430), cf. de Haan 1999: 59–79. Hence, it is conceivable that the variant vuegen mimics High German fügen, and is another instance of the German coloration of Der Minnen Loep.

In the poem Vander losen vrou (Den Haag, ms. KB 75 H 57; mid-15th century), the verb occurs in rhyme on two occasions: 1–2 Waer natuer twe harten vuecht / Te samen mit gherochter doecht, and 13–14 Want reden is int recht ghevuecht / Dats den goeden wael ghenucht. The earliest of the Golden Age authors who used veugen seems to have been Jan van der Noot (ca. 1539–after 1595), from near Antwerp. Hence, veugen may have been his regular Brabantish form. We sometimes find veugen, gevuecht in the seventeenth century, e.g. with Bredero, Vondel, Roemer Visscher. The rhyme confirms the eu-sound (Verdenius 1943: 203).

---

\(^{168}\) Here is a selection of lines in which the <ue>-forms occur: I 175–76 Dan des den enen wael ghenoecht / Daer toe him die ander vuecht; I 691–92 Daer dreven si al hoer ghenoecht, / Als sulken jonghen luden vuecht; I 1399–1400 Der vroukijn sijn op deser tijt vele, / Die him gaerne vueghen tallyn spele; I 1487–88 Want hi ghetrwvede hoir alre duecht./ Lucrecia heefter soe ghevuecht; I 1783–84 Hy was guetlic inder tael, / Alle sijn leven vuechde him wail; I 1897–98 Ende dede sijn dinck alst him ghenoechde. / Calistomus hem naerstelic vuechde; I 1905–06 Op dat haer te bet mocht ghenoghent. / Wint ende weder waren ghevueghen; I 1930–32 Ende dan sal icken boven leyden, / Ende vueghen onse ghenoechte te samen, / Als wy vriendeliste connen ramen; II, 1781–82 Pelops seyde: ‘Laet di ghenueghen; / Ic sal di tavont bi haer vueghen.’

\(^{169}\) I 1883–84 Dat hi him tot di wil voeghen / Ende leven slechs na dijn ghenoeghen; III, 719–20 Waer quaet, mochtement ande[r]s voeghen. / Si sprac: ‘Mirra, laet u ghenoeghen.’
Chapter 17. WGM *ea, *eo and *ø

12. *voeren ‘to lead; treat’ < *førjan. Eastern and Central Dutch forms of *vueren are found as expected in Middle Dutch. Van Loey (1976: 52) adduces from lines 1477–8 of Der Minnen Loep the participle *ghevuert, which rhymes with *ghebuert ‘it was his turn’, pointing to /ø:/. We can be reasonably sure that *ghevuert is another instance of the German coloration in this text. Other Late Middle and Early Modern Dutch attestations with <ue> or <eu> are all from Brabant or Guelders and can therefore not be used. The dialectal origin of the war song which contains the following lines is unknown: *Het was wel stout gheavontuert / Op s’vyants bodem krijch ghevuert ‘It was a rather bold adventure / to give battle on the enemy’s territory’ (ca. 1600).

13. *woensdag ‘Wednesday’. See § 19.2 below for a more detailed discussion of this word. A variant weunsdag is found in traditional dialects of Holland and Zeeland and in East Flanders. Whereas the latter area might have eu from the palatalising effect of j < d, the Zeelandish and Hollandish forms must be due to unconditioned fronting of ò to eu. It is conceivable that the preform *wòndesdag, which underlies many western dialectal forms (cf. Pijnenburg 1980: 152), was shortened to *wodnesdag (cf. with metathesis dn > nd in wondesdach, Bruges 1271), whence with assimilation *wonesdag, and, with western unconditioned fronting and open syllable lengthening of the type zeun, in particular before n, to weunsdag. Later, this would have been superseded by inland Dutch woensdag.

14. *zøet ‘sweet’ is found as seuter ‘sweeter’ in the colloquial speech of the nurse in Coster’s play Isabella from 1619, line 127 (Verdenius 1943: 202), rhyming with kleuter. The expression zeute kynd ‘sweet child’ in the farce De Gewaande Weuwenaar, met het Bedroge Kermis-Kind (1709) is probably rendering Utrecht city dialect and may belong to the i-mutation area. It is to be noted that suet already occurs in some Late Middle Dutch texts from Holland, e.g. in Van de proprieteyten der dingen (Haarlem, 1485), in Dirk Potter’s Bouck der bloemen, in Dirck van Delf’s Tafel van den kersten ghelove (usually suet, not soet), with Willem van Hildegaersberch (once), and in the Tübingen ms. of Ons Heren Passie, which originates from North Holland (o zuete heer). These are all literary texts, and the ue-vowel may be a stylistic means to lend solemnity to the expression. In modern dialects, i-mutated forms of ‘sweet’ occur in all eastern and central dialects up to and including the Gooi area (Huizen, Laren). Thus, the isolated instance in Coster’s Isabella may have been taken from those dialects.

15. Pace WNT s.v. *reuf, North Hollandish reuf ‘oilseed, cole-seed’ (Boekenoogen 1897: xxxi reuf and reufseed ‘turnip seed’) is probably unrelated to northeastern Dutch reuve ‘turnip’ < *rōbjōn- (MoHG Rübe; Kroonen 2013: 415). Reuf represents a rounded variant of local reef, the regular correspondent of MoHG Rebe ‘vine’, MDu. reve ‘shoot, vine’. Rounding of lengthened e in open syllable, particularly in the neighbourhood of labials, is frequent in Hollandish.
Summary

The evidence can be divided along the following lines:

a. With local, recent fronting: beuzem, greup. The reflex /ø:/ shows that we are dealing with fronting of earlier /o:/, not of /u:/, due to the presence of the neighbouring labial consonant (b-, -p) as a condition for the fronting, also in view of meui and teuven, which also have a preceding or following labial consonant. A parallel can be found in the southern part of French Flanders, where *ðo was fronted to /y:/ only before a labial consonant, as in ruupen 'to call', bluume 'flower' (Taeldeman 1979: 68). Of course, in Hoekse Waard, the fronting is not at all regular.

b. Probably with conscious German coloration: ghevuert.

c. Good evidence for /ð > eu/, but only in (selected) literary texts between 1400 and 1700: geneugte, reukeloos, veugen, zeut. With zeut we are clearly dealing with the stylistically motivated importation of an eastern, i-mutated form. For geneugte, reukeloos and veugen, the same can be claimed for at least some of their literary occurrences, so that their seventeenth-century tokens probably also belong here.

d. Good evidence for /ð > eu/ in western dialects and in literary texts: beuk, breur, meui, reuren, teuven, weunsdag. The words beuk, breur, meui, reuren, teuven have i-mutation in (large parts of) inland Dutch (albeit not well attested for meui), whereas woensdag does not.

Obviously, group (d) is the most interesting one for the Old Dutch period. In weunsdag, palatalisation is oldest, and is found from North Holland to southern Flanders. If it is due to unconditioned fronting of a short *o or (in Flanders) due to d > j, it is irrelevant here. In the other five words, the eu-vocalism in coastal Dutch is more recent than the oe which is attested in the case of boek 'beech', broer and roeren. In meui, reuren and teuven, the fronting is restricted to South and North Holland, maybe also northern Zealand. In beuk, the introduction of the eu-form from inland Dutch seems a plausible explanation. For breur, meui, reuren, teuven, this is possible (because inland Dutch has eu-vocalism in these words) but cannot be supported by the attestations, and is also unsatisfactory from a sociolinguistic point of view: why would coastal Dutch have adopted an eastern form for a number of words in *ð, but not for other vowels? Thus, the alternative explanation of an internal tendency within (particularly) Hollandish to front Early Middle Dutch /o:/ to /ø:/ must be admitted. This tendency may be connected with the coastal Dutch tendency (observed above in § 15.3.4, summary 3) to front the product of lengthening of *u in open syllables, yielding western zeumer 'summer', reuk 'smell', etc. Part of the words with inherited *ð would then have joined in this tendency,
especially in the neighbourhood of rounding consonants \( (b, m, v, \text{ in Dutch also } r) \), which can be regarded as an additional dissimilatory factor.

17.4 North Hollandish \( ja, \ aa \) from \( *eu \)

In Old Frisian, PGM. \( *eu \) developed into \( iā \) unless an \( i- \)-mutation factor followed, in which case we find OFri. \( ā \) (Siebs 1901: 1234, Bremmer 2009: 29). The second element of the diphthong \( iā \) merged with OFri. \( ā \) which had arisen from other sources, such as WGM. \( *au \) and \( *ai \). From ca. 1450 (thus Versloot 2012: 109), Westerlauwers Frisian /a:/ started raising to /ɛ:/, which eventually, around 1700, yielded /e:/ written as \( ea \). Examples include MoWF \( tsjeaf \) ‘thief’ (WGM. \( *peuba- \), \( tsjek \) ‘jaw’ (*keukōn-), \( tsjea \) ‘thigh’ (*peuxa-). With the frequent loss of \( j \) after \( l \) and \( m \), we find, for instance, \( fleane \) ‘to fly’ (OFri. \( fluān \) < *fluxan-), \( lea \) ‘limbs’ (< *liā < *litha), \( leaf \) ‘dear’ (OFri. \( liāf \) < PGM. \( *leuba- \)), and \( meane \) ‘to mow’ (OFri. \( miān \)); see Hoekstra 2001: 728. A few North Holland dialect words show traces of this Frisian development of WGM. \( *eu \) to \( iā \) and \( ā \), though they lack the subsequent raising to /ɛ:/ or /e:/ . They confirm that the raising of /a:/ had not yet started in westernmost Old Frisian when North Holland was defrisianized in the thirteenth century.

1. \( jaar \) ‘udder’. As explained in detail in § 9.4 nr. 9, MoWF \( jaar \) ‘udder’ goes back to Old Frisian \( *jāder \) from PGM. \( *eudr- \). The form \( jaar \) is also found in North Holland and it clearly represents a loanword from the Frisian substratum. There are also some sporadic attestations of a variant \( jadder \) in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The short vowel and retained \( d \) in \( jadder \) can be explained from shortening of the long vowel before \( dr \).

2. \( tjad \) ‘quick, lively’. As an adjective, \( tjat \) is first attested in a text from 1698, but the derived adverb \( tjats \) ‘playful, fiery’ occurs several times in the works of Bredero and Hooft in the early seventeenth century. Heeroma (1948: 12) regards \( tjad \) as an old Ingvaeonic word which he connects with Gothic \( þuþs \) ‘good’ (< PGM. \( *þeuda- \)). Since initial \( þ- \) would have become \( t- \) in Frisian (compare coastal Dutch \( tille \), \( til \) ‘little wooden bridge; dovecot’, loanword from OFri. \( *tilla < PGM. *þiljōn- \)), \( *tiād \) would have been the regular Old Frisian outcome of \( *þeud- \). The features \( t- \) and \( ja \) and the geographic restriction to North Holland render an Old Frisian origin of \( tjad \) inescapable (Bremmer 2012: 141).

3. Toponyms in \( Tja- \). Gysseling (1962: 21) mentions the North Hollandish place-names \( Tjaddinkrijtje \) (in Oude-Niedorp) and \( Tjaarlingermeer \) (in Warmenhuizen) as possible derivatives on the basis of an Old Frisian personal name \( *Tūāde \) from WGM. \( *peudan- \). He is more hesitant about \( Tjallewal \) (Schagen) because the etymology is less clear.
4. *vlaar* ‘elder(berry)’. The plant is called *vlier* /vli.r/ in Standard Dutch and *flear* /flɔːr/ in Modern Westerlauwers Frisian. These forms developed from WGem. *fleoþra-*, which only has descendants in Low German (the earliest being the Old Saxon toponym *Fliadarlōh*), Dutch (ODu. *Fliether-, Flither-* in toponyms), and Frisian. For Old Dutch, we must assume paradigmatic alternation between the Nom.Acc. *flioder* and the oblique cases such as the Gen.Sg. *fliodres*. In the former variant, intervocalic *d* was often syncopated in modern dialects. The variant *fliodr-*, on the contrary, preserved the *d*, and the stressed vowel was often shortened before the cluster. These changes explain much of the dialectal variation which is described in van Sterkenburg (1975: 203) and PLAND s.v. ‘gewone vlier’. Dialectal *vlier* and *vleer* continue *flioder*, whereas *vledder* reflects the outcome of the oblique case forms such as genitive *fliodres*. Flemish *vliender* has introduced *n* and can go back to either of the Old Dutch forms.171 The expected but unattested Old Frisian descendant would have been *flia-thar*. Via *fljāthar* and *flāthar* (with loss of *j* after *l*), this would yield Late Old Westerlauwers Frisian *flār*. Such a preform would directly explain the attested modern forms, MoWF *flear*, dialectal [flɔːr] in Hindeloopen, [flö.ɔr] in Wouden and Gaasterland.

The dialectal forms in North Holland correspond closely to the Frisian ones. The noun itself is *vlaar* or *vlaarboom* in modern dialects of Zaanstreek, Waterland and West Friesland, with an older variant *vlaarde*, *vlaardeboom*; cf. Boekenoogen 2004: 569. As regards family names derived from ‘elderberry’ attested throughout the Dutch linguistic area, *Vlaar* is the typical variant of West Friesland (first attested as *Vlaar* in 1647), compare also *Vlaarkamp* in Castricum (NHol.). These names confirm the dialectal appellative *vlaar(de)*. It follows that ‘elderberry’ was borrowed into North Hollandish at the stage Nom.Acc. *flāder*, Gen. *flādres*. Syncope of word-internal *d* yielded the variant *vlaar*, whereas the metathesis *dr > rd* gave *vlaarde*.

5. *vlaremuis*, *vlaarademuis* ‘bat’. Standard Dutch has *vleermuis*, MDu. *fledermūs* (cf. German *Fledermaus*), from *fleþar- ‘wing’ and *mūs ‘mouse’. The North Hollandish word is first attested in 1711 as *vlaremuyksen* (pl.); its aa-vocalism cannot be explained on the basis of the Franconian *ee*-forms. Again, a Frisian origin seems likely. Modern Westerlauwers Frisian has *flear(e)mūs*, nineteenth century *fjermuws*, and among modern dialects we find Hindeloopen

---

170. For a more extensive analysis of the data, I refer to de Vaan (2013a), of which the present subsection is a summary.

171. See De Grauwe (2005: 58–61) for the epenthetic *n*. 
[flɔˌɔrmʊs], Schiermonnikoog [flıˌɔrmʊs], Terschelling [flıˌɔrmʊs]. Whereas flear- can go back to *fleþar- ‘wing’ (cf. Miedema 1970), the Hindeloopen form rather points to OFri. *ā or to lengthening of short *a. Possibly, *fleþarmūs was replaced in Old Frisian by *flaþarmūs on the model of the verb ‘to flutter’, which is attested in North Frisian as fladre, flare. A preform *flaþarmūs, borrowed into North Hollandish, would directly explain attested vlaardemuis and vlaarmuis.
WGm. *ǣ

WGm. *ǣ yields *aa /a:/ in standard Dutch, as in *schaap ‘sheep’, *jaar ‘year’, *raad ‘council’, *laten ‘to let’. Some words in coastal Dutch show a high vowel reflex *ee or *ie. Several scholars have suspected that such words were influenced by or borrowed from Proto-Frisian. WGm. *ǣ usually yields *ee /e:/ in Old Frisian, whence *ie /iə/ in Modern Westerlauwers Frisian: *skiep ‘sheep’, *jier ‘year’, *ried ‘council’. Before we can discuss the alleged evidence for this development in western Dutch, there are some dialectal complications to review.

Zealand north of the Westerschelde, southern South Holland, West Friesland, and other rural dialects of Holland, generally have a front vowel /ɛ:/ or /æ:/ as a reflex of both WGm. *ǣ (Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: §80, Goossens 1981: 25–7, FAND III) and of the product of open syllable lengthening of short *a. Both of these West Germanic phonemes have usually merged into one vowel in modern western Dutch, but in at least part of central and eastern Dutch, long *ǣ and lengthened *a yield two different phonemes (Goossens 1981: 59–60). The modern dialect situation can easily be retrieved from the dialect atlases, but it is uncertain how the present linguistic landscape developed in earlier centuries.

In North Holland, most of the *a:/’s which existed in (Late) Middle Dutch were susceptible to raising, see the examples below. Still, there are some striking exceptions to this raising. The chronology of the raising and merger in North Holland is also uncertain. Two possibilities present themselves: (1) *a was first lengthened in open syllable before it was raised to the same height as original *ǣ; (2) inherited *ǣ was first lowered to /a:/ (as in Central Dutch dialects) before merging with lengthened *ā and then raising to /æ:/. These two scenario’s are presented in Table 43 by models A and B:

Table 43. Two models for the coastal Dutch raising of *aa to *ee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model A</th>
<th>Model B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stage 1:</td>
<td>/a/ vs. /æ:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage 2, o.s.l.:</td>
<td>/a:/ vs. /æ:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage 3: raise:</td>
<td>/æ:/ = /æ:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stage 4: raise:</td>
<td>/ɛ:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:</td>
<td>/a/ vs. /æ:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, lower:</td>
<td>/a/ vs. /a:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, o.s.l.:</td>
<td>/a:/ = /a:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4, raise:</td>
<td>/æ:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, raise:</td>
<td>/ɛ:/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For Zealand, written evidence for an early, medieval raising of /a:/ to /æ:/ and higher is lacking. The modern, written standard language rarely allows <ee>-spellings for words with inherited *ǣ.

Van Loon (2014: 95–6) assumes that the geographic difference between Middle Dutch brochte (in coastal Dutch) and brachte (in central and eastern dialects) ‘brought’ was caused by the underlying vowel system of coastal Dutch. This system would have contained the long vowels /æ:/ and /o:/, but not /a:/ (see § 12.2.5). If correct, van Loon’s view would imply that we have independent structural evidence for a fronted realization of WGm. *ǣ in southwestern dialects of Early Old Dutch. Yet, as I have argued in § 12.2.5, it seems unlikely that Old Franconian /a:/ was adopted as /o:/ in coastal Dutch only before cht, whereas all other /a:/’s were adopted with /a:/ I therefore assume that the vowel of *brãxtē ‘brought’ was still nasalized when it was adopted by the coastal dialects as a rounded vowel in *brõxtē. As a result, the sequence WGm. *-anxC- cannot inform us about the quality of WGm. *ǣ in western dialects.

It remains to be seen whether the fronted reflexes ee and ie in coastal dialects directly go back to the realization *æ:/ which we reconstruct for the Early Old Dutch long vowel system. Some scholars have argued that the similarity in long front vowel raising between Old and Modern Frisian, on the one hand, and modern coastal Dutch, on the other, was accidental or reflects systemic pressures independently at work in both areas (Heeroma 1935). The results achieved by Versloot 2012 have now effectively made this view obsolete. He shows that the raising of WGm. *ǣ in Holland goes together with the raising of lengthened reflexes of WGm. short *a, and it never progresses beyond the mid-vowel stage /e:/ Also, there are words which show Hollandish /e:/ for StDu. /a/, but which have a different vowel than /e:/ in Old Frisian (viz. /i:/, /o:/, /a:/, short /e/). In addition, some Old Frisian words can be ruled out as sources of coastal Dutch words altogether because of their different consonantism. Examples of such vocalic or consonantal differences given by Versloot (2012: 106) include Dutch kaas, North Hollandish kees vs. OFri. *tsēze ‘cheese’; Du. maan, NHol. maen, meen vs. OFri. mōna ‘moon’; Du. gaan, NHol. geen vs. OFri. gān ‘to go’; Du. baard, NHol. beerd vs. OFri. berd ‘beard’. Such words show that Old Frisian words were not the input for the ee-reflexes found in (North) Holland dialects.

Instead, Versloot assumes two separate – though maybe not independent – processes of raising, one in Holland and the other in Fryslân. He claims that an identical raising of the phoneme /a:/ via /ɛ:/ to /e:/ and /ɪ:/ (in Frisian, to /i.ə/) can be observed in the same period in Westerlauwers Frisian and in the dialects of North Holland. He dates the initial and final stages roughly to 1450 and 1700. He also suggests that North Holland was the area which initiated the raising (p. 112), whence it was passed on to Frisian. The process of raising may have started well before the year 1450. Schere ‘host’ (MoDu. schar, scheer) is first attested in a North
Hollandish text from 1347. If the word *sthereman in a late thirteenth-century manuscript from Egmond can be emended to *s<hereman and continues *schareman ‘member of the host’ (de Vaan 2012b), the raising may have started already in the thirteenth century.

Once the ee-words are disregarded, the possible evidence for frisianisms is confined to words (also) attested with ie and not restricted to North Holland. The reflex ie implies that these words already had a long mid vowel /e:/ when the vowel resulting from *ǣ and lengthened *a was still a low vowel /a:/ or /æ:/.

The evidence was collected from Schönhfeld & van Loey 1970, §80, de Vaan 2010, and Versloot 2012.

1. *deek and *veek ‘washed-up rubbish, driftwood’ < *þǣka- ‘cover’. A high vowel ie is only attested in part of the North Hollandish material. Boekenoogen (2004: 87) regards diek as the contemporary dialectal word, whereas deek is found in earlier documents and may be used in contemporary speech on the basis of those written sources. Boekenoogen claims that the same division between older ee and modern ie exists for the verb afdeeken ‘to remove the washed-up rubbish from the sides of the dike’. Southern South Holland has *deek in a number of dialects, whereas in Utrecht and Overijssel, we find the expected Central Dutch variants daak, daok (Opprel 1937). An alternative form veek /veːk/ – with exactly the same meaning as *deek – occurs in southern South Holland and in Zeeland (Opprel 1937, WZD 1042). In Flanders, veek is restricted to Zeeuws Flanders (WVD ‘Waterhuishouding’, p. 526).

The word *þǣka- also underlies the Modern West Frisian toponyms De Tike, Tiekelân (Versloot 2001c), East Frisian teek, North Frisian Föhr tiak, Amrum siak, and Sylt teeki ‘washed-up seaweed’. It seems likely that Opprel 1937 and WNT (s.v. veek(e), an entry written in 1952) are correct in assuming that WGm. *þǣka- had a variant *fǣka-, and that both variants are reflected in coastal Dutch. Parallel cases of a *þ-/*f-vacillation within Germanic are ON þili vs. ON -fili ‘board’, MoHG finster vs. MHG dimster ‘dark’ (both etyma with PGM. *þ-), and ON fēl vs. þēl ‘file’ (with *f-). Versloot (2001c: 5–6) concludes that Old Frisian *þ- in Holland had remained voiceless at the time of the language shift, as this would make its interchange with *f- easier to understand. The Hollandish form has the usual Dutch reflex d- from *þ-, and did not share the Frisian development to t-.

2. *lieke ‘leech’ < *lǣkja- (OFri. lētza ‘physician’, OE læce ‘physician; leech’, MoE leech, OS lāki, OHG lāhhi ‘physician; ring-finger’, ODan. læki, Goth. lēkeis ‘physician’). Middle Dutch forms with a raised vowel are lieken beside leken ‘leeches’ (Lancfranck, Amsterdam ms., ca. 1460), lieken (Yperman, Medicina, Flanders, 1351), which occur beside lake ‘leech’ (Boëthius-translation, 1485; SE-Flemish). Kiliaan mentions as a Flemish word lijklaecke, literally ‘body-leech’. In modern dialects, the word only survives in Flanders (see van Sterkenburg 1975: 224–7
with dialect map). The data for ‘leech’ in WVD show that laken, lijk-laken is found all over West Flanders, whereas leek is a form of southeastern East Flanders and of westernmost South Brabant (WBD). The ee of this form looks like a pre-stage of the ie in MDu. lieke. The forms leek and MDu. lieke have been explained as an i-mutated form which entered Flanders from Brabant (thus Heeroma 1942b: 69), where indeed leek is attested in the southwestern corner. In that case, the forms lake, laecke, modern laken, must represent a coastal Dutch form with regular absence of i-mutation of ODu. */a:/.

3. Coastal Dutch mede (meet) ‘mowing field, mead’ < *mǣdwō (OFri. mêde, MoWF miede, OE mǣd) is a derivative of ‘to mow’ (Kroonen 2013: 367). Standard Dutch has made, maat. In Old Dutch (cf. ONW and Quak 2003: 297–8), we find made next to mede in toponyms from South and North Holland but only mede, meeth in Zealand and Flanders. Examples from the latter region include: 1162 Langenmeeth (near Veurne, WFla.), 1130 Avinęmēd (Oudenburg), 1171 Woburgmet (Oudenburg), 1177–87 Comet (near Cadzand); compare also the name of the region Meetjesland in Northeast Flanders. The only Flemish name to show both vowel variants is 1041 Matkerke, 1089 Madkerca, ca. 1175 Metcherche, 1193 Metkerka ‘Meetkerke’ (near Bruges). In the simplex ‘meadow’, the Early Middle Dutch texts similarly show a preponderance of made in Holland, whereas mede, meet are more frequent in Flanders than made, maet. In toponyms (Rentenaar 1972, van Loon 2014: 93), the thirteenth-century attestations of this word as mapped by Mooijaart (1992: 114) show 68% of e(e)-spellings in West Flanders, as against 33% in East Flanders, 20% at the count’s court in Holland, and zero in the remainder of Holland.

The frequent attestation with /e:/ in West Flanders excludes the possibility that meed, mede represents a purely Hollandish raising of earlier /a:/, an option left open by Versloot (2012: 115) because of the absence of variants with <ie> in Holland. We do find <ie> in one toponym, however: in Cadzand in Zeeuws Flanders, the toponym ‘House-mead’ is attested in 1189 as Husmiet, Húsmiet and Husmet (ONW).

4. Middle Dutch mieien ‘to paint’ < *mǣlōjan- (OFri. mēlia, MoWF miel(j)e, OHG mālōn, mālēn ‘to paint’, Olc. mála, denominative to *mēla- ‘spot, mark’; but Gothic meljan ‘to write’) versus Early Modern Dutch malen. Middle Dutch ie-forms occur in Lodewijk van Velthem’s Arturs Doet in the Lancelot Compilation (ms. 1325–30, Flemish with Brabantish influence), viz. pret. mielde (line 2710), ptc. gemielde ‘written, painted’ (line 2637, 2726),172 in the Amsterdam ms. of Hein van Aken’s Die Rose (ca. 1315), viz. gemielde ‘depicted’

(line 999, not in rhyme),\textsuperscript{173} in the Leiden fragment of \textit{Huge van Bordeus} (first half of 15th century, Flemish; line 209),\textsuperscript{174} viz. \textit{gemielt} ‘painted’, and in the prologue of \textit{Spieghel der menscheliker behoudenesse} (ca. 1400–1420, Flemish),\textsuperscript{175} viz. \textit{ghemielt} ‘painted’. A noun \textit{mielre} ‘painter’ occurs in Jacob van Maerlant’s \textit{Spiegel Historiae}. The aa-form \textit{malen} is attested in East Flanders (\textit{Enaamse Codex}, 1290) and its rounded variant \textit{molen} in Limburg (\textit{Glossarium Bernense}, 1240). The absence of \textit{i-mutation} in Limburgian proves that we must reconstruct an Old Dutch present stem in *\textit{-ōn} or *\textit{-ēn} rather than *\textit{-jan}, since the latter would induce \textit{i-mutation} in eastern Dutch. Hence, the suggestion by Heeroma (1942b: 69) that \textit{mielen} may represent a Brabantish form with \textit{i-mutation} must be dismissed. Middle Dutch and Early Modern Dutch literary texts from Brabant and Holland have \textit{ma(e)len}. After 1700, the verb slowly disappears from written usage (cf. \textit{WNT} s.v. \textit{malen} III).

5. Coastal Dutch \textit{triem(e)} ‘crossbar of a chair; shaft of a wheelbarrow’ < WGM. *\textit{trēman-or \textit{brēman}-} (MoWF \textit{triem}, \textit{trym}, \textit{trim} ‘rung of a ladder’). Cognate forms are MDu. \textit{tram} ‘wooden beam’, Modern Limburgian \textit{tram} ‘id.’, West Flemish \textit{traam}, pl. \textit{tramen}, all from WGM. *\textit{tramu-}, and East Flemish \textit{treem}, pl. \textit{tremen}, Limburgian /\textit{tre:m}/ ‘beam’ < *\textit{trami}, the plural of *\textit{tramu-}. For a discussion of the forms and their reconstruction, see de Vaan 2010. The \textit{ie}-forms occur from North Holland down to East Flanders and point to an early frisianism. Initial \textit{t-} of \textit{triem} might reflect the Frisian development of *\textit{p-} but could also be due to analogy with Franconian *\textit{tramu-}.

6. Standard Dutch \textit{wiel}, also \textit{weel} ‘pool (after a dike has collapsed), eddy’ < *\textit{wēla-} (OFri. \textit{wēl}, MoWF \textit{wiel}, OE \textit{wēl}), beside \textit{waal}. An Old Dutch instance may be \textit{Vual}, pl. \textit{Vuala} ‘abyss’ in the Wachtendonck Psalter. The PN \textit{Gerardus de Wildreht} (1187, near Dordrecht, SH) is interpreted by \textit{ONW} as containing a place-name ‘Wieldrecht’, with a first member *\textit{wiel} ‘pool’. This is possible but of course uncertain. Clearer attestations occur after 1200, when we find \textit{wiel} in Holland (Arkel, 1284) and West Flanders (Bruges, 1285; if the surname \textit{vanden wiele} means ‘From the Pool’) and twice \textit{wile} (dat.sg.) in \textit{Oudenaerde} (East Flanders). The acc.sg. \textit{wiele} occurs in the Life of St. Christine (East Brabant, 1276–1300), which is somewhat remarkable because of the eastern provenance of this text. In fact, throughout Late Middle Dutch the word \textit{wiel} is found in texts from Brabant, and Kiliaan (1599) also uses \textit{wiel} as a translation of the “antiquated Hollandish” word \textit{wael} /\textit{wa:l}/. \textit{WNT} (s.v. \textit{waal} I) probably correctly

\textsuperscript{173} http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/aken002ever01_01/aken002ever01_01_0008.php.


\textsuperscript{175} http://www.dbnl.org/tekst/_spi003ldan01_01/_spi003ldan01_01_0001.php
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assumes that *wiel* was originally restricted to coastal Dutch and gradually replaced *waal* in the inland dialects. Judging from the thirteenth-century material, this process had already started in Late Old Dutch. Still, the *aa*-forms were not completely ousted from the coastal area. *Wael, dat.sg. wale, also a nom.sg. wale*, is attested in the thirteenth century in Flanders, Zeeland and South Holland, and it remains frequent throughout Middle Dutch and Early Modern Dutch in all (western) dialects. *Waleput ‘eddy’* retains *aa* in modern West Flemish. De Bo (1892) furthermore cites *wèèle /we:la/ ‘sea gully’*, but seems to regard *wiel* as a non-Flemish, Brabantish word.

The interpretation of the *ee*-forms is not straightforward. *Weel* is the usual form in North Holland from the sixteenth century (Boekenoogen 2004), where it can also mean ‘little bridge across a gap in the dike’. For these dialects, a development of *waal > weel* with the frequent North Hollandish transition of *aa* to *ee* is quite possible. Zeelandish *weeèle, wèële, wieël* ‘pool after a dike collapsed’ (attested in eastern Zeeuws Flanders and Waasland) and West Flemish *wèèle* cannot reflect MDu. *waal(e)*. Thus, the situation is similar to *veek, deek*, with Flanders retaining *ee*-vocalism whereas other dialects have *ie*.

The village of Oosterweel near Antwerp is attested as *Otserwele* (1210 copy middle 14th c.), *Oucerwela* (1225) and in the surname *van outserweele* (Antwerp, 1248–71). Quite possibly, the eight instances of *van den wele* in the same Antwerp Obituary refer to the same village. The word has also survived in surnames derived from toponyms. Early attestations are *Boudens van den Weele = B. van den Wele* (1324, Antwerp); *Gillesse van den Wiele* (1373, Pittem, WFla.); *Heindric vanden Wiele* (1460, Middelburg), cf. Debrabandere 2003: 1321.

The vowels of the surnames by and large confirm the evidence from the appellatives. We find *ie* from Holland to Flanders, but also further inland in North Brabant: *Aandewiel* (Katwijk, South Holland), *Aan de Wiel* (Alblasserwaard), *Verwiel* (central North Brabant), *van de Wiel* (ibidem), *van de Wiele* (East Flanders), *van der Wiel* (Biesbosch, Noordwijk), *van der Wiel(n)* (eastern NBrab., also elsewhere).

The vowel *ee* appears mainly in southern South Holland and in Zealand: *Verweel* (Voorne-Putten), *van der Weele* (Beveland, Schouwen-Duiveland), *van der Weel* (Schouwen-Duivelend), *van Weele* (Beveland), *Overweel* (Goor-Overflakkee), *Westerweel(e)* (Zealand). Finally, *aa* is more prominent in southern South Holland, though it is found elsewhere too: *van der Waal* (passim, but especially in southern South Holland), *Verwaal* (southeastern South Holland). Possibly, part of the name bearers of the last two names were named after the river *Waal*.

7. Western Dutch *Ee* ‘water’ < WGm. *axwô-* has apparently merged with the other frisianisms containing PFri. *é. In inland Dutch, the nom.acc.sg. became *aha* (cf. Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 §207) whence ODu. *à in à-lende ‘island’* (WPs.), MoDu. *Aa* in several river names. The raised reflex is attested
down to West Flanders, cf. Zierikzee (Siricasha 1156 copy ca. 1222, Sirixe 1233, Zierikshe 1250), Hiddeneze ‘Hidden’s Ee’ (1167), and many others. Van Durme (2011: 259–71) offers a collection of fifty medieval toponyms in ee ‘water’ from Zeeuws Flanders and East Flanders. The vowel was raised further to /iː/ and /i(:)/ in North Holland, as in the toponyms Die < d’Ie = MoDu. het IJ, Krommenie (1276 Crommenye, 1292 Crommene, Crommenye, 1317 Crommenie, 1480 Crommenee), Edam (1357 Edam, 1393 Yedamme), and Middelie (1277 Middela, 1342 Middelee, 1393 Middelye). Whereas the shift ee > ie may be part of the general raising in (northern) Holland and may have been contemporary with the raising of aa to ee in North Holland, the input stage ee ‘water’ itself must reflect a frisianism.

The following words turn about to be irrelevant to our question:

8. gier ‘manure’ (North-Hollandish ier) versus Middle Low German gare ‘manuring’ (TNZN Map 1.7). See § 9.4 on this noun and its Proto-Frisian origin. As was established there, Hollandish gier, ier does not go back to Old Frisian *jēra with a long vowel, but to *jerō with a short stressed vowel. This vowel was lengthened in Hollandish before r, yielding ee and then ie.

9. schriel ‘lean’ versus schraal ‘scanty, thin, frugal’ < *skrǣxa/ila-? (thus EWN s.v. schraal; compare MoWF skriel; further to MDu., MLG schrå ‘thin, lean’, Oic. skrā ‘piece of dry skin or parchment, scroll’ < *skrǣxa-). The standard language has adopted both words but with semantic differentiation. In written Dutch, schriel is first attested in 1810 in Francq van Berkhey’s natural history of Holland, and it seems to be a Hollandish word. The late attestation, however, renders the antiquity of the word less certain. For instance, Boekenoogen mentions beside schriel ‘stingy; meagre’ also skriebel, schrieuwel ‘small, thin person’; thus, it cannot be excluded that schriel represents the secondary development of a word that has nothing to do with schraal.

10. The evidence of wetering ‘watercourse’ is inconclusive. From ODu. *wataringō- f., we find reflexes with stressed a and stressed e in Dutch. There are two Old Dutch forms in e, viz. wetteringa in a document from Utrecht of 1155, in which it is said of the inhabitants of Polsbroek (between Utrecht and Gouda) that in their language they call a ‘watercourse’ wetteringa. In another document of 1159, the bishop of Utrecht grants the people of Thurslac (‘Doorslag’, near Beesd between Utrecht and Den Bosch) the right to make an aquae ductum ‘watercourse’, which apud nos ‘among us’ is called weteringe. In Early Middle Dutch, there are four attestations of weteringhe from Haastrecht (1289), not far from Polsbroek in South Holland, and one of 1298 from Utrecht. In the same period, there are 47 instances of wateringe from West Holland, including Dordrecht, from Bergen op Zoom and from West Flanders. In later Dutch,
wetering is firstly an eastern Dutch word, with expected secondary i-mutation. It also survives as a hydraulic term in the west, but more so in South Holland than in North Holland; Boekenoogen (2004) gives several examples with wa- but none with we- for North Holland. For toponyms, compare Wateringen near The Hague versus Rijkwetering northeast of Leiden. Obviously, the a in watering could be restored at any moment on the model of the simplex water. Hence, the absence of wetering does not necessarily imply the absence of the word in the oldest layers of western Dutch. Still, it seems at least possible that the five twelfth-century instances of wet(t)eringe reflect the language of Utrecht, for which we expect i-mutation. The original term in all of coastal Dutch may have been wateringe. Some support comes from the verb wateren ‘to drain (into)’, a verb which may be regarded as the derivational basis for wa/eteringe. It is found with a in Early Middle Dutch texts from West Flanders, Holland and Utrecht, but as weteren in two documents from Sint Michielsgestel (near Den Bosch) and one from Arkel, on the border of Holland and Guelders.

11. mazelen ‘measle(s)’ (OS and OHG masala ‘blood blister’, MoWF hunemiezel ‘swelling on the finger’). This word is regarded as a frisianism in North Hollandish by Versloot (2012: 114). His judgement is based on one attestation of miezele in Pannekeet’s dictionary (1984) of North Hollandish, who says that it is an antiquated form of mazelen. Boekenoogen 2004, however, does not mention miezen ‘measles’. The source word is identified as MoWF miezels ‘sickly condition’ by Versloot. A Frisian origin for NHol. miezele is therefore possible but uncertain. The oldest expressions given by WFT are yn ’e miezel sitte, wêze ‘to be ailing, be sick’, with a singular miezel. EWN reconstructs WGm. *masalō-, but Kroonen (2013: 366) reconstructs PGm. *mēslō- r. ‘growth’ on the strength of the comparison with *mēsōn- ‘spot, scar’. Within Frisian, miezels may belong to a set of words with pan-Frisian lengthening of *a before fricative plus resonant, as in MoWF fiem ‘fathom’ < *fadm- and biezem ‘broom’ < *besm- (Versloot, pers.com.).

Interpretation

For mede, mielen and wiel, we have medieval evidence for the raising to ie in Flanders; for triem, such evidence is absent, though modern dialects make it very likely that triem(e) was present in East Flanders in the Middle Dutch period. For MDu. lieke, leke, SW-Brabantish leek ‘leech’, a Brabantish origin of the i-mutated vowel cannot be excluded. The inherited aa-vowels are not normally raised in Flanders, and the medieval occurrences of these ie-words do not fit in the general development of
the Flemish vowel system. Either they are relic words which escaped the general
development of */æ:/, or they were borrowed from a different variety.

If they are relic words, they must have been raised to /e:/ in the Old Dutch pe-
period, and were further diphthongized to /i.ə/ in large parts of coastal Dutch (triem,
wiel), or at least in Flemish (lieke, mieten, sporadically miede). In view of the general
retention of /æ:/ (in Zealand) or its lowering to /a:/ in the bulk of the lexicon, these
words were then petrified with a high vowel in names (viz. viel and mede) and in
a few other, isolated lexemes (triem, lieke, mieten) without any apparent phonetic
conditioning. Afterwards, *ai was raised to /e:ə/, and further raised to /i.ə/ in late
medieval Hollandish (see §20) and, between ca. 1500 and 1800, under Brabantish
influence, in East Flanders (Taeldeman 1985: 193).

In de Vaan 2010, it was suggested that coastal Dutch words such as mielen and
triem are Frisian words which remained in use when the speakers of coastal dialects
shifted from Proto-Frisian to Franconian. As for the semantics, the assumption of
local borrowing from the substrate language is unproblematic for deek, mede, viel
and Ee, which refer to local toponymy. Lieke is an insect, for which borrowing or
replacement by a similar insect name is a frequent phenomenon. Only mieten ‘to
paint’ and triem ‘beam’ belong to the more general vocabulary, and their borrowing
would be more conspicuous. Note, though, that triem has various local technical
uses, and may have referred to a certain technique (of making chairs, wagons,
houses) that was preserved when the language shifted.

The raising to ie in deek and Ee is confined to North Holland, with Ee showing
early instances, but deek only modern ones. The co-occurrence of deek (next to
daak), weel (next to waal), and mede (next to made) in Zealand and South Holland,
can either continue a Late Old Dutch mid vowel /æ:/ or be due to a more recent
raising of /a:/ to /e:/.
Chapter 19

Unrounding of *ū̄, *ō̄, *äü, and *iu

In a number of words, western dialects show an unrounded reflex of an original back vowel or diphthong which was followed by an i-mutation factor. Compared to the unrounding of *ū̄, which is limited to two well-defined categories (see § 15.2), the coastal Dutch unrounding of long back vowels and diphthongs has a more sporadic character. Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 46–7) regard most of the relevant forms as loanwords from Old Frisian, or, in the case of ‘heel’, as Ingvaenic. Other scholars, such as Schrijver (1999: 19 and 2014), regard i-mutation of long back vowels plus subsequent unrounding as an original characteristic of coastal Dutch, most traces of which were ousted by the later franconization. In this section, I will discuss the possible evidence for unrounding in words which had or could have had *ū̄, *ō̄, *äü, or *iu in Old Franconian.

19.1 Unrounding of *ū̄

A few words have an unrounded reflex of i-mutated *ū̄. In order to correctly judge the evidence, we must take into account the following changes. Firstly, *ū̄ was fronted to *ŷ in Flemish in the Old Dutch period. Secondly, we find an (apparently recent) unrounding of MDu. /y:/ to /i:/ in parts of West Flemish and Zealandish if the vowel was followed by a labial. De Bo (1892: 290) mentions drijvelaar for druivelaar ‘vine’, hief for huig ‘uvula’ (via *huuf), and (h)ieveren for huiveren ‘to shiver’. To this we may add Zealandish ival ‘poverty, discomfort, illness’, ivalig ‘disgusting, weak; nice’, as against West Flemish ival and uvalig (see § 13.1 for the etymology *unfala-). Probably, this unrounding is a hypercorrect reaction to the frequent Flemish and Zealandish labialization of /i:/ to /y:/ between labials, as in puupe ‘pipe’, bluuve ‘to stay, Du. blijven’, vuuf ‘five’, wuwf ‘wife’.

1. The Early Middle Dutch surname duninc also occurs as dininc in Bruges. VMNW mentions Riquard Dininc (1268, 1272), Riquard Dining (1267, 1293), Riquard Dunig (1271) and Riquard Donig (1293), which either refer to the same person or to father and son. Another person is Jan Duningh, the late husband

of Heysa (1280). This surname was derived from the Old Dutch given name Duno. The surname is also found as Dunning (1166, 1205) and, much later, as Duyninck (1626). The latter name confirms the length of original *ū. A preform *dūninga-, if it existed in Old Franconian, would have given secondary i-mutation of the stressed vowel. In that case, dininc might indeed be due to unrounding of /yː/. But it seems very doubtful that the formation was so old as to go back to the franconisation of Flanders, i.e., to the ninth century at the very latest. The name occurs only a few times, and -ing was a productive derivative suffix in surnames. Moreover, VMNW offers an alternative explanation of the name dininc s.v. dieninc, where it is held that Riquard Dininc contains a derivative of the verb dienen ‘to serve’. Since this verb is mostly spelled with <ie> rather than single <i> in Flanders, this second hypothesis is less attractive. In view of the alternation between Riquard Dininc, Dunig and Jan Duningh in Bruges, the explanation from a recent unrounding is to be preferred.

2. MDu. hide ‘fishing port’ < *xūþjō- (OE hȳð ḗ. ‘landing-place, port’, MoE Hythe, Greenhithe in Kent, and other toponyms; Mansion 1933). The noun cannot be a derivative of the verb ‘to hide’ (contra Mansion and Debrabandere et al. 2010: 133) because of the different dental consonants in the two stems (*d in hide but *p in hithe). Of course, at a deeper level both words could be Verner variants of the same root, that is, PGm. *xūþjō- from barytone PIE *kúHt-iH-versus *xādjan from oxytone PIE *kuHt-éje-. But there is no good Proto-Indo-European candidate for the root, and the meaning ‘port’ does not necessarily derive from ‘shelter’. In fact, the Old English word hȳð originally meant a ‘landing-place’ where ships were drawn onto dry land, as opposed to a port where ships could stay in water (Ellmers 1984: 137). It is therefore conceivable that *xūþjō- does not derive from ‘to hide’ but from *xunþjō-, a variant beside OE húdo ’booty’ (*xunþō-) and Gothic *hunþs ’captivity’ (*xunþi-), all to the verb *xinþan ‘to reach for, catch’. In that case, *xunþjō- ‘landing-place’ may originally have meant ‘transfer, place for transshipment’.

Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 32), Heeroma (1952) and others have recognized the element (h)ide in a number of coastal toponyms. On the Flemish coast there are le Hyde (near Dunkirk, 1318), Koksijde (1270 Coxhyde, 1295 Koxide), Raversijde (1295 Wilravinside, 1419 Walravens yde), in Zeeland Coxijde (1252, Zeeuws Flanders), Coude Hide (1227, 1239), Palvoetzide (1351, Schouwen), and in South Holland die Hiide near Zwijsn (1331). The Old Frisian product of unrounding *ē is possibly attested in Terschelling Hee


178. On Koksijde see Lehouck 2010.
(15th century *Heed, 1450 *Hee) if from *hēpe (van Berkel & Samplonius 2006). Whether *Yde, attested in Drente in 1323 and as *Hye, *Hyde in 1560, belongs here too, as Mansion assumes, is unclear to me. If the Low German toponomical suffix *hude belongs here, it goes back to a slightly different formation, viz. without *i-mutation.

3. *hidēn ‘to hide’ < WGM. *xūdjan- (OE *hīdan, MoE hide) occurs twice in Middle Dutch, viz. *gehidēt ‘hidden’ and *te hydēn ‘to hide’. The usual Middle Dutch form is *hūden, *hūyden, Early Modern Dutch *huyen. The verb mainly occurs in sources from Flanders, Holland and the northeast. Unrounded *hydēn ‘to bring into safety’ is attested in an account from Oostende (1403–04; Debrabandere et al. 2010: 133). The participle *gehidēt ‘hidden’ rhymes with *lidēt ‘goes’ (MoDu. *lijdt) in the Reinaert ms. E (1276–1300; the ms. has many Limburgisms but the language is Flemish in origin).

4. *kēsē ‘molar’ < *kūs(j)ō- (MLG kūsē, OFri. kēse, MoWF kīse ‘molar’, MLG kise). The earliest attestations are kīsetand ‘molar tooth’ (1440; MNW) and kīs (ca. 1460–70; EWN). Kiliaan (1599) calls unrounded kēsē, kīse Saxon, Frisian, and Hollandish, as against rounded kūyse, kūse, which would be Saxon. In modern Dutch, according to TNZN Map 4.1, kīs is found in most dialects of Holland, Utrecht, and Gelderland, whereas northeastern dialects have the rounded vowel: kōes or kūeze in most of Groningen, Drente and Overijssel (in agreement with MLG kūsē), kūus or kuze in northwestern Groningen and a small northwestern part of Overijssel. Probably the word kūus ‘wooden club or stamper used for making pig’s fodder out of potatoes’ found in East Limburg (WLD I, 12: 34–5) represents the same word. In Zealand, unapocopated kīeze competes with compounds such as dubbele tand, which (together with other words such as baktand) are the only native forms for ‘molar’ in all southern Dutch dialects.

The Frisian form kēse and the ȳ-vocalism in the northeast require a preform with *i-mutation such as *kūsjo(n)-, but most of Low Saxon presupposes *kūsō(n)-. It is conceivable that both forms derived from a single original paradigm. One option is to posit an *i/jō-stem, with nom.sg. *kūsi > *kūsi > *kūs with *i-apocope (cf. OS *brūd ‘bride’ < *brūpi- for the apocope) beside *kūsjo- in the oblique cases. Another alternative would be to posit an *i-stem *kūsi- leading to a singular without, and a plural with, *i-mutation. Early MoDu. kuys(e) ‘cudgel’ might be the same word as unmutated MLG kūsē.

179. The form *hie which is glossed with ‘hamlet’ in WNT, and which is found only a few times in this meaning (e.g. in Kiliaan, who terms *hie ‘hamlet’ an antiquated Zealandish form) is not the same word (contra Heeroma 1952), but represents a semantic specialisation from huwe = *hiē ‘housemate, family member’ (< WGM. *xiwan-), whence e.g. Dutch huwen ‘to marry’, G. Heirat.
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5. **kijte** 'kite, owl' < *kūtjōn- (OE cýta). De Bo (1892: 150) interprets West Flemish **boschkijte** and **duinekijte** as having a second member **kijte** 'owl'. He compares Kiliaan's **kijte** and **hadekijte**, both with the meaning 'kite' and both explicitly called Flemish by the lexicographer. English **kite** is interpreted as *kūtjōn- by the etymological dictionaries. Compare also German **Kauz** 'owl', MHG **kīz(e)** m. from WGM. *kūta(n)-. In view of the probable onomatopoeic nature of this word, it cannot be excluded that West Germanic had *kūt- and *kīt- as original variants (compare **kievit** 'lapwing, peewit').

Evidence to be dismissed

6. MDu. **brine** 'brine, pickle' (1240, Limburg), **brine** (Yperman, WFla.), MoDu. **brijn**, Flemish **brijne**. In view of the spelling of Old English **brýne**, Dutch **brine** has been regarded as a case of unrounding of /y:/, but Limburgian /i:/ excludes this option. Hence, for Dutch we must reconstruct an etymon with WGM. *i, unless the word as a whole was borrowed into eastern Dutch from coastal dialects before 1200. The etymology is unknown.

7. **Grese** 'grit' in a Ghent charter from 1288–1301 is interpreted by VMNW as an unrounded variant of **gruse**, MoDu. **gruis** 'grit; twaddle'. The relevant passage reads Vort van grese & van wercstene 'further of grit and of work stones'. Modern West Flemish does show unrounded front vowels in this word, viz. in greis, grees 'grit' (de Bo 1892). Yet in Late Middle Flemish 'grit' mainly has the shape greys, groys, greus, which points to the so-called Middle Dutch vowel *ui*₂, on which see § 19.5 below. Many of the words with this vowel are French loanwords, and such is the case here: Old Wallonian **groisse** 'pebble, slack' explains the different Middle Dutch diphthongal outcomes. The Old French word was grès 'sandstone, gritstone', which may be the direct source of the Ghent form **grese**.

8. Early Middle Dutch once has **griweliken** (LutGK, WBrab., 1265–70) for StDu. **gruweilijk** 'awful', a derivative of **grouwel** 'horror' < *gruwilō- (MLG **grūwel**, MHG **griuwell**, griul(e), MoWF **grouwel**, ON grýla). It is possible that **griweliken** shows the originally regular *i-*mutation of Brabantish, thus *gruw- > /gryw-/, with subsequent unrounding of /y/ to /i/. Unrounding of rounded front vowels was a regular phenomenon in South Brabantish around Brussels.

9. The single mentioning of ODu. **hurlant** 'tenured land' (thus twice in Werden charters, and once in Guelders) as **hyrland** in the so-called Gros Brief of the

---

180. The origin of the first member **hade**- is unclear. It is tempting to connect the personal names in **Hade**- (Hadebert, Hadewijch), in which **Hade**- represents WGM. *xaþu- ‘battle’. In the verb **haderen** 'to quarrel', the same stem must be present.
Chapter 19. Unrounding of *ū, *ö, *ă̆, and *iu

County of Flanders from 1187 (viz. in the Brevia de Roya from Bruges), is interpreted by van Loey (1980: 78) as a case of Flemish unrounding of /yː/. After all, the verb huren ‘to hire’ < *xūrjan- (OFri. hēra) was susceptible to i-mutation. Indeed, the vocalic grapheme <y> is quite rare in Old Dutch, and, when used, it usually stands for /iː/. In the Gros Brief itself (edition Verhulst & Gysseling 1962: 172), <y> is only used frequently in the name of the town of Ypres; otherwise, /iː/ usually appears as <i>. One must therefore ask why hyrland, if it had /iː/, was written with a different and rare grapheme. If, on the other hand, hyrland was intended to convey a front rounded /yː/ (as is the interpretation of, e.g., van Loon 2014: 214), it is striking that other words containing *ū in the Gros Brief are normally spelled with <u>: gruth ‘gruit’, Dicasmuda ‘Diksmuide’, Duvenhof ‘Duivenhof’, Sclosa ‘Sluis’, Coudescura ‘Koudeschure’. Thus, the grapheme <y> in hyrland is unexpected in any account.

10. Mijzen, a toponym in North Holland, see Boekenoogen 2004 s.v. Mijsmaad. Early attestations are Old Dutch Misnen (1063 copy early 12th c.), Early MDu. mizzen (1293–94). As long as the etymology is unknown, the name cannot be used as evidence for unrounding. It appears that the word mis-n- was originally an appellative, since it is found denoting various places in North Holland, such as a plot of land below Assendelft (mijsmeed 16th c., Miesmaedt 1635, with the appellative meed, maad ‘meadow’), Misnen near Schermer, and in de smaelm-iesen (1613) near Uitgeest. The ie-spellings denote the retention of the archaic [iː]-pronunciation of ij.

19.2 Unrounding of *ö

Some western forms have an unrounded reflex of WGm. *ö plus i-mutation (see van Loey 1970: 46–7, Schrijver 1999: 19).

1. MDu. ondievelike ‘improperly’ (Willem van Hildegaersberch, Holland, ca. 1480), Early MoDu. ondieft ‘improper; rather; nice’. The latter adjective is a mainly North Hollandish word of the late sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries. It probably contains paragogic t and goes back to *on-dief ‘not proper’. These words must be compared with Flemish ongedoeve ‘rough, wild’ (15th c.), modern dialects ongedoef ‘noise, racket’, gedoevig ‘meek’ (de Bo 1892), and go back to *dōb- (Goth. gadōb ist ‘it is fitting’). Whereas the Flemish forms show no i-mutation, the Hollandish ie-vocalism presupposes just that. Since i-mutation is attested in Anglo-Frisian (OFri. unedève ‘dreadful’, OE ungedêfe), we can

181. See Buma 1951 for the Frisian word.
posit Proto-Frisian *gadēve < *gadōbi- which was borrowed by the Franconian dialect of Holland. The form ongedieve 'exceptional' occurs in the Flemish ms.-Wissen of Maerlant’s Troyen in line 15917: Got gheef hem rouwe onghedieve, die sceiden doet twe ghelieve ‘God give him exceptional sadness, who makes two loved ones part’. The rhyme with ghelieve ‘loved ones’ assures that onghedieve was the original form. Verdam (1904: 295) suggests that line 13550 originally contained another instance of *onghedieve ‘unfitting’, rhyming with *lieve ‘love’. Although the ms. has liefde ‘love’ and ongheriefde, the usual Flemish word was lieve, which would have rhymed with *onghedieve. An ee-form ondeeft ‘a large quantity’ is found in the 15th-century Tübingen ms. of Ons Heren Passie, fol. 28v. (Verdam 1906: 197–9).

2. griede ‘grassland, land gained by accretion outside the dike’ appears in North Holland, viz. in Late MDu. griedlant ‘pasture’, MoDu. dial. bagrieden ‘to grow over with grass’ (Ms. Kool, North Holland, ca. 1770; de Vaan 2013b: 130), gried ‘top layer of pasture’ (Boekenoogen 2004), Texel griede ‘land by accretion’. The ie-vocalism proves that the word was borrowed from the Old Frisian word grēde f. ‘grassland’, the regular cognate of MDu. groede f., MHG gruot ‘id.’ < WGm. *grōþi- ‘growth’.

3. hiel ‘heel’ is probably the most famous of the coastal Dutch words with a possible Frisian origin. Proto-Germanic *xanxila(n)- > *xāxila(n)- has reflexes in North Germanic (ON hæll m., Far. hælur m.), in Anglo-Frisian (OE hēla m., OFri. hēl-, heila m., Wangerooge dial. hiil), and in Swabian dialects of southern Germany (Gechingen haile), see Kroonen 2013: 209. In addition, a feminine *xāxilō- is reflected in OHG hāhila, hāhala, Swiss Visperterminen dialect heelif ‘kettle hook’. Hence, *xanxila- meant ‘little hook’, and was metaphorically applied to the heel (Kroonen 2011: 329) in many dialects, particularly in Anglo-Frisian. The earliest Dutch attestation is the surname Hiele (1217). The word is restricted in its modern geographic distribution, as shown by the map in TNZN 4.6. Very roughly, North and South Holland, Zealand, Flanders, and western Brabant have the etymon hiel, whereas the northeastern dialects, Guelders, Utrecht, northeastern Brabant and northern Limburg use hak. Southeastern dialects display the etymon verzen (MoHG Ferse). In the west, we find (h)iele in Zealand and Flanders, and (h)iel elsewhere. The ee-vocalism in central-southern Brabant (Brussels, Mechelen, Antwerp) is expected for StDu. ie (cf. Belemans/Goossens 2000: 154). This means that, if hiele was indeed a frisianism which entered inland Dutch from the west, it must have happened early enough to predate the change of ODu. *eo, *ē to ie in Flanders, since otherwise Brabant would not have /eː/. Such an early date would match the exclusive use of the hiel-etymon in all of Flanders. Apparently, it was borrowed from Proto-Frisian *hēla(n)- in Flanders and thence spread eastwards.
4. *smieê ‘smooth’. In § 12.2.3 above, we have seen that PGM. *smanþa-, *smanþi-‘smooth, weak’ is reflected both without and with i-mutation in western Dutch. Heeroma (1968b) concluded that, in Early Middle Dutch, the coastal dialects knew both *smiede < *smēde and smoede < *smōde; similarly, both variants existed in northeastern Dutch (Gron. smui, smuu, etc.) and in Westphalian. The vowel of smied- shows the unrounding of *÷ which is characteristic of Proto-Frisian.

5. *Swieten from *Swēten was the Old Frisian name of a tributary of the Old Rhine, a little upstream from the later city of Leiden. The name contains the adjective *swōti- ‘sweet’ (<< *swōtu-), with i-mutation and unrounding as in Old Frisian swēte, MoWF swiet. For attestations of the place Suetan (9th copy 10th copy end of 11th c.) and of the stream die Suete (1296), de Sweete (1314), Zwete (1323), Zwiet (1341), see Blok 1959b. He suggests that ‘sweet’ referred to this being the first place with drinkable (non-silted) water when sailing upstreams from the mouth of the Rhine near Katwijk. The name of the stream was adopted by the first settlement after the clearance of the peat-bogs. When the settlement was later moved onto the earlier ‘wald’, the name became Sotre-wold (1205), now Zoeterwoude.

6. Wednesdag ‘Wednesday’. Wednesdag is an Early Middle Dutch hapax with unrounded vowel, whereas Modern Dutch has woensdag. The attested form is the genitive wenesdages (1260, Grauw in Zeeuws Flanders): dies wenesdaghes na sainte mathis dach ‘on the Wednesday after St. Matthew’s day’. The name of ‘Wodan’s Day’ in the Germanic languages reflects both *Wōdanas *dag and *Wōdinas *dag, and can therefore be found both with and without i-mutation (Pijnenburg 1980). Unmutated *Wōdanas is continued by MDu. woensdach, woendesdach, wodensdach, MLG wōdens-, wūndesdach, OFri. wōnsdei, OE wōndesdei, ON òðinsdagr, whereas the effects of i-mutation in *Wōdinas are shown by MoE Wednesday, OFri. wensdei, weñnsdei. The co-occurrence of both variants within English and Frisian suggests that they coexisted within Proto-Anglo-Frisian. A similar alternation is also found in the simplex for the deity, which shows the three suffix variants *-ana-, *-ina- and * -una-: OS Wōdan, OHG Wuotan, OE Wōden, OIc. Óðinn < *-ana-; MoE Wednesday, OFri. wynthiai < *-ina-; ON Óðinn, OSwe. Óðun < *-una-.

Traditionally, the suffix alternation is compared with other suffix alternations such as *-i/a/ula-, * i/a/uga-, and is regarded as secondary (see, e.g., Krahe & Meid 1969: 51, Schaffner 2001: 323). Yet the alternation in l-stems can also be explained on the basis of an inherited mobile l-stem paradigm with suffix ablaut, as shown by Kerhof (2012): PIE * el-, *el-, *l- would give PGM. *-il-, *-al-, *-ul-, respectively, which were then thematized to become a-stems. Similarly, Kroonen (2011) has shown that Kluge’s gemination of
stops betrays the preservation of Proto-Indo-European ablaut patterns in the \emph{n}-stems. Among other things, this requires us to reconstruct a large number of athematic \emph{n}-stems in Pre-Germanic which had kept the inherited suffix alternation between PIE *-\text{o}n, *-\text{e}n, *-on-, *-en-, and *-\text{n}-, as well as ablaut variants in the root. For ‘\text{Wodan}’, we may reconstruct a paradigm with nom.sg. *\text{Wōpō}, acc.sg. *\text{Wōdénun}, gen.sg. *\text{Wōdnáz}. The \emph{e}-vocalism became *\text{i} in unstressed syllable and caused \text{i}-mutation. Note that a masculine \emph{n}-stem *\text{wōdan}- is attested in OHG *\text{wuoto} ‘berserk’, OE \text{wōda} ‘madman’. It is possible that the god *\text{Wōdá/én}- was a secondary \emph{n}-stem derived from the adjective *\text{wōda}- ‘enraged’.
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\textbf{Map 40}. Front vowels in \emph{woensdag} according to the 1879 questionnaire (map taken from Kloeke 1936; front vowels given in red).

In a 1879 dialect enquiry, ‘Wednesday’ has a front rounded vowel \textit{eu} in southern South Holland and Zealand and in traditional dialects along the Hollandish coast up to and including Texel, as well as in West Friesland (see Map 40). Kloeke
1936 concludes that this distribution shows the effect of an Ingvaeonic phase. The spread of /ø:/ in western Dutch is such that one may assume *Weunsdag to have been the colloquial form in all of Holland and the islands of Zealand until fairly recently (see also WZD). Kloeke also notes *wuunsdag in Tilburg and Den Bosch, which is harder to interpret. The modern distribution according to the GTRP database, given on Map 41, shows that *weunsdag has now receded from many Hollandish dialects, but is still found in Zealand. *Weunsdag also occurs in northern and western East Flanders, and in the south-east of the province of Antwerp (viz. in Herentals, Itegem, Geel, Tongerlo, Tessenderlo, and Haacht).

The distribution of the front vowel within Flanders is unique, compare Taeldeman 1979: 68–9. It might be suggested that the back vowel was fronted in East Flanders when intervocalic or prenasal d was lost, i.e.: *wōdnesdag > *wōdensdag > *wōj-ensdag > woensdag (for the stages *wōdnes- > *wōdns- > *wōdens- > woens-, see Pijnenburg 1980: 152). That intervocalic *d > *j could have this effect on *ō is claimed by Taeldeman (1979: 68) for eastern Waasland and southern French Flanders. A concrete example is *broeden ‘to breed’, found as *bruun in French Flanders and *bruuien in East Flanders.
The explanation of *weunsdag* from *d*-loss is in any case quite likely for the fronted tokens in the south of the province of Antwerp. This area coincides to a large extent with the Antwerp dialects that have */øy/ or */œy/ in *koe* ‘cow’ on Map 99 of *FAND* II/III, as opposed to the back diphthongs in the surrounding dialects. The accompanying comment of *FAND* (p. 218) explains that this region regularly has front diphthongs from */ô/ before an original *d* which was syncopated (viz. in *bloeden* ‘to bleed’, *broedsel* ‘breeding’, *roede* ‘stick’, *voederen* ‘to feed’, *moeder* ‘animal mother’)\(^{182}\) and before a hiatus-filling *j* (in *koeien* ‘cows’ and its singular). It is unclear whether the explanation of Flemish *weunsdag* by *d*-loss may also account for *wuuensdag* found in Tilburg and Den Bosch in 1879.

For Zealand and Holland, a similar explanation of *eu* in *weunsdag* is not available, as we have no parallels for it. The central and eastern dialects of Dutch unanimously point to an Old Dutch back vowel (cf. Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 46), meaning that there was no Franconian *i*-mutated form which the speakers of coastal Dutch could adopt from inland Dutch (*pace* Pijnenburg 1980: 157). As argued above in § 17.3, it is conceivable that the preform */wôdnesdag* yielded */wodnesdag* by vowel shortening (cf. with metathesis *dn > nd* in *wondesdach*, Bruges 1271), whence */wonesdag*. Subsequently, western unconditioned fronting and open syllable lengthening would explain the result *weunsdag*.

This brings us back to the interpretation of the hapax *wenesdaghes*. Could it be a spelling error for */wonesdaghes*? That would be an unfalsifiable solution. Or was it pronounced as *[wø:nesdahəs]*, as suggested by Pijnenburg (1980: 154)? This would be an unattractive explanation, since rounded variants of */e(:)/ are usually indicated in writing in the thirteenth century, compare Early Middle Flemish *woch*, *woeghe* for *weg*, *weghe* ‘road’, *bewueghen* ‘to move’ and *woeke* ‘week’. I therefore prefer to regard *wenesdaghes* as a case of unrounding of the western Dutch vowel */ø:/ of *weunsdag*. In the vicinity of a labial consonant, a rounded vowel could sometimes be perceived as unrounded. The clearest cases of such unrounding are of the type *euvel > evel* ‘evil’, discussed in § 15.2.3.

Evidence to be dismissed

7. *kiem* ‘mould’ (on vinegar, wine, beer, etc.) is the North Hollandish and Groningen form for StDu. *kaam* ‘id.’ It is already given as *kiem* by Junius (1567) and by Kiliaan, who calls it Hollandish and Frisian. The other Dutch dialects have *kaam* or *kaan*, in line with the vowel of MHG *kâm*, *kân(e)*, Olc. *kâm* ‘filth’ and Early

\(^{182}\) Since *bloeden*, *broeden* ‘to breed’ and *voederen* would have had *i*-mutation, only *koe*, *roede* and *moeder* independently prove the front vowel reflex.
MoE coom ‘soot, coal dust, saw-dust’, all of which regularly continue PGM. *æ. The alternation in the word-final consonant is explained by Kroonen (2013: 284) as deriving from an original mn-stem *kēman-, *kēmn-, which led to *kāma- beside *kāna- in Old Dutch.

MoWF kym, kim and kyn, kine also show the m/n-alternation, but their high front vowel cannot regularly reflect unmutated WGM. *æ before a nasal. Kroonen reconstructs a ja-stem *kēmja- for English dialectal keam, keans ‘froth’, which presupposes OE *kēme. The same preform *kēmja- may explain MoWF kym, kyn from OFri. *kēme. The consistent <ie> of kiem in North Holland cannot be the regular Hollandish reflex of *æ (which is MDu. aa > ee, cf. maan, meen ‘moon’; see Versloot 2012). In view of the restriction of kiem to North Holland, its Frisian origin seem likely. Other words in coastal Dutch ie from WGM. *æ are discussed in §18 above.

19.3 Unrounding of *

1. opdiemen is a dialectal form found in North Holland (Boekenoogen 2004) for StDu. opdoemen ‘to emerge, loom ahead’, a compound of doemen ‘to emerge as a mirage’ (cf. OS dōmian, OHG toumen). Modern Westerlauwers Frisian has opdynje, probably for *op-dymje, which may continue OFri. *dēman < *dāümjan-. Hence, opdiemen is a frisianism in North Holland. The /u:/-vocalism of the standard language is unexpected because WGM. *au (i.e. in *daumjan-) usually becomes /o:/ – as indeed it does in MDu. doom ‘steam, vapour’ and domen ‘to steam, fume’. A comparable case is found in the co-occurrence of MoDu. roemer and roemer ‘wine-glass’, of which the latter has become the Standard Dutch form of the twentieth century, whereas the former is the original vocalism. The noun originally means ‘Roman’, and is found in MDu. romer(e), compare MoHG Römer. The vocalism of ‘Rome’ and ‘Roman’ in Dutch was originally that of *au, as is confirmed by several modern dialects.

2. stiemen ‘to smoke, emanate warmth’ is found in North Holland dialects (Boekenoogen 2004), as are stiem ‘fume’ and afstiemen ‘to emanate’. They must be regarded as frisianisms, compare Modern Westerlauwers Frisian stymje from *staumjan- (OE stieman, MDu. stoomen).

3. Dutch teem or hoyteem (thus Kiliaan) ‘instrument for making haycocks, consisting of a pole with ropes at the outer ends, dragged across the ground by

183. OFri. ē was diphthongized to ie (skiep, swiet) and ji (skjirre ‘scissors’, bjinne ‘to scrub’) in Modern Westerlauwers Frisian, and sometimes further monophthongized to /i/ as in sykje ‘to seek’ < *sökjan-, tsis ‘cheese’, stymje < *staumjan- (Hoekstra 2001: 729, Versloot 2012: 114).
one or two horses, thus making rows of hay’. The corresponding verb is North Hollandish *tiemen* ‘to make haycocks by having a horse drag a pole across the mown grass’. The word is absent from Flanders and Zealand. In fact, it is also absent from South Holland, with the exception of *tiemen of hooitiemen* once in Francq van Berkhey’s *Natuurlijke Historie van Holland* (1811). Van Berkhey’s *tiemen* is interpreted by Boekenoogen (2004) and WNT s.v. *tiemen* (1934) as a South Hollandish word, since the author was from South Holland; but he may have learnt the word further north. In any case, there are further instances of the verb in northeastern Dutch: Groningen *taijen, teijen*, Drente *teemen*, Overijssel *teeme* (for the noun), also *teemen*. In view of its general absence from southern Dutch, *teem* in Kiliaan is conspicuous: did he take it from a Frisian or a Saxon glossary? MoWF *tieme*, Schiermonnikoog /tɪem/ ‘hay-wiper’ is a probable derivative of an OFri. verb *tēma* ‘to make haycocks by dragging a hay-wiper’ (< WGm. *taumjan-*)). The Modern Westerlawiers Frisian verb *tiemje, tymje* ‘id.’ was derived secondarily from the noun *tieme* (thus Spenter 1968: 209). Löfstedt (1963–65: 309–13) has collected other Frisian forms which belong here, such as the Saterlandish verb *time*, Continental North Frisian *tīme*, and Insular North Frisian (Sylt) *temi*, which would also point to OFri. *tēma*. I conclude that North Hollandish *tiemen* can easily be a borrowing from Frisian, but that this is less certain for northeastern Dutch *teemen*.

Uncertain evidence

4. MoDu. *kreen* ‘sensitive, touchy, averse, very precise, stingy’ is mainly attested as *kreen* in South Holland and western Utrecht, but also sporadically in North Holland, Zeeland (Zuid-Beveland *krielen* ‘to haggle’), North Brabant (Dongen *krien*), Overijssel and Groningen; see Buma 1960 for the meanings and the spread within the Netherlands. Buma regards *kreen* as a frisianism in the wide sense, encompassing the whole Dutch coast. The Old Frisian source word would have been *krēne* ‘plaintive’ from WGm. *kraunī-*, a variant of *krauna-* as continued by OHG c(h)rōn ‘talkative’. Compare also the verbs MoE *to creen* ‘to repine, fret’, OFri. *krōnia* ‘to complain’, MDu. *croenen* ‘id.’ and MoDu. *kreunen* ‘to moan’. Although no Old Frisian simplex *krēne* is attested, Buma points to the compounds North Frisian *siarkren* (on Amrum), *sirkrāin* (in Wiedingharde) ‘sensitive’, *äim-kräim* ‘too sensitive at the skin’ (Bökingerharde), and Low German (Ostfriesland) *särkrēnig* ‘sensitive’, which in his view contain Old Frisian *krēne*. Yet if western Dutch *kreen* is indeed a frisianism, it is striking that it rarely has *ie*-vocalism. Hollandish *kreen* could also continue a preform *krinV-* or *krain-*, so that its Frisian origin remains uncertain.
Evidence to be dismissed

5. Dutch *baken* ‘sign, appearance, beacon’ is found as *[boken]* in eastern Early Middle Dutch (1240, Limburg) but usually with /a:/ in western dialects: *bakijnghelde* (DAT.SG.) ‘beacon money’ (Dordrecht, 1284), MoDu. *baken*. Its *aa* deviates from the oo-vocalism which we would expect on the basis of the West Germanic etymology *baukna-* (OS *bōkan*, OHG *bouhan*, OFri. *bāken*, bēken, MoWF beaken, OE bēacen). The *aa*-vocalism must be due to borrowing from Westerlauwers Old Frisian *bāken*, Easterlauwers OFri. *bēken* (which is also the preform of the North Frisian forms, FÖ *biak/biik*, CNFri. *biik/biiken*). Besides the noun, the verb *bauknjan-‘* to signal’ yielded OE *bēcnan*, MoE *beckon*, OS *bōknian*, OHG *bouken-*. Though unattested in Old Frisian, its *i*-mutation explains the appearance of *ē* in Old Frisian *bēken*. In Holland, beside /a:/, we also find cases of /e:/: MDu. *beeken* ‘beacon’ (Amsterdam 1402–12), North Holland *beeken* ‘large fire’, *bekenen* ‘to light fires at certain festivals’ (Boekenoogen 2004 s.v. *bekenen*), also *bekem* and *bekemen* (Pannekeet 1984). North Hollandish /e:/ can represent the local, late medieval raising of /a:/ to /e:/ (Versloot 2012: 117) in a borrowing from Old Frisian *bāken*. Hence, *beeken* does not reflect an unrounded, *i*-mutated vowel.

6. MDu. *he(e)rnesse, -nisse, haernesse* ‘pasture; flock’ has been compared with OE *hērnes* ‘district’ from the verb *hēran* ‘to belong to’ (*xaurjan-*). This explanation was last defended by Heeroma (1952: 261), who argues that the meaning ‘dominial land’ would have shifted in Flanders to ‘pasture’ and then to ‘flock’. The occasional spellings with *d*, such as *he(e)rdnesse*, would be due to folk etymology with *herde* ‘shepherd’. However, the spellings with *herd- are hardly occasional (see the attestations in de Bo 1892 s.v. *hernesse*) and are among the first to appear, viz. in the fourteenth century (although ODu. *Vluodes Hernesse* in northern France already appears in 1097). Original *herd-* is confirmed by ODu. *herdnisse*, the word which the Dutch translator of the Leiden Willeram uses to translate OHG *corter* ‘herd’.

7. The Old Dutch toponym *Kinēlo/ēson* is attested with a second member twice in <e> and twice in <o>: *Kynloren* (2nd half of 8th copy 9th copy middle of 12th c., Fulda), *Kintloson* (idem), *Kinlesen* (855 copy early 10th c., Werden), *Kinleson* (10th c., Werden). The toponym refers to a place in West Friesland and may be analysed as a compound of *kinō- ‘creek’ and *lausja- ‘drainage, outlet’, hence ‘at the outlet of the creek’ (Quak 2003: 289; ONW s.v. *kina*). A derived adjective appears in *Chinnelosara gemarchi* ‘border area of the Chinnelosara’ (985 copy 1206–26 copies 14th–15th c.). If the etymology is correct, the spellings with <e> show Old Frisian /e:/ from *i*-mutation of *au*, whereas <o> would show the expected Old Franconian /o:/ or /ø:/ from *āū*. For the stem, compare Dutch *lozen*, G. *lösen*, OFri. *lēsa*, OS *lōsian*, Goth. *lausjan* ‘to release’. 
19.4 Unrounding of *iu

PGm. *eu was split into two allophones in West Germanic, viz. *eo before low and back vowels in the next syllable and *iu before high vowels. In northern and eastern Dutch, *eo has usually resulted in a front unrounded vowel such as /i:/ or /e:/ whereas *iu remained rounded, mostly giving /y:/. In Standard Dutch, we find <ie> /i/ for the former diphthong (StDu. *bie*den ‘to offer’, *diep* ‘deep’, *kiezen* ‘to choose’). The latter has yielded <ui> /œy/ except before r, where <uu> /y:/ results (duister ‘dark’, Duits ‘German’, but sturen ‘to steer’).

Southwestern and south-central Dutch only have a single reflex <ie> for both *eo and *iu. The extent of the area in which both diphthongs have merged differs per word. Since the main lines of development are sufficiently known, I will only give a brief enumeration of the words with unrounded ie for WGm. *iu in western and southern Dutch:

1. briel, toponym, originally ‘fenced area’, also ‘pasture’. This is a loanword from Old French *Brilo, Brula, Bruilo* (> MoF Bruille, Brueil), see Debrabandere et al. 2010: 54. The ie-vocalism in western Dutch versus uu-vocalism in the east suggests that the Romance word was borrowed as *briul*, which shared the change to /y:/ in Brabant and Limburg but became /i/ in Flanders.

2. duur, dier ‘expensive’, dierbaar ‘dear’ < WGm. *diuri-. In Early Middle Dutch, i(e)-vocalism is found in all of Brabant and in West Limburg. Only Maastricht and Cleves/Guelders have du(e)r(r)e. In modern dialects, the adjective is found with /i/ or /i:/ in all of Flanders, South Brabant (also lowered to /e:/) and westernmost Limburg, in the province of Antwerp, Zeeland, western North Brabant, the islands of South Holland and in some archaic coastal dialects of South and North Holland (ANKO II, Map 13). Map 42 indicates the southeastern isogloss between dier and duur, based on the GTRP database.

---


185. Though /y:/-vocalism is partly found in East Flanders, too, and, conversely, /i:/ in one Limburgian toponym: ODu. *Briel ‘Brielen’ (1129–58), Briel (1195) ‘Briel’ (West Flanders), Brile (NW-Limburg, 1160), Early MDu. *tenouden briel* ‘Brielle’ (SHol., 1280), briel (Ghent), versus ODu. *Bruel* (SW-Limburg, 1151–1200), Early MDu. van den bru(e)le (Antwerp, 1248–71; Geraardsbergen, 1295; Grimbergen, 1294; but also in Petegem, and uten brule in Oudenaerde, in southern East Flanders), bruel in SE-Limburg.

186. This seems a more straightforward solution than to assume two separate borrowings from French – one from OFre. *bruel*, another from Ofr. *briel* – pace van Berkel & Samplonius (2006: 76).

187. The hiatus in the centre of this area is caused by the regular unrounding of front rounded vowels in central Belgian Limburg, which makes it impossible to distinguish between the two types here.
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Map 42. The border between the types dier (rectangles) and duur (circles) in Limburg

3. diepte ‘depth’ < *diupipō-. In nearly all varieties of Dutch, we find the reflex of *eo, e.g., ODu. diopithon dat.pl., MDu. dipde (Limburg, ca. 1300), elsewhere diepte. A single instance of a reflex of *iu is eastern Late MDu. duypte (Teuthonista, 1477). Of course, the vowel of diepte may have been influenced by the simplex diep ‘deep’.

4. duiden, dieden ‘to explain’ < *þiubjan. In Early Middle Dutch, we find (be)dieden in Flanders, Brabant and Limburg, but once beduden in Cleves/Guelders. The form beduden is rare in Late Middle Dutch and is confined to Holland and other northern texts. Still, in the literary language of the 1500s and 1600s, bedideden > bedien and bediet ‘explanation’ are frequent forms in Holland, too. In the course of the seventeenth century, bedieden is replaced by beduiden in the standard language.

5. duister ‘dark’ < *þiustria-. The usual Middle Dutch variant is duuster, a variant deester being once attested in the Dutch Lucidarius (Flanders, 1401–50). According to Franck & van Wijk (1912), the hapax deester could have originated from the synonym deemster if m was lost on the model of duuster. In view of the total lack of other unrounded occurrences of duister, this solution is attractive.

6. Duits, Diets ‘Dutch, German’ < *þiudiska-. Goossens (1966: 91–92) interprets MDu. Dietsch in Brabant and western Limburg as a Flemish form, which spread east because of the prestige of the Flemish literary language. Goossens goes on to show that, even in the nineteenth century, dialects from southwestern Brabant to southeastern Limburg still used reflexes of the eastern form Duitsch to refer to the indigenous dialect (as opposed to Standard Dutch or German). Hence, he argues, the border between Dietsch and Duitsch must, in the later Middle Ages, have run between Flanders and Brabant. Mooijaart (1992: 133) objects to this view that the Limburgian Glossarium Bernense (1240) already has ditsch ‘teutonicum’. A possible explanation for the latter form is to assume analogical influence of the simplex diet ‘people’.

7. duivel ‘devil’ < *deobala- and *diubila- from Latin diabolus. In Early Middle Dutch, dievel is found in West Flanders and western East Flanders, whereas duivel is at home in Ghent, Limburg, Cleves/Guelders, and in the only Hollandish instance. But after 1300 there are various traces of unrounding in Holland too, e.g., ian diuel (Amsterdam, 1392), Ghiisbrecht Divel and Heyn Dyvel (Gouda, 1397 resp. 1408; Goudriaan et al. 2000: 12, 31), West Brabant has both divel
(Lutgart K) and duvel (Wisselaar, Liege Diatessaron) in literary sources of the thirteenth century. All modern Dutch dialects have a front rounded vowel such as /y:/, except, of course, for the productively unrounding dialects (GTRP).

8. guur ‘bleak, rough’ < WGm. *ga-xiurja- ‘familiar’. MDu. ghehiere, gehuer ‘nice, pleasant’ provided the basis for MDu. on-ghehure ‘enormous; awful, nasty’ whence modern guur ‘bleak, rough’. In Early Middle Dutch, the adjective is only attested in Flanders and West Brabant, always with *i(e). Interestingly, in Modern Dutch, both Zealand and Holland seem to have /y:/, which must represent inland Dutch vocalism or influence from the standard language.

9. kuiken, kieken ‘chicklet’ < *kiukína-. Between 1200 and 1300 we find ki(e)kin, ki(e)ken in all southern dialects, including Limburgian, with the exception of the form kákên in Cleves/Guelders. In Holland, the earliest attestations are cuken, cuyken after 1390. In modern dialects, the front unrounded vowel /i(:)/ and sometimes /e(:)/ (especially in Brabant) is found in all of French and West Flanders, most of East Flanders, the west of Zealand and western North Brabant, throughout the province of Antwerp and in western Limburg (GTRP). The rest of the Netherlands, and, surprisingly, also south-central Brabant, has /y:/ or its historical descendant. 188 The structural border between modern forms continuing Middle Dutch unrounded kieken and rounded kuiken in Limburg is given in Goossens 1966: 90, compare Map 43.

Map 43. The border between the types kieken (rectangles) and kuiken (circles) in Limburg

10. kuit ‘calf (of the leg)’ and ‘spawn, roe’ < *kût(j)a-, *kúti- or *kiuti- ‘soft part of the body’ (MLG kút n. ‘intestines, calf, roe’, Scottish and northern English dial. kyte ‘belly, stomach’, Bavarian Kütz ‘part of the intestines'; Kroonen 2013: 314). 189

Middle Dutch kuite means ‘calf’, ‘spleen’, ‘animal meat’ and ‘roe’. These meanings are treated separately in WNT, but they probably go back to the

---


189. MoWF kút, see Hof 1933: 255–7 on the vocalism within Modern Westerlauwers Frisian. Versloot (1994: 71–2, 87–8, and pers.com.) argues that irregularities in the Frisian dialectal correspondences, as well as the late attestation of the word (only from 1705 onwards) point to the word having been borrowed from Dutch and Low German */kyt/ with unetymological sound substitution. Among his arguments are north-eastern dialectal küt (instead of expected *kuot), Wangerooge kiit (instead of *kuut), Harlingerland Frisian kũhte.
same West Germanic etymon, cf. EWN. Kiliaan (1599) mentions *kuyt, *kijte, *kiete ‘calf’ as being Frisian, Guelrish and Hollandish terms, and *kuyte, *kiete ‘roe’ also as a Flemish word. In modern dialects, the Dutch area has the etymon *kuit in three different structural-historical forms (TNZN Map 4.8, WVD): *kūt- without i-mutation, *kiuti- (with unrounding in the coastal provinces), and *kūt-/*kūt- for a large number of dialects in which both variants would end up the same. The detailed map in TNZN was summarized in a simplified map in Daan 1940–41, which Map 44 reproduces.

Map 44. Kuit ‘calf’ in Dutch (from Daan 1940–41)

The following historical interpretation can be given. Unmutated *kūt- is continued by koet in North Limburg and sporadically by reflexes elsewhere in Limburg (e.g., Tongerlands kaait, Borgloon koa(ë)t).

Earlier *kiuti- or *kūt- with i-mutation is evidenced by most of the dialects east of the IJssel river, which have kute (Groningen also kude) or kuut. Also, the
central and southern parts of Limburg (as far as they do not have the heteronym brade) have i-mutated kuut, and sometimes its plural, kute. The Limburgian distribution is mirrored on the other side of the Dutch-German state border. Rheinisches Wörterbuch indicates that Geldern has /kut/, whereas most other Ripuarian dialects have a sg. /kyːt/ and a plural /kyːtə/. The meaning can be ‘calf’ (of the leg), but also ‘intestines of small animals’ (such as snails and fish); in the latter case, the word only occurs in the singular.

kūt-/*kūt-/*kiut- with ambiguous vocalism is continued by all dialects of Brabant190 (except for Budel), western Guelders, Utrecht and Holland, in which WGM. *ū was fronted unconditionally and merged with *ī. The actual reflexes vary from kuut (Guelders) via kuit (Standard Dutch) to koit (North Holland, parts of Brabant) and kout.

Finally, we witness unrounded kīete with /iː/ in Zealand and northern East Flanders, and with /i/ in West and French Flanders (given under the umbrella heading kijte in WVD). The long vowel in Zealand presupposes *eo or the unrounded reflex of *iu, whereas old *i before t usually gives short /i/. Hence, the Flemish-Zealandish form may be reconstructed as *kiuti.

In summary, a preform *kūt- is reflected in the Cleves/Geldern area, *kiuti- in southwestern Dutch, whereas *kiuti- and *kūt- can both explain the vocalism in all other dialects. Clearly, assuming only unmutated *kūt- for Cleves/Geldern beside *kiuti- everywhere else would be the most economic solution. The word can be connected with WGM. *kuttō(n) - ‘vagina’ (MHG kotze, MoDu. kut, Kroonen 2013: 314). In the end, they may all go back to a PGM. alternating n-stem paradigm *keudō, *kuttaz ‘bag’ as per Kroonen 2011: 175–6 (cf. OHG chiot ‘bag, purse’, ON koddi m. ‘pillow, scrotum’, Early MoDu. kodde ‘testicle’), followed by generalisation of the t-consonantism and the introduction of u, eu or (secondarily) ū-vocalism in the whole paradigm. The different meanings can partly be due to generalisation of a specific number form: we find usage as a collective (‘intestines’, ‘roe’) but also as a count noun (‘calf of the leg’).

11. lichen, luchten ‘to lighten’ < PGM. *liuxtjan- (ODu. liughten, MDu. lichten, lichten, luchten). The long vowels /iː/, /eː/ and /yː/, which would have been the regular results of the diphthongs *eo and *iu in Early Middle Dutch, were shortened to i, e and u in most dialects. The original geographic distribution of the vocalism was disturbed by influence from the noun ‘light’, MoDu. licht, which has *eo. In the west, we must additionally reckon with rounding of i or e to u next to l.

190. The text in Daan 1940–41 is not very reliable. For instance, the northeastern Brabant forms kout do not continue *ū (pace Daan, p. 253) but represent the local velarisation of *ū > *ui before dental obstruents, cf. Belemans & Goossens 2000: 189. Also, the heteronym hiesse in Limburg has nothing to do with ijsbeen, but belongs to haas, G. Hachse, see TNZN 4.4 ‘knieholte’.
12. *lied, lui ‘people’ < WGM. *liudi- pl. In Early Middle Dutch, ie-vocalism is characteristic of Flanders, Zealand, West-Brabant and, partly, South Holland, whereas uu-vocalism (lude) is found in Holland, Utrecht, East Brabant and Limburg (Berteloot 1984a Map 124; Berteloot 1984b).

13. *Lutgard < *Leudi-gardi-. In Early Middle Dutch, this name only rarely occurs with ie-vocalism, and always in Flanders: liegaerden in Bruges, liegaert and ligardis in Oudenaarde. In Holland, Brabant and Limburg, the first member is either luit-, or, in most cases, lut-, with vowel shortening before a consonant cluster. See § 9.1.1 for the earliest attestations of the name. Although the name may have entered the Low Countries from the east, according to Lindemans 1950, the distribution of ie versus ui, u does not contradict the assumption that we are dealing with an indigenous development of ODu. *Liut-gard-.

14. *stuit ‘tail bone, rump’ < *stiuja-. In Middle Dutch, only WFle. stiet ‘tail bone’ and ystiet ‘with a tail bone’ are attested (1287). The ie-form was apparently also used in West Brabant, since Kiliaan calls stuyl a Hollandish form of stiete. In modern dialects, stiet(e) is found in Zeeuws Flanders (WZD), in northeastern Flanders, and in Ghent (WVD), next to stuyt(e). Since there is also evidence for a preform *stūt- (e.g., MLG stūt ‘young ox’; ON stútr ‘id.’; maybe also Dutch stuyte, stoete ‘loaf of bread’), it cannot be excluded that (part of) the uu-forms for ‘tail bone’ do not continue WGM. *iu but reflect *ū.

15. *sturen ‘to steer, send’, bestieren ‘to govern’ < *stiurjan-. Early MDu. stieren is the only form found in Flanders and West Brabant. All other dialects, including Hollandish, have front rounded stu(e)ren in that century, but isolated unrounded forms can be found later. In a charter from Stolwijk (1376) we find several times styeren ‘to send’. The Gouda homestead tax register from 1397 lists stierman Huge ‘helmsman Hugh’ (Goudriaan et al. 2000: 4), and stierman also occurs in Schiedam in the fifteenth century (MNW). In modern dialects, unrounded stieren occurs in all of Zealand and on the island of Goeree-Overflakkee, as well as in the conservative Hollandish dialects of Katwijk, Zandvoort and Aalsmeer (GTRP). In most southern Dutch dialects, the heteronyms zenden or schikken are used, so that the original distribution there cannot be established.

16. *vlies, vluis ‘film, membrane’ < *fliusi-. The Dutch dialectal distribution of ie in Flanders versus uu elsewhere would be in agreement with a preform *flius-. But Franck & van Wijk (1912) and Kroonen (2013: 146) reconstruct for Proto-Germanic an s-stem *fleusaz, with oblique cases of the shape *flius-iz-, which would yield a West Germanic alternation between *fleos- and *flius-. Therefore, it is conceivable that vlies continues the stem variant with *eo whereas vluus reflects *iu.
17. *vriend* 'friend'. The noun derives from a present participle *frijōnd-* ‘loving’ (Goth. *frijonds*), in which the two vowels have merged into a diphthong which shared the development of WGm. *iu* in Continental West Germanic: OS friund, MLG vrünt, OHG friunt, OFri. friünd, friönd (EWAhd III: 585). Old Dutch has friund (Leiden Willeram). In Early Middle Dutch, we find vri(e)nd in all southern dialects, with the exception of a single occurrence of gen.pl. vründe in Heinsberg. In Late Middle Dutch, vrund, frunt is common in northeastern texts (www.cartago.nl). Vrunt also occurs in Guelders and Limburg and in texts from Holland, to begin with, in Dirck Potter’s Der Minnen Loop (Holland). Vrund is frequent in the literature of the seventeenth century (WNT). In modern dialects, vrund(schap) is restricted to central and southern Dutch Limburg and to Groningen and the northeastern half of Drente (GTRP). This restricted occurrence may be due to the ousting of vrinde, vrund by the heteronyms kameraad or maat ‘pal’, which gave western vriend a better chance to spread eastward. It has been argued that Middle Dutch vrunt arose from the rounding of *i* or *e* in vrint, vrent to *u*, compare the case of sinte, sente ‘saint’ > sunte (van Loey 1976: 22). Yet sunte is hardly ever found in Holland, as opposed to vrunt. Furthermore, the distribution of vrint, vrent (from shortening in vrient) versus vrunt (from *vruunt*) agrees well with that found in other words in *iu*.

A form vreent occurs in Melis Stoke’s rhyming chronicle of Holland and in Jean Froissart’s chronicle of Flanders. It is possible that this reflects the occasional lowering of /i.o/ to /e:/ as we have seen in § 17.1, as in ‘tithe’.

18. *vuur*, vier ‘fire’ < *fiuri < PGm. *feuri (OE fīor and OFri. fiūr), analogically for an original dat.sg. *fu(w)eri (Kroonen 2013: 151). The distribution of variants is the same as for other words in *iu*. Flemish, Zealandish and adjacent parts of South Holland have unrounded vier, whereas the other dialects have /y:/ or /ø:/.

19. *ziekte* ‘illness’ < *siukiþō-. Siecte is the usual form in written Middle Dutch texts from all dialects. Forms continuing *iu* are only found in Holland, the northeastern dialects, and Limburgian: sucde, sucde (Limburgse Sermoenen, ca. 1300), elsewhere suucte, suycte (MNW s.v. suucte). Kiliaan (1599) also calls suykte a “Hollandish” word. Since the vowel of ziekte may have been influenced by ziek ‘ill’, it appears that the ui-variant of ‘illness’ continues the original form. In that case, it is interesting to see that it is also found in Holland.

20. *zuinig* ‘stingy’, MDu. siene, sune ‘clear, good’, onsiene ‘ugly’ < WGm. *siuni- ‘clear’ (Goth. ana-siuns, OE ge-siene ‘visible’). Compare also WGm. *siuni- f. ‘face; appearance’ (Kroonen 2013: 435) which yielded MDu. siene ‘eyesight’, sune ‘face, vision’. The Middle Dutch adj. siene is characteristic of the Flemish literary language, though it is also found further east. The uu-forms are rare. In Modern Dutch, on the contrary, only zuinig ‘stingy’ has survived. It has
probably entered the standard language from north(east)ern dialects: MDu. *sunich 'meticulous', onsunich 'of impure mind' (Hol., 1440–55), sticksuynigh 'short-sighted' (Cleves/Guelders, 1477).

Discussion

The words which probably continue ODu. *iu in all dialects without too much analogical interference from *eo-forms are 1 briel, 2 duur, 4 duiden, 6 Duits, 7 duivel, 8 guur, 9 kuiken, 10 kuit, 12 lieden, 13 Lutgard, 14 stuit, 15 sturen, 17 vriend, 18 vuur, 20 zuining. They clearly have ie-vocalism in Flanders, Zeeland, and to varying extents in southern Brabant. Elsewhere, they show uu-vocalism. It has been claimed that unrounding to ie was more restricted in Holland than in Flanders and Zealand, in the sense that it would occur only before r in Holland (see the handbook references above). Yet this is not borne out by our data. True, for duur, guur, sturen, vuur, there is evidence for ie in southern South Holland and in archaic dialects further north. But for lieden and duivel, ie-vocalism is also present in the same regions, and it may have been so from the thirteenth century on (Berteloot 1984b). The same cannot be proven for bedieden, but it is at least possible on the basis of the Early Modern Dutch forms.

For most of the other words discussed in this section (nrs. 3, 5, 11, 16, 19), we only rarely have localizable information about the distribution of ie vs. uu in Middle Dutch. I therefore agree with Heeroma (1935: 92–5), that *iu originally yielded /i(:)/ in all of Hollandish. If we assume, then, that Flanders, Zeeland and Holland originally shared the reflex *iə, whereas all of Brabant – at least in Old Dutch times – and the areas to its north and east had *ŷ, the isogloss between these reflexes is the same as that between other phenomena separating coastal Dutch from inland Dutch. Words showing ie in all of southern Brabant and western Limburg already in Middle Dutch, such as dier 'dear' and kieken 'chicken', must then reflect paradigmatic alternation between *eo and *iu, with generalisation of *eo or its introduction from cognate words.

The unrounded versus rounded reflexes of *iu can be connected with the western absence versus the eastern presence of secondary i-mutation on low and back vowels. The majority of handbooks explicitly deny a connection of eastern uu with i-mutation. Schönfeld & van Loey (1970), for instance, claim that *i in the diphthong *iu was rounded by *u, followed by contraction (*[iu] > *[yu] > [y:]), whereas van Bree (1987: 111) suggests the reverse assimilation of *iu to *[iy] plus contraction to [y:]. Goossens (2008: 68) talks about mutual assimilation.

Two main arguments have been put forward against an explanation via i-mutation. The first one is of a dialectgeographic nature: the merger of *eo and *iu is spread further east than is usual for the absence of i-mutation. As we have
seen, this claim is incorrect, since the original isogloss does seem to have separated Flanders from Brabant. The second objection which has been voiced is chronological: the distinction between *eo* and *iu* already arose in Proto-Germanic. This argument is valid only if one regards eastern /y:/ as necessarily reflecting mutual assimilation in the diphthong *iu*. If we assume that *i*-mutation in a sequence *-iu*- produced *-iy*-i-, followed by a contraction of *iy* to /y:/, as seems perfectly possible, the Proto-Germanic origin of *iu* versus *eo* becomes irrelevant, since the much later *i*-mutation would give the same results.

I therefore find myself agreeing with Heeroma (1938: 239), who states that (in eastern Dutch) [iu] became [iy] by *i*-mutation, and was then assimilated to [y:]. Inherited *eo*, however, became [ia], whence modern ie. Dutch uu and ie, therefore, do not directly reflect a Proto-Germanic alternation between *eo* and *iu*, since the latter was affected by Old Dutch *i*-mutation. The western merger of *eo* and *iu* makes sense when connected with the absence of *i*-mutation in coastal Dutch. In a language contact scenario, the allophone [iy] could have been adopted by L1-speakers of Proto-Frisian as [iu], or maybe even lowered to [io], and then shared in the Late Old Dutch reduction of *eo* to [ia] in the tenth or eleventh century. 191 In a continuity scenario, such as the one adopted by van Loon (2014: 129), the absence of *i*-mutation on *iu* matches the absence of *i*-mutation on other low and back vowels in western Dutch, and might point to an earlier date for the reduction of unstressed *i* in coastal Dutch than in inland Dutch.

### 19.5 The rise and unrounding of so-called “ui”

Next to the diphthong ui from WGM. *ū*, Early Middle Dutch had also acquired a diphthong *ui* /œy/ from a few other sources, none of them very frequent. This phoneme is sometimes called “ui₂” in Dutch linguistics (Muller 1921, van der Meer 1927: 63–4, 260–61, Goossens 1974: 44, van Loey 1980: 78). Whereas “ui₁” is spelled consistently as <u>, <ue>, <uy>, and eventually <ui>, the older diphthong “ui₂” has many more spelling variants. This is partly caused by the different native and foreign sequences which fed into “ui₂” (see directly below), and partly by the fact that this diphthong was

191. Written sources do not tell us which phonetic stages lay between WGM. *iu* and southwestern MDu. ie. The Lex Salica (ca. 600) still shows a spelling <eu> or <eo> for the diphthong, viz. in leudinia, leodinia ‘money for a woman’, if representing a derivative *liud-inna* with ONW. For the subsequent phases of Old Dutch, hardly any reliable evidence is available (cf. Mansion 1924: 211–14). Maybe the toponym Tielt in West Flanders, if from *tiulithi* (thus ONW), shows that monophthongization had taken place in the first half of the twelfth century: de Tiletto (1119 copy 1126–50).
new to the phonemic system, and hence speakers were probably very uncertain about how to spell the sound. Three typical types of spelling for ui₂ are (1) o-combinations, such as oei, oy (MDu. loei, loye 'lazy'); (2) u-combinations, such as uy, ui (luy, lui), eu(i); (3) unrounded diphthongs, such as ey, ei (Early MoDu. ley); cf. Muller 1921: 146–8. The unrounded reflexes are mostly West Flemish (Muller 1921: 152).

For ui₂, several different etymological sources can be distinguished. A language-internal source was the West Germanic combination *-uj-, viz. in lui 'lazy' < *luja-, spui 'lock, sluice' < *spujôn- and hui 'whey' < *xuja- (StDu. wei < *xwaja-; Kroonen 2013: 261). A rather large, second group consists of Old French ui /yj/ or ehu, ahu /ɔy/, /ay/, such as StDu. fruit 'fruit', fluit 'flute', pui 'front of a house', buitelen 'to tumble' (Early MoDu. buytelen, beytelen, beutelen). In some cases, an unrounded French diphthong was rounded to ui, as in wambuis 'vest' (OFre. wambais), which also occurs in Middle Dutch as wambeis, and fornui 'stove' (OFre. fornaise), MDu. also forneise. A third source for ui₂ was the sequence *-īwa-in MoDu. spuiten 'to squirt, gush' < *spīwatjan- (MDu. speiten, spoyten, spouten). A fourth set of input forms was provided by the sequence *-olt/d-. The l was normally vocalized to a labial approximant in -out-, -oud- in Early Middle Dutch, but it sometimes yielded a palatal glide, in Flemish -oit-, -oid-. This development looks like i-mutation, cf. Mooijaart 1992: 155; but we also have oi from words without any i-mutation factor, such as Early MDu. (Ar)noid in Zeeland and once gewoyt 'power'. This fourth oi can also be unrounded to ei or fronted to ui, as shown by a number of personal names and surnames: Baldwin > Boidins > Buyens, Woutijn > Weitin, Walter > Woyte/Wye > Wuyts, Weyts, Arnold > Noyte/Neyt > Nuyts/Neyts. The unrounding to ei is typical for Flemish whereas ui is more frequently found in Brabant.

Goossens (1981: 62–63) claims that the unrounding of öü in part of Flemish may also be regarded as an Ingvaeonic feature. Of course, the late rise of ui₂ means that its unrounding in Flanders cannot be a direct reflex of any Frisian-Franconian language contact. Still, it is possible to hypothesize that the Early Middle Flemish unrounding of /œy/ could take place because a diphthong of this type did not yet occur in the vowel system, whereas in Brabant and Limburg *äü often yielded a front diphthong of the type /œy/. Since the change of olT to oiT is Late Old Dutch and since the French loanwords are not to be trusted (since some of them may have had an unrounded vowel in French), the most interesting category of words for a historical investigation are those in *-uj-. Unfortunately, these words are poorly attested in the corpus. The words lui and bui are lacking from Early Middle Dutch altogether. The word spui, attested thirty-nine times before 1300, appears as spoye,

---

192. Recent investigations, as reported in EWN, have led to a considerable reduction in the number of words for which an internal development leading to ui₂ is reconstructed.
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spoie in Holland (4x) and as spoy/ie in Ter Doest Lissewege (WFla., 15x), whereas in Bruges and Damme, both vocalisms are attested (Bruges: 10x spoy/ie, 7x spey/ie, Damme: 4x spoie, 1x speie). In East Flanders (4x) and Mechelen (1), spei(e) is the only form found. A verb ute spoien ‘to spit out’ is attested once in West Flemish (Der Naturen Bloeme D, 1287). These data are confirmed by the CRM14 corpus, even if the noun is only found in The Hague and Bruges: op die spoeye (The Hague, 1385), van der spoeye (The Hague, 1385), and always speye in Bruges in documents between 1351 and 1400, also speyhoudere ‘sluice holder’ (1360). Modern dialects do not help to clarify the situation, as the number of relevant words is very small. The typical division is between spui in northern Dutch, including Zealandish spuije (WZD), and spei in southern dialects.

The word hui ‘whey’ occurs as hey in the West Frisian Town Laws. Kiliaan mentions huy, hoy as Frisian and Hollandish forms for ‘whey’, and hoy, hoey as Hollandish and Guelrish, the latter of which could hide a pronunciation /hœy/. Seventeenth-century literature from Holland has hui. Modern North Hollandish dialects, however, seem to have only wei. For West Flemish, de Bo (1892) has compounds such as melkhei ‘whey from milk’, but nowadays, wei seems to be the only living form in Flemish dialects (WVD). De Bo also has the verb weien ‘to whey’, with a variant heien.

19.6 Summary and conclusions

Summaries

A. With *û, three forms provide certain evidence for old unrounding:

1. hide, -ijde ‘fishing port’ < *xûþjō-.
2. hiden ‘to hide’ < WGm. *xûdjan- in Oostende (1403–04) and Reinaert ms. E (1276–1300).
3. kies ‘molar’ < *kûsjō(n)-, but Saxon koeze etc. < *kûsō(n)-; or OS nom.sg. *kûsī > kûs, obl. *kûsjō- in the oblique cases; or WGm. *kûsī-.

The names in hide, and indeed the word itself, are absent from inland Dutch. Their unrounding can therefore hardly be due to the borrowing of an Old Franconian term in [y:] into coastal Dutch with adoption of the stressed phoneme as /i:/ (in which case they would be unique as against the usual adoption with /u:/). Rather, the word must be a loan from Proto-Frisian or a more recent borrowing from English due to the North Sea trade (Taeldeman 1982: 289–90). The elements hide ‘harbour’, hiden ‘to hide’, kite ‘kite’, brine ‘brine’ are discussed by Heeroma (1952). Since unrounding of *û yields Old Frisian /e:/ rather than /i:/, and since these
words are restricted to Flanders, Zealand, and, at most, the southern regions of South Holland, Heeroma proposes to see these forms as imported from English. In view of the late date of unrounding in Old English, he even suggests that they may have come from Middle English. Yet neither of these two arguments in favour of an English origin is compelling. The unrounding of *ũ may have given a different reflex /i:/ in southernmost Proto-Frisian as spoken in Flanders. And the restriction of these words to southern coastal Dutch may be purely coincidental, or even, for huden, not completely true.

B. For unrounding of *ð, the following evidence remains:
   1. ondievelike, ondieft vs. Flemish ongedoeve, gedoevig. The Hollandish forms were probably borrowed from PFri. *gadēve.
   2. griede, griedlant, begrieden, gried 'top layer of pasture': borrowed from OFri. grēde 'grassland'.
   3. hiel 'heel' < PGm. *xanxila(n)- 'little hook', cf. also r. *xāxilō-. Borrowed from PFri. *hēla(n)- in Flanders? Or an internal formation of Old Franconian?
   4. smieē 'smooth', borrowed from PFri. *smēþi- < *smōþi- < *smanþi-.
   5. Suetan, Swieten borrowed from OFri. swēte.

Ondief, griede and Swieten are restricted to Holland, and quite clearly represent direct borrowings from Old Frisian into Old or even Middle Dutch; two of them concern local toponymy. Hiel and smieē, on the other hand, are present in Flemish and must therefore be older. Since smieē displays the un-Franconian nasal loss before *þ, we cannot escape the conclusion that this form – and its unumlauted counterpart smood – was borrowed from Proto-Frisian. For hiel, much seems to speak in favour of the same conclusion, but note the following. The word itself was clearly known in all of Continental West Germanic, and may therefore have been present in Old Franconian. If so, it would qualify for i-mutation of *ā, i.e. a pre-stage *hāhilan-. Normally, we find no trace of secondary i-mutation of *ā in coastal Dutch, but here, we have a special case, in that the intervocalic *h would have dropped at an early stage (cf. sehan > sean > sien 'to see'). It seems possible that *hā'ilan- was phonologized as *hē(ə)lan-, with the same Brabantish /e:/ and Flemish /i.ə/ which resulted from *eo. If this explanation is correct, hiel is not a frisianism in Dutch.

193. Arjen Versloot informs me that the Wangerooge form hiil may actually be seen as supporting this reconstruction, since it can continue PFri. *i, *i in open syllable or *ei, but not normally *hēl- from i-mutation of *honx- < *hanx-. A preform *hē-ilan- was already considered by Löfstedt (1931: 146) with reference to Mainland NFris. forms.
C. For unrounding of *äü, I retain the following forms:
   1. NHol. opdiemen ‘to emerge’ from OFri. *dēman.
   2. NHol. stiemen ‘to smoke’ from OFri. *stēman.
   3. teem ‘instrument for making haycocks’, NHol. tiemen ‘to make haycocks’ from OFri. *tēman.

These clearly represent Old Frisian borrowings in dialects of North Holland.

D. WGm. *iu systematically has an unrounded reflex in Flanders, Zealand and Holland. As I have argued in § 19.4, this situation is best interpreted in the same way as the absence of i-mutation on all other low and back vowels in western Dutch. The unrounding can either be explained from a language contact scenario, with eastern */iy/ being adopted as */iu/ in western Dutch, and then following the regular path to /iə/ > /i(:)/ which *eo also took; or from a continuity scenario, with an internal cause for the absence of i-mutation.

General conclusion

Of the forms in *ū, *ō, and *āū, most of the reliable evidence concerns borrowings from Old Frisian – especially as regards words restricted to North Holland – or Proto-Frisian, viz. all three forms with *āū, four of the five forms with *ō, and hide ‘port’ with *ū. This leaves hiel, hiden, and kies unaccounted for. A possible internal alternative for hiel has been given above. The distribution of kies ‘molar’ (absent from Flanders – though of course this may be due to later loss) can be reconciled without many difficulties with an origin as a borrowing from OFri. kēse.
The regular reflexes of *ai in Standard Dutch are ei and ee. Their distribution depends on the phonetic surroundings but is also subject to dialect variation. Dutch displays a structural split between a southeastern area where *ai developed according to the same conditions as in High German, and the remaining Dutch area which follows a different development.\footnote{Cf. Goossens 1981: 68–70, 76, van Bree 1987: 100–1, van Loon 2014: 121–4, FAND II/III: 273–301.} In High German and in central and eastern Limburg, *ai was monophthongized to OHG ē in front of WGm. *x, *w, *r, and in absolute auslaut. In other positions, the diphthong was retained as OHG ei. In most Dutch dialects, however, *ai only yields ei before *i or *j in the following syllable; otherwise, it contracts to Early MDu. /ɛ:/, StDu. ee. Van Coetsem (1968) and Goossens (1981) assume that the Proto-Germanic raising/lowering mutation (viz., the raising of mid vowels before i, j, u in the next syllable, and the lowering of high vowels before a low vowel) caused the split of *ai in two variants, viz. *ai before i, j, u in the following syllable and *ae elsewhere.

The original distribution of *ai can be disrupted by lexical and morphological analogies. For instance, the regular vowel difference between MDu. eek ‘oak’ and eikijn ‘of oakwood’ does not survive into Modern Standard Dutch because the simplex became likewise eik (van Bree 1987: 101). In some cases, variation between ei and ee in Standard Dutch is due to different suffixal formations from the same root. Thus, we find gereed ‘ready’ < *ga-raiþa- versus bereid ‘prepared’ < *bi-raiþja- (unless bereid was taken from the verb bereiden ‘to prepare’ < *raiþjan-). Different suffix vowels have also been invoked to explain StDu. teiken ‘sign’, vlees ‘meat’ beside Hollandish teiken and vleis. Franck & van Wijk (1912) assume a secondary in-suffix for teiken, the reality of which is confirmed by Early Middle Dutch spellings from Flanders (tekin, teikin, WFla.), Zeeland (tekinen, Zierikzee) and Holland (tekiin, WHol.). However, as we can see, the in-suffix does not always preclude monophthongisation, and for ‘meat’ this explanation requires the reconstruction of two different preforms: WGM. *flaiska- and *flaiski-.

The structural, etymological distinction between the two variants *ae and *ai as [ɛ:] vs. [ei] is valid for the central Dutch dialects of Brabant and Utrecht, and its
restriction to this area is even clearer in Early Middle Dutch than in the modern dialects. In Flanders, there is evidence for a general monophthongization of *ai in all positions except before *j (thus van Loon 2014: 122, who dates the change to /e:/ to around 900). The first subsection below will discuss the evidence for this phenomenon (§ 20.1). In Holland, medieval sources show a large number of ie-spellings which seem to occur in particular phonetic contexts. They may reflect an earlier monophthong similar to Flemish ee, and hence show a specific coastal Dutch development of *ai (20.2). Smaller sets of reflexes of *ai as aa (20.3) and oo (20.4) have been explicitly connected with a Frisian substrate in coastal Dutch.

20.1 Flemish ee and ei

In Flanders, the reflexes ee and ei display a fan-shaped distribution in modern dialects. Monophthongal ee (which is realized as eeë in French and West Flanders but as ieë in East Flanders) is dominant in French and West Flanders, but gives way to diphthongal ei (and its local continuants) progressively as one goes east. The isogloss between ee and ei runs differently per word. In general, the most easterly occurrences of ee in words which have ei in Standard Dutch coincide with the border between East Flanders and Brabant, see the discussion in FAND (II/III: 274) and Taeldeman (1979: 77). According to the latter, Flemish always has the ei-reflex in the equivalents of Standard Dutch keizer ‘emperor’, reis ‘journey’, breien ‘to knit’, ei ‘egg’, mei ‘May’, kei ‘stone’. The last four of these words reflect word-final *-ai, internal *-ajj-, or the palatalisation of *ag (in breien), three categories where the diphthong could be retained longer or arose at a later date. Keizer and reis are high-register words which may have been taken from the standard variety. Conversely, Flanders always displays the ee-reflex in scheiden ‘to separate’, leiden ‘to lead’, dreigen ‘to threaten’, beitel ‘chisel’, eik ‘oak’, and a gradual decrease of the ei-reflex from east to west in geit ‘goat’, spreì ‘bed spread’, weide ‘pasture’, klein ‘small’ (see also van Loey 1967: 49). This geographical situation is very similar to the increasing reduction of unconditioned fronting of *u in Flanders from west to east. It seems likely, then, that the reflex ei has been encroaching on former ee-territory during the last centuries. The words eigen ‘own’ and reiger ‘heron’ have ei in all of Flanders except for French and southwestern West Flanders.

for Flemish the occasional but linguistically real (as shown by evidence from rhyming pairs) occurrence of the diphthong ei before an original i-mutation factor in beide ‘both’, beiden ‘to bide’, bereiden ‘to prepare’, ghemeine ‘mean’, gereide ‘ready’, heide ‘heath’, cleine ‘clean’, leiden ‘to lead’, reine ‘clean’ and weide ‘pasture’, versus ee in the non-mutated words alleen ‘alone’, been ‘bone’, breed ‘broad’, geen ‘none’, leed ‘sorrow’, steen ‘stone’, ween ‘pain’, weet ‘knows’. Furthermore, in prose texts, Flemish has einig ‘single’, gheist ‘spirit’, inheims ‘local’, meister ‘master’, veinoot ‘companion’. Thus, ei may have been autochthonous in at least some varieties of Flemish, but the spelling disappears after 1400 (except in arbeid, eigen and -heid). Van Loey (1967: 64–5) duly notes that most of the ei-words have a following dental consonant, which may have acted as a conditioning environment.

Taeldeman (in FAND II/III: 274, 290) assumes that Flanders originally had the same etymological distribution as Brabant, but that ei was often replaced by ee in a western area with its centre of gravity in West Flanders. Yet if such were the case, the position of the isoglosses would be difficult to understand: How could ee in some words be restricted to southwestern Flanders? Why do some words show ee in eastern but not in western Zeeuws Flanders? Why does the eastern limit of the ee/ei-area coincide with many other vowel isoglosses between western and central Dutch, which show lexical diffusion of the Brabantish forms into Flanders (such as the unconditioned fronting of *u)? It seems more likely that van Loon (2014: 122–3) is correct in assuming that all of Flanders originally had the ee-reflex in all words except where *ai stood in auslaut, before *j, or arose from *ag in Late Old Dutch. The Brabantish distribution was gradually adopted in East Flanders, with ei-words replacing original ee-words. Van Loon adduces additional evidence from place-names and surnames, such as those with ‘oak’ (toponyms Eeklo in East Flanders, 1252 Eclo, Zeveneken in East Flanders, 1220 Seveneken; the surname Verecken in East Flanders). In van Loon’s view, the different Flemish reflex of *ai is caused by an early reduction of unstressed *i to [1] or [ə] in Flanders, which in its turn blocked i-mutation as it applied further east. In Buccini’s framework of a Frisian-Franconian language shift, the absence of i-mutation on *ai in Flanders could be explained in the same way as the absence of secondary i-mutation on other vowels.
20.2 Hollandish ie and ei

Table 44. ie from *ai in medieval Hollandish (Heeroma 1935)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Before n</th>
<th>Before m</th>
<th>Before t</th>
<th>Auslaut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alkmaar</td>
<td>ghien, lienien, myent</td>
<td>liemen</td>
<td></td>
<td>twie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkhuizen</td>
<td>lienien, stien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>twie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoorn</td>
<td>ghien, ghien, lienien, stien</td>
<td>liemen</td>
<td></td>
<td>twie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edam</td>
<td>lienien, stien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>ghien, lienien, stien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hieten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naarden</td>
<td>ghien, yenich, myent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haarlem</td>
<td>gemien, ghien, lienien, stien</td>
<td>liemen</td>
<td></td>
<td>twie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>alliens, ghien, lienien, stien</td>
<td>liemen, liemen</td>
<td>liemen</td>
<td>twie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft</td>
<td>lienien, stien</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>twie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiedam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>twie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>behiete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouda</td>
<td>yen</td>
<td>hyemraed</td>
<td></td>
<td>hyeten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoonhoven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hieten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brielle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hieten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vianen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>twie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mooijaart (1992: 148–49) finds that *ai is raised to Early Middle Dutch <ie> in many parts of the Low Countries before r, viz. in eerst and in tweer, the gen.pl. of ‘two’. In other positions, <ie> is mainly Hollandish, though a number of dialects in East Flanders and southwestern Brabant also show it (see van Loey 1980: 38, Berteloot 1984a, maps 92 and 93).

It has long been known that MDu. /e:/ or /ɛ:/ from *ai was raised to <ie> /iə/ or /iː/ in Hollandish (Heeroma 1935: 90–1, Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: §65c), but the exact conditioning is uncertain. The clearest environment is a following nasal, whence forms such as ien ‘one’, mien ‘mean’, bien ‘bone, leg’, stien ‘stone’, hiem ‘home’, found in Late Middle and Early Modern Dutch of North Holland and northern South Holland. Other ie-environments are before t (hiete ‘to be called’) and in auslaut (twie ‘two’). In the West Frisian town laws from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, ie is quite frequent in a restricted number of words. From his corpus of edited charters and legal texts from the later Middle Ages, Heeroma (1935: 11) assembled the collection of words spelled with ie which is reproduced here in Table 44.195 The towns are listed roughly from north to south.

Table 45 provides the additional attestations from the corpus CRM14 (some forms may overlap with Heeroma’s collection). Note that the ‘other consonants’ are dental consonants in all instances (d, l, r, st, t). The numeral *twie* had paradigmatic forms with -r and -n which could have given rise to *ie* (genitive *tweer*, dative *tween*), and we cannot exclude analogy with *drie* ‘three’ (Franck 1910: 193). The fact that Haarlem provides more attestations than other Hollandish towns is largely due to the fact that the corpus contains a disproportionate number of documents from there. The name *van foriest*, found twice in a charter from 1389, contains MDu. *foreest*, a French loanword, and confirms that *ie* is due to raising of earlier *ee*. The word *clien* corresponds with its variant *cleen*, as opposed to *i*-mutation in MDu. *klein*, StDu. *klein*.

Table 45. *ie* from *ai* in 14th-c. Hollandish (CRM14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before n or m</th>
<th>Before other consonants</th>
<th>Auslaut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Den Burg</td>
<td></td>
<td>twie 1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barsingerhorn</td>
<td>ienen 1398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoorn</td>
<td>ghemyen 1393, stien 1360</td>
<td>twie 1388–93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkmaar</td>
<td>miene ‘common’ 1340, iene 1340, ienen 1348</td>
<td>ghiestlant 1346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egmond-Binnen</td>
<td>ghemieneliken 1317, (te) liene 1363, erfiene 1381, lienware 1333, te lient 1336, liengoet 1395, te lien, verlient 1395</td>
<td>rentemiester 1317, ghiesten 1381, ghiertude 1363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akersloot</td>
<td>ghemienen 1357, ghemiene 1369</td>
<td>in gherieden ghelde 1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castricum</td>
<td>twien 1378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverwijk</td>
<td>lyen ‘loan’ 1388, cliene claes 1332, ghien 1379, miens 1332</td>
<td>ons hieren 1332, ghiertwt 1388 tuie 1332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haarlem</td>
<td>clais clienebien 1331, mienen 1331, ghemiene 1333, 1353, cliene 1333, twiene 1381</td>
<td>hiet 1330, 1375, ghehieten 1316, ghiest 1341, elsghiest 1341, ghiestlants 1330, miester 1316, 1320, myesters 1354, gathlwsmiesters 1378, scoelmister 1333, van foriest 1389, ghehiet 1320, hiele(n) 1385, dielen 1380, wederdiel 1333, mier ‘more’ 1316, ons hieren 1331, ghiertrujd 1331, cliedmakers 1348, ghecliet ‘clothed’ 1376, briet ‘broad’ 1378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Before $n$ or $m$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Auslaut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>yenighen 1389, ghiene 1360, tvien 1371–96</td>
<td>hilighe(misse) ‘holy’ 1384–87</td>
<td>tvie 1360–96, twie 1392–96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amstelveen</td>
<td>ghienen 1398</td>
<td></td>
<td>tvie 1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valkenburg</td>
<td></td>
<td>ghehieten 1376</td>
<td>twie 1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiden</td>
<td>twien 1399, yenen 1353, te liene 1346, virlienen 1346, ghemienen 1393, ghemienlic 1364, ghemientre 1366, ghemiente 1393, ghienrehande 1393, ghelienden 1339, stienbergen 1346, twien 1344, 1366, 1399</td>
<td>hiet 1344, ghehieten 1346, 1353, 1399</td>
<td>twie 1342–99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voor-schoten</td>
<td>ghemiene 1342, ghemienlike 1381, te lien 1360, 1381</td>
<td></td>
<td>twie 1382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hague</td>
<td>myene ‘common’ 1350, ghemynene 1350, 1357, ghemienen 1363–85, ghemienre 1363, stienwerpers 1395, stienaerts 1396</td>
<td>ghehieten 1377</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delft</td>
<td>ghiene 1313, ghemiene 1332, ghemiens 1400, stien 1370</td>
<td>ghehieten 1310</td>
<td>twie 1358–98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monster</td>
<td>ghemienen 1357, twien 1359</td>
<td></td>
<td>twie 1369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'s-Gravezande</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>twiestraet 1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gouda</td>
<td>ghemiene 1324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolwijk</td>
<td>hyemraet and hyemraders 1376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoon-hoven</td>
<td></td>
<td>hieten 1399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dordrecht</td>
<td></td>
<td>hiet 1386</td>
<td>twier 1307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the seventeenth century, the raised reflex appears in low-register speech in the farces. Nauta (1893: 12) gives instances of $ie$ from *$ai$ in Bredero’s language before $n$, $r$, $s$, $d/t$, $k$, $l$, and $p$. Crena de Iongh (1959: 38–9) notes that this phenomenon is much less common in Delft, where it is mainly restricted to the position before...
‘two’, bien ‘leg’, treckbien ‘to limp’, lienien ‘to borrow’, mieren ‘to think’, stien ‘stone’, schoorstien ‘chimney’. For all of these words, ee-variants are much more frequent
in the texts of van Santen. Before other consonants, rare instances of ie are hieten
‘to be called’, swiep ‘whip’, bleik ‘bleak’.

Thus, whereas most of the Hollandish raising of *ai to ie is found before dentals, nasals and in absolute auslaut, there are some examples of ie before k and p. It is possible that the dialects had raised this vowel across the board, but that writers consciously avoided it (or, in the farces, deliberately applied it) because it was a marked low-register phenomenon.

For the modern North Holland dialect of Zaanstreek, Boekenoogen (1897: xxii-xxiii) claims that *ai is represented as ie, except in words where (according to
Hollandish has ei, the Zaanstreek dialect equally has ei, viz. in eigen ‘own’, reis ‘journey’, beitel ‘chisel’, spreiden ‘spread’, heistere ‘to make a fuss’, and furthermore
in vleis ‘meat’ (StDu. vlees), teiken ‘sign’ (StDu. teken). The forms vleis, teiken and bleik are or were common in all of Hollandish.

It is possible that the diphthongization of */ɛː/ to /i.ə/ started before dental consonants (if the medieval evidence can be trusted to reflect the actual distribution in the language) and that ie became established in all relevant words by the seventeenth century.

The overall interpretation of these data will depend on our view of the ei-words. In Middle Dutch texts from Zealand and Holland, and in particular in works by the authors Melis Stoke, Willem van Hildegaersberch and Dirck Potter, as well as in some charters, van Loey (1967: 77) assumes that the following words had a real diphthong ei in at least some of their tokens: with i-mutation factor, deel ‘part’, heil ‘saviour’, heim ‘home’, scheiden ‘to separate’, teken ‘sign’, veem ‘court, company’, vlees ‘meat’;
without *mutation factor, allein ‘alone’, ein ‘one’, breid ‘broad’, eisch ‘demand’, gleid ‘slid’, leid ‘went’, leid ‘sorrow’, stein ‘stone’, vreise ‘fear’, weit ‘knows’, zweet ‘sweat’. He furthermore assumes that this diphthong was autochthonous. Hollandish words such as vleis, teiken, bleik, deil have been inherited by the Afrikaans language. Since many of these words never had an *mutation factor, van Loey (1967: 78–82) concludes that Early Middle Dutch ei in Flanders and Holland represented an archaic stage in the development of *ai via ei to “éè or eǝ”. The retention of ei in coastal Dutch would have been favoured by a following dental consonant and by an *mutation factor. If that is correct, the obvious question arises, why the same phoneme sometimes was retained as ei, and sometimes monophthongized to */e:/ and then became ie, in the same period (Late Middle Dutch), in the same dialects, and in the same phonetic environments (e.g., before nasals and dentals). A different explanation may therefore be preferable.

The raising of *ai to /iə/ (in particular before nasals and dentals) reminds one of that of the mid back vowel *ə to /ua/ or /u/ (before dentals) and to /u/ or /ou/ (before velars and labials), and the two developments may be interlinked. We know that North Hollandish experienced an early raising of old /a:/ and lengthened *a in open syllable to <ee>, which probably did not start later than the fourteenth century (Versloot 2012, de Vaan 2012b: 120–1). At the same time, Old Frisian loanwords in /e:/ developed ie in their Hollandish form, see §18, and compare Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 96; de Vaan 2010: 318–20, Versloot 2012. Bremmer (2012: 135) has made a good case for the view that a following r could also cause raising of long /e:/ to /i:/, viz. in vieren ‘to loosen’, derived from the Early Modern Dutch variant veer of ver ‘far’, and in the expression (op een) kier ‘ajar’ (of a door) to keer ‘turn’. Another probable instance of the same phenomenon is North Hollandish gieren ‘to slant’ (for usual geeren), gier ‘slanted piece of land’ (first attested at the end of the sixteenth century, Boekenoogen 2004: 142) to StDu. geer ‘spear’ < PGm. *gaizō-.\footnote{196} StDu. wier ‘seaweed’ < *waiza- (OE wār) probably also belongs here, as it is best explained as a Hollandish development from earlier *weer (see § 20.4 for a more elaborate discussion of this etymon).

Table 46. Chain shift aa > ee > ie

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sources</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ODu. *ā</td>
<td></td>
<td>ODu. *ae,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODu. *a + o.s.l.,</td>
<td></td>
<td>MDu. e /_r,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODu. *a /_r</td>
<td></td>
<td>OFri. ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shift /a:/</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>/e:/, /e:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>/i.ə/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{196} For this reason, it is less likely that North Hollandish gieren ‘to slant’ is a loanword from Old Frisian, as tentatively suggested by Versloot (2012: 114).
All these individual vowel changes can be viewed as forming a larger chain shift see Table 46: forms with Late Old Dutch or Early Middle Dutch /a:/ were raised to a mid vowel /ɛː/ or /eː/, and forms with a mid vowel /ɛː/ or /eː/ in Late Old or Early Middle Dutch were raised to /iː/.

This allows us to connect the initial stage */eː/; which most *ai-words must have known in Hollandish, with the dominant monophthongal reflex ee of *ai in Flemish. The entire coastal area may have developed *ai into */eː/; which then shared the raising to ie in Hollandish. In Flanders, it remained /eː/ but was pushed back from east to west in a process of lexical diffusion. The relic forms in ei, which occur both in Holland and in Flanders, and which have hitherto been regarded as unexplained (van Loon 2014: 214 calls them unexplained, but, on the same page, he says that “de oudere Hollandse [ie-]vormen langzaam zijn verdrongen door ei-vormen”), 197 must then be explained by a later development of /eː/ to /ei/ which mainly took place before dental consonants, and which is mirrored by the development of /oː/ to /ou/ before velars and labials. This does not work for teiken or other western words with ei before labials and velars, such as haim and bleik.

### 20.3 Dutch aa

A number of coastal Dutch words is reported to reflect WGm. *ai as a long, low vowel /aː/, sometimes shortened to /a/. Gysseling (1962: 12) notes the parallelism with the reflexes of *ai in Frisian and English, and calls Frisia the “focus” of this monophthongization. Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 78) likewise suggest that most of these aa-words must be regarded as frisianisms. De Vaan (2011a) proposes the following reflexes of stressed *ai in Old Frisian: long /aː/ <a> before Proto-Frisian *-u-, *-wV-, *-o- in the next syllable, and before the velar fricatives *-g- and *-h-; short /a/ before a tautosyllabic, post-syncope cluster CC; long /æː/ <e> elsewhere.

In the present section, I will review the alleged evidence for North Hollandish words displaying either the long reflex /aː/ or its shortened counterpart /a/. The shortened forms have also been discussed in de Vaan 2011a: 309–12.

1. aft ‘lawful’, a loanword from Old Frisian āft, eft ‘in accordance with the law; married’ < *aiwō-xafta- ‘law-ful’ (OHG ēhaft). This form occurs as a variant for Standard Dutch echt in a number of Middle and Early Modern Dutch rules and stipulations from South and North Holland (MNW s.v. aft), and in an Amsterdam charter from 1396 (CRM14). The adjective mostly occurs in the fixed collocations afte(n)dach ‘lawful day for judgements’, afte(n) claghe(n)

197. “the older Hollandish [ie]-forms have slowly been ousted by ei-forms”. 
'lawful complaint(s)', and *aftenstoel* 'seat of the judge'. The preservation of *aft* can be ascribed to the presence in Holland until the Late Middle Ages of originally Frisian law, based on the jurisdiction by an *asighe*.

2. *asighe*, *asich*, *azing* ‘officer of the law’, to OFri. ā-sega, -ṣiga, -syga ‘law-sayer’ (OS *cosago*). The Old Frisian term was apparently borrowed into Hollandish as /aː:sige/, and its etymological opacity facilitated the reinterpretation of apocopated *azich* as *azing*, a form first attested in a document from Kamerik in western Utrecht from 1388. This officer must originally have been known in all of North Holland, including Amstelend, and in Rijnland between Katwijk and Bodegraven (Blok 1963: 255–61). The attestation from Kamerik in 1388 is the easternmost occurrence, and it suggests that the entire area to the west of the river Vecht once had asega jurisdiction (cf. Blok 1963: 248). In Rijnland, the institution of *asichdoem* or *aasdom* ‘asegahood’, that is, jurisdiction by the *asighe*, lasted until the end of the sixteenth century. Gradually, this system was replaced by the inland system of *scheependom*, in which a minion of the law is called *schepen* (MoHG *Schöffe*). Blok 1963 provides a general discussion of Hollandish *aasdom* in the Late Middle Ages as well as a list of persons featuring as *azige* in Rijnland between 1311 and 1549. For the actual forms of the word, see MNW s.v. *asige* and WNT s.v. *azig*.

3. *atter* ‘pus’ and *aterling* ‘bastard, poisonous dog’ < *aitra-* ‘pus’ (StDu. *etter*, MoHG *Eiter*). In *etter*, Old Dutch *ē-* has been shortened to /e-/ before the cluster -tr-, compare *vet* ‘fat’ < ODu. nom.acc.sg. *fēitis*, gen. *fettes* from a PGM. past participle *faitida-* ‘fattened’ (Kroonen 2013: 124).

The a(a)-variants must be regarded as frisianisms because of their vocalism and their geographical distribution. Within Old Frisian, the existence of long /aː/ beside shortened /a/ before CC is well established (Siebs 1901: 1228–31, 1365–67; de Vaan 2011a: 309). The long vowel is continued in the Modern Dutch compound *aterling* ‘bastard, poisonous dog’, first attested in Junius (1567), a dictionary that gives mainly North Hollandish vocabulary. Kiliaan (1599) also brandishes *aterlinck* as a Hollandish word. *Aterling* also occurs among Hollandish authors from the seventeenth century such Bredero, Hooft, and Vondel, and continues in use until the twentieth century.

It cannot be decided whether coastal Dutch borrowed *āter* and *attr-* from Old Frisian or whether the short vowel in *atter* is due to a later, internal shortening in Holland. *Atter* ‘pus’ is found in literary sources from Holland from the Delft Bible (1477) to the present, as well as in traditional twentieth-century dialects of North Holland. Berns (1981) provides a small map indicating the occurrence of back vowel variants in Dutch and Frisian dialects in the twentieth century. The word occurs as *atter* in North Holland, *otter* in Westerlauwers Frisian (and on Texel and Terschelling; short a became o in front of a dental
through a recent development, cf. Hoekstra 2001: 724), and *adder and *atter in western and eastern Groningen, respectively.

4. Standard Dutch *boot ‘boat’ reflects PGM. *baita-, see § 20.4. Exceptionally, the word is attested in the 1290s in Calais with /a:/, viz. in the plural *baten (Quod nullus emat pisces recentes in baten ad opus extranei ‘that nobody buy fresh fish in boats from a stranger’; Calais, 1293), and in the compound *baetman ‘ferry-man’ (Calais, 1293), cf. Gysseling & Wyffels 1962: 22–4. Maybe, the word ‘boat’ is also hidden in the surname of *Boid de Bate, *Boid del Bate, *Boud de Bate (Calais, 1295, see Gysseling & Bougard 1963: 15; probably, the same person is referred to as *Boid du Batel in 1298 and 1299). The absence of aa-reflexes of ‘boat’ anywhere else in Dutch is striking. This strengthens the suspicion – hinted at by Gysseling & Wyffels (1962: 15) – that Calais *baat might be a direct loanword from Old English or Early Middle English *bāt. Note that French *bateau is a loan from OE *bāt with the addition of the Old French suffix – *el, as seen in the Calais name *du Batel.

In the 1163 statutes of Nieuwpoort, situated north of Calais on the West Flemish coast, an intriguing form *boiat occurs twice: de nave que est clincaboiait ‘of a ship that is a klinke-boot’, probably ‘a riveted boat’, and *de nave que dicitur *losboiait ‘of a ship called los-boot’, which may mean either a ship ‘with loose boards’ or a ship ‘to be unloaded’. MNW s.v. *losboard reads these words as *clincaboirt and *losboirt, with the word ‘board’. Yet Quak (2014) has a better solution, viz. that *boiat represents a form of the verb *boeien ‘to raise the ship’s freeboard with boards’. Compare the combination *omnes cum losa-boinga ‘all [ships] with a loose raised freeboard’ (1159–64; Letterswerve Toll). The parallel toll charter of Margareta of Flanders (1252) has *loseboynghe instead of *losbo(in) ga, the simplex is found in MDu. *boeyinghe ‘raising of the freeboard’. Thus *losboiat probably represents the weak participle.

5. The word WGM. *gaiza- occurs both as ‘spear, pointed weapon’ (OFri. gēr) and as ‘slanting or triangular piece of land’ (OFri. gāra < *gaizan-). The former meaning seems to be primary, as shown by the other Germanic languages and by its presence in Old Germanic compound personal names where it undoubtedly conveys the meaning ‘spear’. The regular development in Dutch is to ODu. gēr, MoDu. geer. The evidence for aa-vocalism is found in two groups of forms: Old Dutch personal names and place-names, and Middle and Modern Dutch appellatives. In the Old Dutch names, including those in coastal Dutch sources, we mostly find <e>. Only the Fontes Egmundenses sporadically have Garbrand for *Gēr-brand (Quak 2012a: 87). In view of the location of Egmond in North Holland, this may be a real Old Frisian name, and the same may be assumed for the names Garburg, Garhard, Garhelm, attested on the island of Wieringen between the ninth and the eleventh century. In Late Middle Dutch, some toponyms
are found with a spelling <ae> or <ai>, e.g., 1440 *die Ghaer* (Delft), 1544 *de Gairn* (Zoeterwoude), 1343 *Gaer* (Sint-Pankras). Since lengthened e often becomes /a:/ in Holland before a cluster rC, and sometimes also before a single r (van Loey 1980: 35–6, Weijnen 1976: 235, van Loon 2014: 225–6), these sporadic instances cannot be taken as evidence for frisianisms in Holland.

Several compounds in *geer* ‘speer’ show *aa*-forms in Holland and Zealand. *(N)avegaar* ‘auger, large drill’ < *naba-gaiza*- (OS nabugēr, etc.) is attested with <e> in the oldest forms: GEN.SG. *naueghers* (Bruges, 1282), DAT.SG. *naueghe(e)re* (Bruges, 1284, 1291). The first examples with <a(e)> are from Holland: *navigaer* (Egmond, 1388), *navegaer*, *navigaer* (Pelgrimage, Hol., 1450–1500). In Early Modern Dutch, when initial *n*- is often dropped, *-gaar* is typical for authors from Holland as against *geer* in Flanders and Brabant (see WNT s.v. *avegaar*; WVD II.6a: 238–41, and Boekenoogen 2004 s.v. *sluitauweger*). Kiliaan has *avegher*, but there he refers to *evegher*, *eggher*, which were the Brabantish forms. In modern dialects, the final syllable has been reduced to schwa: North Hollandish *auweger*, *auker* has /-ər/.

Another compound noun in *gaiza*- is StDuc. *elger* ‘spit, skewer’, MDuc. *ellegeer*, *ellegaar*, originally a ‘fork to catch eels’, from *êela* ‘eel’ plus *gaiza*-. The meaning ‘eel fork’ is still attested in Middle Dutch and Early Modern Dutch, where *a(e)*-spellings sporadically occur in Holland and Zealand but never in Flanders: *ellegaer* (Brielle, 1445?), Kiliaan *aelgheer*, *elgheer*. Whereas Cats in 1629 still uses *ellegaer*, the WNT attestations after 1650 all have the reduced form *elger*.

The name *Rutg(h)er* from *(h)ruodgēr* is attested in 1263 in Bruges as *Roetjar*. In Flanders, <a> might reflect a schwa (compare *vlaemscar* in Boekhoute, 13th c.), but in Holland and Zealand, we find <a> in names in *-gēr* in the fourteenth century: *rutgaer die hoetmaker* (Den Haag, 1391), *rutgheer rutghaers soen* (Gouda, 1361) from *ruod-gēr*, and *andries rengaers sone* (Zierikzee, 1370) from *rein-gēr*. Similar cases are *Reyngaer* (Rotterdam, 1313; Zealand, second half of the 14th c.) and *Noitgaer* (Leiden, 1412), cf. van der Schaar 1953: 176.

The fact that *gaar* reflects *geer* in unstressed syllable reduces its chances of it being a frisianism (pace de Vries 1942: 134). After all, the change to *aa* may be due to the unstressed position of the vowel. A parallel for the latter development can be found in the Middle Dutch forms for *here* ‘lord’ < WGm. *xairiran*-.

Mooijaart (1992: 120–22) points to the variation between *he(e)re* and *ha(e)re* which occurs in Early Middle Dutch addresses of the type ‘Lord Florence’. In these cases, *a*-vocalism is found in particular in Holland (in 82% of the cases in documents from the Count’s Chancellery, 76% in North Holland, 55% in

---

198. See also Marynissen 1995: 321–27 for the flexion of this noun.
East Holland, 78% in Utrecht), less frequently in Zealand (25%) and North Brabant (21%), and more rarely still in Flanders and other southern dialects. Examples are *pieter sharen tielemans ‘Pieter of Lord Tielemans’ (Dordrecht, 1285–86) as against *goswin, sheren sone van Diteren ‘Goswin, son of the Lord of Dieteren’ (Rijkhoven, Limburg, 1280–90). It is obvious, therefore, that it was the reduced stress of this specific syntactic use of here which caused the change to a(e), as Mooijaart infers. She combines this observation with the fact that *ai is sometimes reflected as aa in coastal dialects (as, allegedly, in Haamstede), and she therefore ascribes hare ‘lord’ to a combination of an “algemene Ingweoons tendens” (viz. of *ai to become aa) and “zwakke accentuering” [“weak accentuation”] in this specific context (p. 121). As she notes herself, the virtual absence of hare-forms in West Flanders would remain unexplained under this assumption.

To my mind, there is no need to explain these forms as frisianisms or ingvaeonisms. Firstly, it would not account for the occasional presence of hare in eastern dialects, such as in Maastricht, Neer (Limburg), Lubbeek/Heverlee and Mechelen (*haren claus van den vliete tspapen, 1291). Secondly, there is no indication of hare ever having been the only variant in Holland. Thirdly, the change to aa is also found in unstressed position in Holland in navegaar, ellegaar and in a few names in -geer. Therefore I propose to regard hare and the compounds in gaar as specifically Hollandish-Zealandish lowerings of the phoneme /ɛ:/ or /ɛə/ (from WGM. *ai) in positions with reduced word stress, such as the second member of compounds and appositions in titles.

6. haal ‘afterbirth (of a mare)’. TNZN Map 120 shows that the etymon haal for ‘afterbirth’ was known on Texel and Wieringen, in the Rijnland (around Leiden), in the Gelderse Vallei, on all the islands of Zealand and South Holland and in adjacent Northwest-Brabant, and in a small Brabantish area west of Mechelen. The map in TNZN is based on questionnaires from J. Goossens (1957), Meertens Instituut (1961), Nijmegen (1963), Ghent (1978, 1980), and other sporadic sources. This explains why the map ‘De naam voor de nageboorte van het paard’ in Voskuil 1969: 33, which is only based on the 1961 questionnaire from the Meertens Institute, shows haal only in Zealand, western North Brabant and southern South Holland, but not in Utrecht/Gelderland or on Texel and Wieringen. Voskuil’s map does – contrary to TNZN – show a few instances of a type heling, as well as haal, across Fryslân. These must probably be seen as imports from North Holland. Berkhey, *Natuurlyke historie van Holland 6 and 7 (1807, 1808) mentions heling a number of times for ‘afterbirth of a cow’.

199. The map in TNZN is based on questionnaires from J. Goossens (1957), Meertens Instituut (1961), Nijmegen (1963), Ghent (1978, 1980), and other sporadic sources. This explains why the map ‘De naam voor de nageboorte van het paard’ in Voskuil 1969: 33, which is only based on the 1961 questionnaire from the Meertens Institute, shows haal only in Zealand, western North Brabant and southern South Holland, but not in Utrecht/Gelderland or on Texel and Wieringen. Voskuil’s map does – contrary to TNZN – show a few instances of a type heling, as well as haal, across Fryslân. These must probably be seen as imports from North Holland. Berkhey, *Natuurlyke historie van Holland 6 and 7 (1807, 1808) mentions heling a number of times for ‘afterbirth of a cow’.
and Brabant may reflect lengthened *a or old *ä: haol /hɔːl/ in Hoekse Waard (HWW), /ɔːl/ in North and South Beveland, Tholen, Schouwen-Duiveland, Overflakkee, /æːl/ in Walcheren, /æːl/ in Goeree (WZD), /ɔːl/ in northwestern Brabant, and /aːl/, /ɔːl/ and once /æːl-/ in northwestern Flemish Brabant (WBD; see Map 45). For the interpretation of the vowel reflexes, compare the maps zaal and paal in FAND II/III.

Map 45. (h)_l ‘afterbirth’ as per WBD

The etymology of haal is disputed. WNT and Weijnen (2003: 140) suggest an etymological connection with helen ‘to conceal’, since the afterbirth is often referred to as the ‘cover’ of the foetus. This is certainly possible for southern

and western Dutch: *haal, haol could continue the feminine noun hale ‘secrecy, concealment’ attested in Middle Dutch and Middle Low German, OHG hala ‘cover, case, pod’ (EWAhD IV: 753). A different solution is introduced by van Haeringen (1936: 63) who stresses the synonymy of ‘healing’ and ‘afterbirth’ in the North Frisian dialects. Föhr hialing, Wiedingharde hjiling, Mooring hiiljing, Karrharde and Goesharde hjiling can be reconstructed as Proto-Frisian *hêlinge (Löfstedt 1963–65: 305, Sjölin 2006: 81), itself a transparent derivative of *hel ‘whole, healthy’. Van Haeringen sees a semantic parallel in East Frisian sundels ‘afterbirth’ to sund ‘healthy’. He somewhat rashly concludes that Dutch dialectal *haal has Ingvaeonic ą < ai, a conclusion adopted by various subsequent scholars.

In my view, the explanation of the Dutch forms as frisianisms is implausible. The only Dutch forms which seem identical to the North Frisian ones are those from Texel and Wieringen, which have the same suffix -ing. This prompts Versloot (2012: 117) to regard Texel ééling as a loanword from Old Frisian *hêlinge. Yet the absence of the word from attested Westerlauwers Frisian (which has haam, ham(me) ‘afterbirth of a mare’ instead) calls for caution. Also, the vowel /ɛː/ of ééling is consistent with the usual Texel reflex of Middle Dutch /aː/, as in skéép ‘sheep’ (Heeroma 1935: 36). Texel ééling may therefore just be the regular continuation of Hollandish *haal, to which the suffix -ing was added. A strong argument against explaining the other Dutch forms as frisianisms – apart from the lack of the suffix -ing – is that they are also found in western Gelderland and southwestern Brabant, which is too far east.

It is difficult to accept for Dutch *haal an etymological explanation from WGM. *xalō- ‘cover’, since the vocalism of the Brabantish dialects (where ‘afterbirth’ has either *a with open syllable lengthening or *æ without i-mutation) does not match that of Gelderland/Utrecht (which may reflect *e or *ä with open syllable lengthening; i-mutation of *æ; maybe *ai). One option is to stick to *xalō- ‘cover’, and to explain the Gelderland/Utrecht vocalism as deriving analogically from the verb helen. The semantic side of this etymology can be supported by the occasional occurrence – on Voorne-Putten – of the heteronym helm ‘helmet’, which is also used for the membranes surrounding a child at birth. Another possibility would be to posit a derivative *xanxalō- or *xanxilō- ‘instrument for hanging’ to the verb *xanxan- ‘to hang’. This noun is attested as ‘pothook’ in OHG m. hāhal and f. hāhala (in glosses, EWAhd IV: 744), OS m. hāhal, MLG hāl, MDu. hael, MoDu. haal, MoHG f. Hahl, Hähl. Kroonen

201. Within the Dutch dialects, compare the derivation of ‘afterbirth’ from genesen ‘to cure’ in Drente/North Overijssel and East Betuwe. ‘Afterbirth’ is derived from ‘to cleanse’ in Flanders and East Limburg.
(2013: 209) reconstructs PGm. *xanxilō- f.,202 beside which – if we take the Low German evidence seriously – *xanxalō- must have existed,203 as well as a-stem variants. The original meaning was 'hinge, handle', which has the Verner variant hangel (e.g. Plantin, hael oft hangel). Connecting 'afterbirth' to these words implies that 'hinge' shifted its meaning to 'what is hung up'.204 This would have a clear motive: the afterbirth was often hung from a tree, in order to beg for the foal’s good health and for other reasons. See Voskuil 1959 and 1969 for the spread and the background of this custom.

7. MDu. heesch, MoDu. hees 'hoarse' reflect PGm. *xais(is)ka-, a by-form of *xaisa-(OHG heis, OE hās). Other Germanic variants were *xaisra- (ON háss, E. hoarse), the latter with metathesis of *sr to rs (Kroonen 2013: 202). Some Dutch forms end in -rsch, e.g. Early Modern Flemish heersch; this would suggest *xairska-, unless <sch> is a hypercorrect spelling for <s> in all these forms. In the fifteenth and early sixteenth century, a number of Hollandish tokens have /a:/-vocalism: mijn kele is haesche gheworden ‘my throat has become hoarse’ (early 15th c.; MNW), haersch Holl. (Kiliaan, 1599), haars (Biestkens, 1619). Compare, from modern dialects, haars (Opprel 1896) or hoar(r)s (HW) in Hoekse Waard, haasten (< *haarsten) ‘to be hoarse’ in Zaanstreek (Boekenoogen 2004), hōós ‘hoarse’ on Texel (Jansen 1993), haers /hæːrs/ on Goeree (WZD). In Zealand, aes /æ:s/ with MDu. */a:/ is found on Schouwen-Duiveland and in eastern Zeeuws Flanders (WZD), but êê-vocalism occurs everywhere else.

The various Frisian dialect forms for 'hoarse' (Schermonnikoog haiz, Hindeloopen /hɔːs/, MoWF heas, FÔ huask, Mooring hüüsk) point to OFri. *hās(k) (Spenter 1968: 180, Sjölín 2006: 86, WFT s.v. heas). EWN explains the coastal Dutch aa-vocalism with reference to OFri. hās, which is unlikely because the r-variant is lacking in Frisian. The alternative is quite straightforward: the long vowel of Old Dutch *hērs(k) was shortened to *hers(k) in Early Middle Dutch, and then shared the lowering and lengthening of e to aa before r plus a dental obstruent which is typical of Holland (van Loey 1980: 35, FAND), as in kaars ‘candle’ < kerse, paars ‘purple’ < MDu. perse, vaars ‘heifer’ < MDu. verse, to mention only a few examples with a following s.

202. I-mutation is confirmed e.g. by the dialect of Bree (in northern Belgian Limburg) hīil-hōk ‘fishing rod, pothook, chimney crook’ < *hāhil- < *xanxil-, see Dupont 1922: 63.

203. Or, alternatively, the unmutated vowel was restored from the verb *xanxan > MDu. haen ‘to hang’.

204. Another alternative is to regard haal as a productive deverbal adjective in -el with the meaning ‘hanging’, in view of the productivity of -el in Middle Dutch (Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: 203–204). This view is better suited to explain why we have both hael and hangel for ‘pothook’.
8. The word *xaima- 'house, home' (OFri. hēm). From the Ghent personal names between 1000 and 1253, Tavernier-Vereecken (1968: 571–3) mentions no a-spellings for *ai. The toponyms in -ham from *-haim 'home', e.g. ernigaham 'Eernegem' (1084 copy 1141) in West Flanders, and in particular several instances in Nord and Pas-de-Calais, are explained by Gysseling (1962: 12) as written by Romance-speaking scribes, in which case they would be irrelevant. Alternatively, -ham could be interpreted as rendering an already unstressed *ai as <a>, compare nrs. 5 and 13.

The place Haamstede on Schouwen (Zealand) is first attested in the thirteenth century as Hamstede (Utrecht, 1296) and Hamestede (WHol., 1299). It has been interpreted as *haima-stadi-, compare Heemstede in South Holland (Hemstede in the 12th c.). The fact that Old Frisian only has vocalization of *xaima- to hēm and never to hām already casts grave doubts on the explanation of Haamstede as a frisianism. The first e of the attestation Hamestede would also be unexpected. There is an alternative explanation for Haamstede. VMNW points to a single occurrence of a topographical reference in den haem in a Ghent document from 1270. The dictionary hesitantly explains it as a lengthened variant of ham 'headland in marshy land', which is usually MDu. hamme with a short vowel. The latter has developed as 'land in the curve of a river' from a more general meaning 'curve, bay', which itself is metaphorical from 'back of the knee'. Indeed, as appellatives, Early Middle Dutch has hame 'back of the knee' beside hamme 'shank, ham'. Kroonen (2013: 207) reconstructs the corresponding Proto-Germanic noun as *xam(m)ō- f. 'shank', with variants with single *m and geminate *mm in the Germanic languages. Hence, Hamestede could belong to the toponyms in ham and contain hame 'curve' or 'headland'. The disadvantage of this approach is that ham usually occurs as a second member of compound names. It will be up to historical geographers to determine whether this is a decisive argument against the proposed etymology.

9. klaver 'clover' < WGM. *klæwr- (MLG klēver, klāveren; OE clāfre, clābre beside clēfre, clēfra, ME claver). The word competed with *klaiva-, as reflected in OHG klēo, OS klē, GEN.SG. klēwes, MoHG Klee. The earliest attested forms are MDu. clauere 'klaver' (WFla. gloss., 1226–50) and clavere (Fla., 1351). From the sixteenth century onwards, the word is better attested. The usual literary form in all western Dutch is klaver(en). The modern dialectal distribution is given in TNZN, maps 2.5 and 3.11, and in PLAND s.v. klaver. Van den Berg 1954 and Foerste 1954 have simultaneously tackled the dialectal distribution in Low German and Dutch. Map 46 reproduces Foerste’s map, to which I have added a name for each of the main geographical-etymological areas which can be discerned and which are separated by the dotted lines. The legenda: Type 1 = klee, 2 = klēver, 3 = klāver, 4 = klīver, 5 = klöver.
In the southeast of the Low Countries, in Ripuarian and in southern Westphalian, the type *klee < *kliwa- is dominant. The areas 2 to 5 all have the r-suffix. The form *kleevon of the large Low German type 2-area contains *ai (Foerste 1954: 399), and seems to continue the same preform as OE cláfre. In the Netherlands, however, not all dialects in the North Brabant-Gelder s-South-Hollandish *kleevon-area continue the same Germanic vowel. Foerste argues that the majority of the Dutch *kleevon-dialects have *ai, in agreement with type 2 in Low German. In North Brabant and North Limburg, however, the vocalism presupposes i-mutation of *æ. In Foerste’s view, this vocalism would be due to reinterpretation of *kleevon as the plural of the singular *kläver which oc- curs in western and southern Brabant (type 3). The other main deviation within western type 2, viz. *kleevon on Voorne-Putten, has open syllabe lengthening of *æ, which Foerste ascribes to contamination, maybe with *klever(boom) ‘ivy’. The /i:/ in type 4 *klevier (in the province of Utrecht) would be due to folk etymol- ogy with the verb *klieven ‘to cleave’, invoked by the ‘cloven’ leaves of the plant. The vocalism in the type 3 *kläver-area is interpreted by Foerste in the sense that the original vowel in this area was WGm. *æ, which left traces as /e:/ here and there, but is mostly found with the standardized, southern-central vowel /a:/ in type 4 *klevier (in the province of Utrecht) would be due to folk etymol- ogy with the verb *klieven ‘to cleave’, invoked by the ‘cloven’ leaves of the plant. The vocalism in the type 3 *kläver-area is interpreted by Foerste in the sense that the original vowel in this area was WGm. *æ, which left traces as /e:/ here and there, but is mostly found with the standardized, southern-central vowel /a:/ in type 4 *klevier (in the province of Utrecht) would be due to folk etymol- ogy with the verb *klieven ‘to cleave’, invoked by the ‘cloven’ leaves of the plant. The vocalism in the type 3 *kläver-area is interpreted by Foerste in the sense that the original vowel in this area was WGm. *æ, which left traces as /e:/ here and there, but is mostly found with the standardized, southern-central vowel /a:/ in type 4 *klevier (in the province of Utrecht) would be due to folk etymol- ogy with the verb *klieven ‘to cleave’, invoked by the ‘cloven’ leaves of the plant. The vocalism in the type 3 *kläver-area is interpreted by Foerste in the sense that the original vowel in this area was WGm. *æ, which left traces as /e:/ here and there, but is mostly found with the standardized, southern-central vowel /a:/ in type 4 *klevier (in the province of Utrecht) would be due to folk etymol- ogy with the verb *klieven ‘to cleave’, invoked by the ‘cloven’ leaves of the plant.
Map 46. Klaver according to Foerste 1954
name *honeysuckle* in English, and also, for instance, by Kiliaan’s (1599) *klaueren honigh*, which he glosses as ‘the best and sweetest honey’.

In the same year that Foerste’s article was published, van den Berg’s comment on the *TNZN* maps for ‘clover’ appeared. Its main novelty was the theory that the Dutch *v* had arisen from *w* before *r*. A change of the reverse sequence *rw* to *rv* is well known from many Dutch dialects, e.g., in *tarwe* ‘wheat’ in Limburg, Brabant and many western dialects (*FAND* IV, Map 199) and in *erwt* ‘pea’ in Drente, Overijssel and Achterhoek (*FAND* IV, Map 198). Also, Standard Dutch always shows fortition of *w*- to *v*- before *r*, and often of -*rw*- to -*rv*- too (*wringen* ‘to pinch’, *verf* ‘colour’, etc.). For Dutch, then, a development from *klaiwr*- to *klaivr*- is not very problematic, even though the change was apparently earlier and more pervasive in ‘clover’ than in other lexemes.

The original Proto-Germanic paradigm would have been an *s*-stem, with rhotacism of *z* to *r* in the oblique cases: nom.acc.sg. *klVwaz*, pl. *klVwezō* > *klVwiru*. Foerste (1954: 396) objects to this explanation because Old English did not know such a shift of *w* to *v*, nor does most of Low German. Hence, Foerste retains two different West Germanic stem forms. Foerste’s view is adopted by Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 78).

Recently, Liberman (2008: 26–31) and Kroonen (2013: 290–1) have returned to van den Berg’s hypothesis, and rightly so. The similarities between the two stems *klaiw*- and *klaibr*- are too striking to be coincidental. Commenting on English, Liberman argues that original *-wr*- may have become -*fr*- in Old English because word-internal *wr* was a rare sequence in the language. Kroonen reconstructs an *s*-stem paradigm with a nom.acc.sg. *klaiwaz* (which would have yielded type 1 *klaiva*- by a trivial shift to *a*-stem inflection), and a plural *klaiwizō*. In order to explain Dutch -*vr*- and Old English -*fr*- , Kroonen tentatively proposes that “the original paradigm *klaiwaz*, *klaiwizaz* may have given rise to a syncopated stem *klaiwz*- , in which the sequence -*wz*- developed into -*bzu*-.” I think that these explanations are complementary. The only road to a phonetic explanation runs via internal syncope, which made *w* and *z* adjacent sounds. But as far as I can see, -*wz*- was not a possible intervocalic cluster in West Germanic. In other words, -*aiwza*- would normally be realized as [-ajuza-]. In order to retain the stem identity as *klaiw*- , restoration of the final *w* may automatically have led to realization as its closest look-alike in phonemic terms, viz. WGm. *b [β]*. This may be the origin of the alternation between *klaiw*- and *klaibr*-.

Kroonen does not express an opinion on the vocalic alternation between *ai* and *æ*. Here, as in the word for ‘starling’, the low monophthong is found

---

205. This parallel was given by Foerste (1954: 407). The other alleged parallels for *ai* : *æ* which he gives are irrelevant: G. *Ameise* has original *æ*- , the dialectal *ai*-forms being recent; Early
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in western and northern Dutch, which has led to the theory that Dutch /a:/ is Ingvaenic, as per Van Haeringen (1936: 203). This was refuted by Foerste (1954: 405), who regards the eastward distribution of klaver as incompatible with such a view, but it has been reintroduced by Schönsfeld & van Loey and was recently adopted by EWN, who call the /a:/ “Noordzee-Germaans”. Schrijver (1997: 305) interprets the vocalic alternation in ‘clover’ as a sign of substrate origin. I think that, as in the case of wr versus br, it is preferable to assume that the alternation between *klaibr- and *klæbr- goes back to one single original variant. In view of *klaiwa- and its clear semantic connection to other words with a root *klaï- meaning ‘to stick, sticky’, such as *klajja- ‘clay’, the original vowel can only be *ai. It follows that *klaiw-z- first became *klaewr-, with the regular, lowered variant [æ] of the diphthong *ai before r, h, (h)w, before becoming *klæbr- as sketched above. In *klaiw-(a)z-, the diphthong is expected to yield */ɛ:/, but once the *w had become a fricative, the sequence */ɛ:β/ would have been unique in the language. Maybe this was the reason why the vowel was reinterpreted as /æ:/ and shared the further development of long aa.

10. ladder ‘ladder’ < *xlaidrō-. The dialectal distribution of ladder at the beginning of the twentieth century is shown by TNZN Map 1.4, where we find ladder in North Holland (lodder on Texel), the western part of South Holland, and in the whole of Zealand. The remainder of the Dutch area has the expected ee or ei: leer(e), ledder, leier, etc. The border between the types ladder and leere in Flanders is, in the twentieth century, identical to the state border between the Netherlands and Belgium, which suggests that ladder may have been known in West Flanders in previous centuries. Nonetheless, this distribution does not seem to have changed significantly since the Late Middle Dutch period, judging by the attestations from Middle and Early Modern Dutch (van den Berg 1938: 15–7, 45–50). There is one exception to this continuity, however: a few Middle Dutch attestations point to a long vowel /a:/: Middelburg (1364–65) ladren, Geervliet (ca. 1525) laderen, laeder. This /a:/ has subsequently disappeared from the dialects, but its previous existence means that we cannot be sure whether coastal Dutch borrowed an alternating paradigm with PFri. *hlād(V) r- vs. *hladr-, or only forms with *ā. In any case, the word was borrowed before the raising of Late OWFri. /a:/ to /ɛ:/ started. In Fryslân, the modern dialects have ledder, ljedder, ljerre or leider (Hof 1933: 162), which means that coastal Dutch ladder cannot be due to recent influence from Frisian.

Modern Dutch-Westphalian-Ripuarian amer ‘embers’ for *aima-uzjōn- can be due to contamination with *ēmōn ‘erysipelas’ (Kroonen 2013: 117); the verbs ‘go’ and ‘stand’ can be explained from their innerparadigmatic alternations in Proto-Germanic.
11. *van lieverlede* 'gradually, bit by bit' (VMNW s.v. *lieuerlade*, MNW s.v. *lade*, WNT s.v. *lieverlede*). The expression can be analysed as consisting of a preposition plus the feminine of the adjective *lief* ‘dear’ and the noun *lade*, MoDu. *lede*. In Middle Dutch, the expression *bi lieuerlade* ‘slowly, calmly’ first occurs six times in Bruges charters (1284, 1285). *Bi liever lade* and *met liever lade* are subsequently found in various other literary texts from Flanders, and in Melis Stoke’s chronicle of Holland. A variant is *met lichter lade*. The Hollandish literary texts of the early seventeenth century already have *met liever lee* and *van liever lee*, nearly exclusively with ee-vocalism. In dialects, however, *van lieverlaad* was retained, for instance, in the Zaanstreek (Boekenoogen 2004: 301).

The dictionaries have different explanations for the form *lade*. MNW interprets it as ‘load’, whereas later dictionaries compare OE *lād* ‘road’ < *laidō-‘journey’. The latter would give Dutch *leede* but OFri. *lāda*. This explanation, given by WNT in 1918, was already rejected by Franck & van Wijk (1912), but re-established by van Haeringen (1936) in the supplement to the etymological dictionary. Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 78) more or less adopt van Haeringen’s explanation. If correct, it would mean that *bi lieuerlade* meant literally ‘with a pleasant course’ (thus EWN), whence ‘easily’. But Franck & van Wijk object to this view on the basis of the early attestation of *lade* in West Flanders. We may add that the semantic motivation for the use of *lief* ‘dear’ in combination with a word for ‘road’ is not evident. I would therefore like to propose an alternative etymology.

In Middle Dutch, *laden* means ‘to summon’, and *ladinge* ‘a summons’. These juridical terms go back to PGm. *lāpōjan-‘to invite’ (OHG *ladōn*, OS *lathian*, see Kroonen 2013: 328) and *lāpō- f. ‘invitation’ (> Goth. *lapo*, ON *löð r*.). The latter noun would yield the exact form *lade* found in the oldest Middle Dutch texts – where *lede* is never found. The metaphoric use of *bi liever lade* ‘with a friendly summons’ as ‘calmly’ seems unproblematic, and can easily be understood from the disappearance of the simplex *lade* ‘summons’ from the living vocabulary. The replacement of -lade by -lede is problematic under any theory. Probably the most educated guess is given by EWN, who propose that *lade* was replaced by MDu. *lede* f., MoDu. *leed* ‘grief’ under the influence of the fixed, antonymic combination *lieve ende lede*, later *lief en leed (delen)* ‘(to share) happiness and sorrow’.

12. *schapraai* ‘cupboard’ (OHG *scafreita*, MHG *schaftreit*), a compound from *skapa- ‘pot, vase’ and *raidō- ‘row’. Most of the Middle Dutch forms hail from West Flanders, Zealand, and Holland, and have a-vocalism in the second syllable: *scaperade* (Ghent, 1376, 1377 CRM14; Damme, 1382–83), *scapraden* (Ghent, 1321–22), cf. Jacobs 1911: 180. The a-vocalism is explained as an Ingvaenic reflex of *ai* by Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 78) and by the
etymological dictionaries. We find *scaprede* in *Vocabularius Copiosus*, and Kiliaan has *schapraede* next to *schaprede*. Middle Dutch *schapreel* ‘cupboard’ (e.g. *scaperelen*, ‘s-Hertogenbosch, 1378) is regarded as a novel suffixation to earlier *scaprede*, which would also presuppose the existence of the *ee*-form.

In Early Modern Dutch, only *aa*-vocalism appears, in *schapraai* (Brabantish), *schapraat* (North Holland), *schapra* (Holland). In modern dialects, the word occurs as ‘pantry’ in all of Flemish (*WVD*) and in various other southern dialects, but not in Zealand or Holland. This distribution seems to reflect the recent spread of the Flemish and West Brabantish variant *schapraai* across southern Dutch.

Presently, the second syllable is stressed, but, originally (in Middle Dutch), *-rede* and *-rade* must have been in unstressed position. Hence, we must allow for the possibility, as with *-gaar* < *-geer*, that *-rade* is due to a development of (*ai >) *ee* in unstressed syllable.

13. *schout* ‘sheriff, bailiff’ < *skuldi-haitjan- ‘who calls for duty’ (OS *skuldhētio*, OHG *schuldheizo*, MoHG Schultheiß, Schulze, Langobardic *sculdahis*, sculd-hais, Easterlauwers OFri. *skeltata*, skelta, Westerlauwers OFri. *skolta*, skulta, OE *scylhdēta*, *scultheta*). The modern form *schout* has arisen through *l*-vocalization and the reduction of the second member of the compound: ODu. *skolthēti* in Latinized *scultetus* (1105) > Late ODu. *sc(h)outhēte* > Early MDu. *schoutete* > *schoutte* > *schoute* (this stage was reached already at the end of the thirteenth century) > MoDu. *schout* (*EWN*). One of the Middle Dutch by-forms is *schouthate*, the *<a>* of which is regarded as an Ingvaeanism by Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 78), that is, as the Frisian reflex /a:/ of WGM. *ai*. However, the *a*-forms are restricted to a few occurrences in Zealand and northern Flanders in the thirteenth century (Zierikzee, Saaftinge, Axel, Assenede). They are dwarfed by the usual *<e>*-spellings in the suffix in the same region. In the fourteenth century, *scoutate* is found in Dordrecht, Zierikzee, Middelburg and Aardenburg (*CRM14*), next to *scoutete*. Occasional *-ate* is best regarded as another instance of the reduction of *ai* in unstressed syllable to /a(:)/.

14. *spaak* ‘spoke’, allegedly from *spaiķon- f. (whence OS *spēka*, MLG *speke*, also *spake*, OHG *speihha*, Eastern OFri. *nigunspētze*, nigunspätzte ‘with nine spokes’ [< *-spaikja-], MoWF *speake*, OE *spāca*). All the older Dutch attestations have *<e>*: Early MDu. *speeken* ‘spokes’ (Dordrecht, 1285–86), *speeghen* (Bruges, 1350–85; *MNW s.v. schamel II*), also more generally ‘beam attached to an axis, screw jack’, e.g. *moederspeke endeleine speeken* ‘winch and small spokes’ (1432–68; *MNW*). The earliest *<a>*-forms are found in the sixteenth century and also refer to larger beams: *spaek* ‘winch’ (1567; *Nomenclator*), *specke*, *spaekte* ‘winch’ (1588). *Spaak* becomes the general literary form from the seventeenth century.
The word for ‘spoke’ was not counted as a frisianism by Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 78) or by the preceding dictionaries, but EWN claims that the /a:/ of spaak is a North-Sea Germanic development of *ai. There is a homonym spaak in Dutch, which derives from WGm. *spakō- and means ‘twig, branch, stake’: Early MoDu. spaecte ‘bar, stake’, OHG spahha f., spahho m. ‘osiers, twigs’, MLG späke ‘a spoke of a wheel’, späken pl. also ‘dry wood’, OE spæc ‘twig(s)’. It probably goes back to an original meaning ‘dry wood’, compare MDu. spak ‘dry, arid’, verspaken ‘to dry out’. Franck & van Wijk (1912) argue that speke ‘bar, stake’ interfered with the meaning speeke ‘spoke of a wheel’, spaak becoming the word for ‘spoke’ in Standard Dutch, though speek was retained in many dialects. The correctness of this scenario is clear from the distribution of ‘spoke’ as given in MAND: ee-vocalism from *ai is found, by and large, in most of Flanders of Zealand, in traditional dialects of South Holland, in Limburg and in Gelderland and Overijssel, whereas aa-vocalism is continued in eastern East Flanders, large parts of Brabant, South and North Holland, Utrecht, western Overijssel and Groningen. This distribution does not make sense in terms of the phonetic history of the dialects or of possible paradigmatic alternations within *spai-kōn- or *spakō-. It rather looks like a classic case of semantic disambiguation of two words which are closely similar in form and meaning. Some dialects have retained the *ai-etymon for the meaning ‘spoke in a wheel’, whereas in others, the *a-etymon of ‘twig, bar, stake’ has been adopted in the meaning ‘spoke’ as well. It is the latter ones that have furnished the standard word spaak ‘spoke’. EWN objects to this explanation, because spokes of a wheel must be made of strong wood, and are therefore unlikely to derive from a word meaning ‘dry wood, small twig’. But we do not have to assume a straight metaphor from ‘small, dry twig’ to ‘spoke’, since Early MoDu. speck can also refer to a large beam or a winch – as it still does in miller’s terminology. For spaak, we must in any case assume the shift from ‘small, dry twig’ to ‘larger beam’, and the slightly different shift from ‘twig’ to ‘not so large, but strong, round bar’ = ‘spoke’ is unobjectionable. Since the ee-forms for ‘spoke’ are found in coastal dialects from the thirteenth century, whereas aa-forms do not appear before the sixteenth century, this explanation for spaak ‘spoke’ is to be preferred over one that relies on contact with Frisian.

15. spreeuw ‘starling’ from *spraiwōn- (MDu. sprew) beside spraa(n) (MDu. spra once in Teuthonista from 1477, glossed as ‘a bird, thrush’) from *spræ̆ōn- (OHG sprāa, sprēa, MoHG Sprehe). In modern dialects, spreeuw is generally found in Holland, Flanders and Brabant, and in West and South Limburg (WVD, WBD, WLD). The dialectal variants in Brabant (spriew, sprief, spruw, sprjow) confirm the etymology with *ai. The variant spraa(n), spraon is found in the eastern Netherlands, from southeast Limburg to Groningen. The spraan-area
continues into Germany, where most of Ripuarian and Moselle Franconian have a corresponding variant (RhWb).

*Spraa(n)* reflects a West Germanic preform *sprē-ōn*- ‘the speckled one’, derived from the verb *sprē-an*- ‘to spray’ (MHG spræjen, spræwen, MDu. spreuen, spraien, Early MoDu. spraaien ‘to spray’). Because of the speckled feathers of the starling, ‘speckle’ or ‘speckled’ is a frequent naming motive for the bird, compare E. star-ling. The restriction of *spraiwōn-* to Dutch suggests that it is of more recent origin than *sprēōn-. Since *ai* can represent a secondary sequence of *æ* plus *j*, as in Du. blein ‘blister’, derived from blaaien ‘to blow’, *spraiwōn-* may be a derivative in *-wōn-* from the stem variant *sprējan (> spraaien)* of the verb. That is, *sprēj-wōn-* became *spraiwōn-.*

This explanation obviates the need to invoke expressivity (thus NEW) or different dialects. Schrijver (1997: 304) had proposed that “*sprāw-* (…) may ultimately reflect the Ingvaeonic treatment of *spraiw-*”, but the geographic distribution of the ā-vocalism in eastern Dutch and *ai* in western Dutch contradicts this suggestion.

16. *taling* ‘teal, small species of duck’. Cognate with ME tēl, MoE teal, and Early MoWF teling (1555), teeling (1614), cf. Buma 1974: 91–2. Groningen and East Frisian (Low German) have teelnk and taolng (Spenter 1975: 237). Middle Dutch has /a:/ in Holland, viz. in taeling (Hol., 1377–78), taling (Leiden, 1471), though Junius in his Nomenclator (1567) calls teeling Hollandish, too. In the course of the seventeenth century, teeling is replaced in the standard language by taling. Boekenoogen 2004 has taling, with an occasional variant teling, also as a family name Teeling, which mainly occurs in northern Kennemerland. Wieringen had telink (Daan 1950: 16, 152) and Texel tjilling (Keyser 1951: 201). MoWF tjilling reflects OFri. *tēlinge*, see Buma 1974: 91–3.

Most etymological dictionaries of Dutch and Germanic have assumed a preform *tail-* which developed into OFri. *tāl-* or *tēl-* and was then borrowed into coastal Dutch as a frisianism. Buma (1974) still defends this explanation. However, there is no evidence that Old Frisian ever possessed a form *tāling*, which makes Hollandish /a:/ difficult to explain. The North Hollandish form teling can be due to the local raising of MDu. /a:/ to /e:/. Versloot (2012: 117) assigns Hollandish /a:/ for *ai* to an Ingvaeonic substrate, though he duly notes that the vowel /a:/ does not correspond with the */e:/ which we need for Old Frisian. Since the extant forms of English, Frisian and Hollandish can all be explained on the basis of a West Germanic preform *tēλi-*, Spenter 1975 is justified in rejecting the reconstruction *tailing-.*

17. *vracht* ‘load, freight’ < *fra-aixti- ‘reward, rate, fare’ (OHG frēht ‘reward, recompense’), see de Vaan 2011a: 311–12. We find the expected Franconian front vowel *ē* shortened to /e/ in the Flemish form vrecht. The form vracht is found
in a much larger area than other words with a from earlier *ā (aft, etter, ladder). For instance, vracht is completely normal to the lexicographer Kiliaan (1599) and it is already found in Middle Low German. The only explanation I see for this remarkable spread is its use by Frisians and Hollanders as a commercial term in long-distance trade.

18. zwaag 'pasture' as an appellative (e.g. inden zwaech 1465, in die swage 1544) and in the toponym Zwaag (ca. 1312 Svaech, 1336 Swachdijc, 1396 Zwaech; van Berkel & Samplonius 2006: 528) in North Holland is a clear borrowing from Old Frisian *swāga < WGm. *swaigō- (OHG sweiga 'cow’s pasture', ODu. gloss sueiga 'herd'). It is found in Frisian toponyms such as Beetsterzwaag (1315 Suagh, 1504 Beeexterswage), compare OWFri. swāger ‘inhabitant of Kollumerzwaag’ (Gildemacher 2007: 36, Hofmann & Popkema 2008).

Summary

The evidence discussed above falls into the following categories:

Frisianisms:
- Frisianisms in Holland, sometimes also Zealand, which appear to have been transferred from Old Frisian to Old Franconian at the latest before the franconization of South Holland around 1100: 1. aft, 2. asighe, 3. etter, aterling, 10. ladder, 17. vracht.
- Local borrowing from Old Frisian in North Holland: 18. zwaag.

Not Frisianisms:
- aa arose by internal phonetic development from *ai within Hollandish: 5. toponym Gaar in Holland, 5. -gaar in unstressed syllable in Holland (navegaar, ellegaar, Rutgaer), 7. haa(r)s ‘hoarse’, 12. schapraai, 13. scoutate.
- Loanword from Old English (?): 4. baat.
- Etymology with *ai which gave aa internally in Franconian under specific conditions: 9. klaver.

It follows that the frisianisms are restricted to Zealand and Holland (with the exception of vracht, which became more wide-spread). The terms aft, asighe and vracht are closely related to the juridical and economical system of medieval Frisia, and were borrowed as part of that jargon. Zwaag is a term of local toponymy. Only etter and ladder belong to the unmarked vocabulary, although there may have been a technical connotation to ladder which escapes us now, and which was tied to the earlier Frisians (a ship’s ladder?).
20.4 Dutch oo

A small number of Dutch words in oo unexpectedly seem to continue WGM. *ai. Schönfeld & van Loey (1970: 78) suggest that they may contain Old Frisian ā, one of the two regular reflexes of WGM. *ai in Frisian (see de Vaan 2011a). Inherited *ā (StDu. aa) shifted to /ɔ:/ in many central, eastern and southern Dutch dialects, and Schönfeld & van Loey suggest that the problematic StDu. oo-words first acquired oo in the dialects in which aa regularly became oo, and were then borrowed into the standard language. The immediate objection which one can make is why only words in *ai would have been involved in this interdialectal borrowing.

In 1951a, Heeroma coins the term ‘derailed franconisations’ for a number of words in which the coastal Dutch vocalism does not directly reflect the inherited vowel of Old Franconian. Specifically for the words in which WGM. *ai is represented by oo, Heeroma (1951a: 84–85) assumes that the Old Frisian vowel */a:/ (< *ai, *au) was wrongly substituted by OFra. *ō (*au) instead of *ē (*ai), due to uncertainty on the side of the Proto-Frisian speakers. In Heeroma’s view, those speakers were replacing their native words with Franconian ones. This explanation was accepted by Bremmer (1993: 25–8, 1997a), but has been refuted explicitly by van Bree (1997a: 31–2), while Weijnen replaced it with an explanation of his own (1965a: 399) that involved indigenous Ingvaeonic rounding of /a:/ to /o:/.

Van Bree has two concrete objections to Heeroma’s scenario: (1) we would also expect the reverse derailment, viz. ee for *au, but this does not exist; (2) we would expect the derailments to oo (and others assumed by Heeroma) to be more sporadic than they are. I would add another, fundamental objection: the language contact scenario assumed by Heeroma is an unlikely one. He starts from the reasonable assumption that L1-speakers of Proto-Frisian would have imposed their own phonological system on the lexicon of their L2 Old Franconian. But he assumes, rather implausibly, that speakers were highly conscious about the etymologies of words: they would have known that the Old Frisian vowel which corresponded to PFri. *ā was either ē or ō, but not ā, the vowel of their own, Proto-Frisian system which was phonetically closest to ā. Whereas one may observe individual cases of ‘etymological substitution’ of this kind in modern, learned speakers, it is unlikely that such variants would survive for a long time in a situation of general language shift, in which the target language (Old Franconian) must have been well known and sociologically superior. Here is a discussion of the alleged evidence for oo from *ai:

1. boot ‘boat’. This noun has been discussed intermittently in recent decades. Rogby (1963) explains it as a ‘derailed franconisation’ in the sense of Heeroma 1951a, that is, with OFri. *bāt < *baɪt- as the source noun, which was erroneously
interpreted as having ā from *au by the Franconian speakers, who remade it into *boot. Bremmer (1993: 27) follows this explanation, and EWN s.v. boot is also sympathetic towards this view. The etymology as *bait- – which is only one of the possible sources for OE bāt – is thought to be supported by Old Norse beit ‘ship’ (in poetry) and Middle and Early Modern Dutch beitel ‘little boat’ (after 1445). Kroonen (2013: 48) reconstructs PGm. *baita- and surmises that it may have “originally denoted a small boat made of a tree hollowed out like a trough”. This may explain the derivation of ON beit from the PIE root *bʰid- ‘to split, cleave’ (PGm. *bītan ‘to bite’), but it is not certain that Dutch beitel directly continues a diminutive of the noun. Instead, its meaning ‘little boat’ may simply be due to metaphorical use of beitel ‘chisel; peg, wedge’: most ships can be characterized as ‘wedge-shaped’. As for *boot, Kroonen thinks that it could be a loanword from Old English or from OFri. *bāt (the latter is not attested but can be reconstructed on the basis of Insular North Frisian: FÔ buat, Mooring büütj). As we have seen in § 20.3, baat is only found in Calais, next to Old French batel, and it may well have been borrowed from English. So did boot go through Frisian mediation, or was it a post-1200 borrowing from southern Middle English?

It is slightly odd that Dutch boot is not attested before the fourteenth century, as opposed to older schip and schute. This could support its interpretation as a loanword, but not from the Frisian substrate, because we would then expect to find boot already in the thirteenth century. Another problem is the vocalism: until now, we have seen Old Frisian ā reflected in Hollandish as aa (aterling, ladder, zwaag) or ee (in various words), but not as oo. Thus, both the chronology and the vocalism suggest that boot, if it was a loanword, was borrowed from Middle English rather than from Frisian. The chronology and the absence of bāt from Old Frisian also speak against it being a ‘derailed franconisation’ of an Old Frisian word.

2. flikflooien ‘to flatter’. The Standard Dutch reflex of PGm. *flaixan- ‘to flatter (MoHG flehen) is vleien, attested from the thirteenth century onwards. A variant with oo-vocalism appears at the end of the fifteenth century, viz. in al dijn floeyen ‘all thy flattering’ (1460–80; Holl./Fla.). Subsequently, in a compound with flikken ‘to repair’, Early MoDu. flickefloyen ‘to flatter’ is found quite frequently with Hollandish and Zealandish authors. In northeastern dialects, such as Groningen, we find flooin. The variation between ei and ooi recalls the vocalism of ui2 (see § 19.5). Compare with a similar phonetic environment StDu. glui ‘straw for thatching’, a loanword from Old French gloi, glai, which surfaces as gloi in Bruges (1286, 1291) and as ghelie in Ghent (1288–1301). In Modern Dutch we find it as glei next to glui in Flanders, but as gloy, glui in Zealand and
South Holland, and glooi in northeastern Dutch. It seems possible, therefore, that flooien represents an inner-Dutch rounding of earlier vleien, with rounding due to the l. The distribution of unrounded (and, here, original) ei and rounded ooi is the same as in a number of words which have a secondary rounded diphthong of the type ui₂, such as wambuis and spuiten. Hence, there is no need to invoke a Frisian substrate, which would be unlikely anyway on the basis of the chronology.

3. North Hollandish MDu. oghen, hoogen ‘to lawfully possess, own’, 3sg. hooch ‘owns’, preterite (h)ochte, MoDu. dial. heugen ‘to belong to’ (Boekenoogen 2004: 178; MNW s.v. hogen). The Middle Dutch forms are attested in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in charters and town laws of West Friesland. The restriction to North Holland shows that the word was borrowed from Old Frisian āga ‘to own’ as a legal term.

4. lode/lo ‘creek’. Heeroma 1951a, fn. 4, explains MDu. lode, lo ‘creek’ as a derailed franconisation of OFri. *lāde, the unattested cognate of Franconian lede, lee < *laidō- ‘road, stream’, cf. OE lād. The oldest attestation is Morlode (1204, 1208, also later in the thirteenth century) for a creek on South Beveland, later called Maarlo, with a probable first member mōr ‘moor’; the same document has the place-name Morlodenesse. The usual form in Old Dutch is -letha, -leda, which occurs in various compound toponyms from Flanders, Zealand and South Holland, and -lede in Early Middle Dutch. But it is not certain that lode continues the same etymon as -lede. Van Durme (2011: 278) lists other medieval hydronyms from North and West Flanders which contain the noun lode, lood ‘creek’ (1138 Loth, 1257 Loet, 1297 Dorloet, etc.), and the word is also attested as an appellative (1379 plural looden). Weijnen (1949: 76) had proposed a semantic shift from ‘moor’ via ‘pool’ to ‘creek’, and Gysseling (1954: 58) had proposed to etymologize the word as *laupō-, although the further etymology is unclear. The oldest attestation Loth, from 1138, could show a genuine fricative th, in which case lode cannot be identical to lede from *laidō-. In view of these considerations, it seems preferable not to regard lode as a frisianism.

5. The Middle Dutch noun lootsman ‘pilot of boats’ (1389), MoDu. loods, is a direct borrowing from Middle English lodesman ‘pilot’ (cf. EWN), and can therefore be dismissed.

6. MDu. loosten ‘to redeem’. This verb was added to the dossier of alleged frisianisms in Bremmer 1997b, who compared OFri. lāsta ‘to perform, fulfill; pay’ < PGM. *laistjan- (OS lēstian, OHG leisten). The Frisian verb is once found translated as loosten in a Middle Dutch translation with Low German colouring of the Old Frisian Skeltanariocht (Bremmer 1997b: 44). The traditional
The explanation of MDu. *losten* is that MDu. *lo(e)sen* ‘to liberate, redeem, pay’ (cognate with OS *lōsian*, OFri. *lēsa*, MoHG *lösen*) was sometimes back-formed as *loosten* on the basis of the weak preterite, e.g. *losten* ‘they freed’ (EBrab., 1276–1300). The latter form could be reanalysed as the preterite of a present *loost-en* instead of original *loos-en* (van Helten 1887: §195, note 1). In Early Middle Dutch, the present still only has *s* or *z* (*VMNW* s.v. *loossen*). From the later centuries, *MNW* cites one passage from Jan Boendale’s *Der leken spieghel* from Antwerp (1330) which has *om ... te loostene* ‘for to redeem’, but the usual expression remains *om te loossene*. Under *verloossen*, *MNW* explicitly remarks that in many places, it cannot be determined whether we are dealing with *verloosen* or *verloosten*, and they give examples with the preterite and the past participle of *verloossen*. The use of *verloosten* in the present tense has prompted a separate lemma *verloosten* in *MNW*, where the editors list a number of instances from fourteenth-century texts from Brabant and Flanders, the majority of which contain a rhyming, literary figure combining *vertroosten* ‘to comfort’ with *verlosten* ‘to redeem’. Hence, we may safely conclude that *verloosten* arose as a back-formation to *verloossen*, and may partly have been supported by the rhyme with *vertroosten* ‘to comfort’. The fact that most attestations are from Brabant – and none from Holland or Zealand – further speaks against an interpretation as a frisianism.

7. *moot* ‘a slice of fish or meat’ is usually compared with English *meat* and derived from PGm. *maitō-‘portion*. To explain the vocalism, Heeroma considers a derailed franconisation. Yet the word is attested only once in Middle Dutch, viz. at the end of the fourteenth century in *Overijssele* (*MNW* s.v. *slim*), where frisianisms do not normally occur. The next known attestation is from 1561 (Coornhert, *Odyssea*), and subsequently the word becomes more frequent in Hollandish literature. Kiliaan calls *moete* Hollandish. Note that the spelling of the vowel (which Kiliaan took from Junius’ *Nomenclator*, which contains a number of north-hollandisms) suggests WGm. *ō*, or at least it allows for this possibility. In the lemma *moes* ‘mash’ (written in 1907), *WNT* considers a derivation *mōt-‘same root as *mati-‘food*. A viable alternative would be to reconstruct a noun *mōtō-‘portion, slice’ derived from *mōtan-‘to find room, be allowed’ (Kroonen 2013: 372), viz. as ‘allowance’ > ‘portion’. The preservation of ODu. *ō* as /o:/ in Holland (as opposed to its usual raising to /u/) must then be regarded as a dialectal archaism which made it into the standard language (see § 17.2.2 on the reflexes of WGm. *ō* in Holland).

8. *oot, aat* ‘wild oats’. One of the earliest written attestations of this noun is *hoote* from Zealand, in De Perponcher’s *Zeeuwsche Graanbouw* (1800), and
Bremmer (1993: 25) found *oot in an agricultural handbook from 1799 (by Ponse). According to Bremmer, “the word must be considerably older”. Earlier texts, from Early Modern Dutch, only have *haver or *evene for ‘oats’. In modern dialects, ‘oats’ is found as *oot or *ote, *aote in West Flanders, Zeeland, parts of Holland and North Brabant, in the Achterhoek, in Limburg and in Groningen (see _PLAND_ s.v. *oot). According to Heeroma (1951a: 84–5) and Taeldeman (1982: 279), *oot would reflect WGM. *ait-, as is found in OE ǣt, pl. ǣtan ‘oats’ (on which see Liberman 2008: 170–4). The oo-vocalism would be an instance of a derailed franconisation of Old Frisian *ā. Yet Weijnen (2007) points out that the word occurs as /ɔːt/ in Groningen, Drente, Achterhoek, and Limburg, where this vowel cannot reflect *ai; nor is a frisianism likely in eastern and southeastern dialects. Taking into account Zealandish ôôte (in Zuid-Beveland, Schouwen-Duiveland, Zeeuws Flanders; _WZD_) and Flemish *ote, Weijnen therefore reconstructs *aut- and *ut- for the dialectal forms; West Flemish *ate would be a direct frisianism which continues OFri. ǣ. Weijnen has certainly made a step towards a better solution, but several problems remain to be solved.

Firstly, beside *ote, *aote, West Flemish also had the variant *aat. The most straightforward explanation is that *aat represents a semantic specialization of Middle and Early MoDu. *ete, *et ‘food’ < *éta- (OS ǣt, OHG āz), a derivative of *etan- ‘to eat’. This noun is found mainly in Flemish texts. The shift from ‘(human) food’ to ‘wild oats’ can be explained from an intermediate stage ‘animal fodder’ which is actually attested for modern West Flemish *aat, *ate (de Bo 1892: 16).

Secondly, the distribution of /a:/ and /o:/ as given by _WVD_ for this word does not correspond with the usual variation for *a or *ē before dentals in Flemish (Taeldeman 1979: 62, _FAND_ II–III, Map 109). According to the map for ‘oot’ in _WVD_, aa-vocalism is prevalent in French Flanders and southwestern West Flanders, and is also found sporadically in the rest of West Flanders, and even a few times in Zeeuws Flanders. *Oot prevails in northern and central West Flanders and in Zeeuws Flanders. Yet before *t, we would expect a rounded back vowel from *a or *ē in all of French and West Flanders.

A closer look at the data from the various dialect enquiries which underlie the distributional maps for ‘wild oats’ in _PLAND_ and _WVD_ largely clarifies this issue. It turns out that the type *aat on the published maps also includes a large number of Flemish tokens of *oat or *oat, which are clearly naive spellings for /ɔːt/. In other words, many of these forms do match the usual Flemish realization of *a or *ē.

Here is a structured interpretation of the various types given by _PLAND_ and some new maps based on them.
With /æː/: one token of <éét> from Sint Maartensdijk (Tholen);
With /aː/: spellings representing /aːtn/, /aːt/, /aːta/, /haːta/ (Map 47);
With /ɔː/: /ɔːt/ and /ɔːta/, spelled as <oat>, <aot(e)>, <òòt>, <ôôt(e)> (Map 48);
With /oː/: /oːt(ə)/; (Map 49);
With ø-diphthong: spelled <å‑øtə>, <òò‑øtə>, <oowetə> (Map 50);
With /oːj/: (h)ooit, ôôite, oiøta: sporadically in West Flanders (not on map).

Map 47. Oot with /aː/ (dataset: PLAND)

A number of observations can be made on the basis of these data:
- West Flemish ooë can only continue *ā before dentals;
- èè on Tholen may also continue *ā;
- oo in Holland, Brabant and Groningen could reflect lengthened *ø;
- ao in Flanders and Groningen would be in line with *ā (before dentals in Flanders);
aa before t in southern West Flanders does not fit any established etymological sequence, but the restriction to this province (excluding French Flanders) is striking.

For Flanders, it is now possible to assume a single word āte ‘food’ as the source of the words for ‘wild oats’. On the island of Tholen, the same noun is found with the expected Zealandish reflex /æː/, whereas in most of French and West Flanders, it has the same vowel as e.g. in draad ‘thread’ in FAND: /ɔː/ or /oː/, and a diphthong /oːə/ in western West Flanders. The same vowel ā can yield the forms found in North Brabant and in Groningen. The /ɔː/ in Zealand and South Holland, and /oː/ in North Holland, cannot directly reflect ODu. ā, however.
We could assume that āte was the original word used in all dialects, that it developed into aot by regular sound change in southern, eastern and northeastern dialects, but to aet in Zealand, of which faint traces are left. It remained aat in conservative southwest Flanders. The form aot found in most of Zealand and Holland must then be borrowed from Flemish or from the inland dialects. A different solution is to posit two different lexemes: one being āte, the other being Hollandish oot. Weijnen 2007 suggests a preform *aut- or *ut-, but a suitable Germanic etymon of this shape is unknown. In western Dutch, oot could in principle reflect *ovet ‘fruit’ (MDu. ooft, StDu. ooft), compare Zealandisch hoot < *hovet ‘head’. But this is a last resort, since we have no other indications for this meaning of *ovet. For now, I prefer to explain Hollandish oot ‘oats’ as a loanword from inland Dutch dialects.

Map 49. Oot with /o:/ (dataset: PLAND)
9. *roef* ‘skein’ (of yarn), cognate with MoWF *reaf* ‘id.’ < OFri. *råf*. The word is cited as a derailed francaisation by Heeroma 1951a: 84, and is derived from PGM. *raif-* by Bremmer 1993: 27, who connects OE ärāfian ‘to unravel’, ON reifa ‘to wind’ (< *raibō-, according to Kroonen 2013: 402). Bremmer also claims that *roef* ‘skein’ must be separated from *roof* ‘fleece (of a sheep)’ < *rauf-. This separation is also advocated by MNW and WNT s.v. *roof-1* ‘robbery; fleece’ and *roof-2* ‘skein’. Yet I doubt that these represent two etymologically distinct words. *Roof-1* is used in Middle Dutch and in modern dialects for ‘sheep’s wool’, especially ‘the amount of wool that is shorn off one sheep per year’, ‘yearly yield of wool by a sheep’. For instance, in the Glossarium Bernense (1240, Limburg), *wollen roef* occurs as a translation of Latin *vellus*. *Roof-2* is used for ‘a certain quantity of wool, yarn, etc., which is rolled into a skein or a knot’ (WNT), e.g. *een roof wol* (Boekenoogen 2004), *een rooff van zijn beste garen* (Kackadoris, 1596), *roof gaerens* (Kiliaan, 1599). As WNT stresses, it is usually the weight or the size
of the roof that matters. This usage in quantifying wool or yarn is sufficiently close to that of ‘a year’s yield of wool’ for roof-1. Add to this the absence of the use as ‘skein’ before the end of the sixteenth century, as opposed to the much earlier and more widespread notion of ‘fleece’, and the safer assumption clearly is to regard roof-2 as a simple metonymical instance of roof-1. From ‘a woollen fleece’ and ‘a year’s worth of wool’, roof came to mean ‘a skein of wool’ and ‘a skein of yarn’. Since roof-1 is derived from PGm. *rauba- (see EWN), it has the expected Dutch reflex of *au.

10. roop ‘rope’ is a by-form of Dutch reep ‘rope; strip (of land)’ < PGm. *raipa- ‘strap’, compare OE ráp, OFri. -råp, MoWFri. reap, Gothic skauda-raip ‘shoe-lace’. Heeroma 1951a: 84 and Bremmer 1993: 27 list it among the derailed franconi-sations. In North Holland, roop was used for a specific kind of straw band used in thatching roofs. Boekenoogen (2004: 435) mentions an early attestation of the plural roepen from the accounts of Egmond from 1398. Kiliaan (1599) has roop ‘rope’ in Hollandish, Frisian and English, where “Hollandish” is certainly
based on the occurrence of roop in Junius’ Nomenclator (1567). In modern dialects, roop ‘rope’ seems restricted to North Holland and Groningen.

Since there is no indication that roop was ever found further south than North Holland, we may interpret the word as a borrowing from Old Frisian which took place in North Holland, directly on the basis of Old Frisian rāp. Similarly, for roop in Groningen and Low German, which mainly indicates rope made of straw, Remmers (1996: 156) rejects the explanation as a derailed (hypercorrect) sound substitution. Instead, he suggests that roop continues OFri. -rāp in the specialized meaning ‘rope (used in thatching)’ whereas Low German rèp was used in the general meaning ‘rope’. Note that, in North Holland, roop is neuter, whereas reep ‘chord’ is a masculine noun.

11. toon, a dialectal variant of StDu. teen ‘toe’. Dutch teen is the original plural of MDu. tee ‘toe’ < PGm. *taixwō-, which was reanalysed as a singular (MLG tē, OHG zēha, OFri. tāne, MoWF tean, OE tā, ON tā). MLG tēwe and MoHG dialectal Zewe require a Verner variant *taigwō- > *taiwō- (Schaffner 2001: 408). In Early Modern Dutch, toon, pl. toonen, is first attested in 1583 in van Berensteyn’s translation of de Guevara’s Sendtbrieven (from Amsterdam). The other literary attestations are from Bredero, Vondel, and other North Hollandish authors in the seventeenth and eighteenth century; see WNT s.v. toon. In modern dialects, a back-vowel variant toon(e), tooën, town etc. is found in North Holland, on Texel, Terschelling and Ameland, in Town Frisian dialects (which undoubtedly acquired them from North Hollandish), in northern Overijssel (Blokzijl, Kuinre, Scherpenzeel), and in all of Groningen and northern Drente (see Map 52).

This distribution is in accordance with the theory that Old Frisian tān was borrowed as /tɔːn/ into North Hollandish and into the Low German of Groningen before Westerlauwers Frisian raising of ā to ē, which began around 1450. It is less attractive to assume a derailed franconisation, as advocated by Heeroma 1951a and WNT s.v. toon, as this would have happened in two regions independently, viz. in North Holland in the thirteenth century and in Groningen-Drente in the fifteenth century.

Map 52. Toon ‘toe’ in northern Dutch and Frisian
12. *woer* ‘seaweed’, a coastal Dutch variant of StDu. *wier* ‘id.’ The latter form represents a local, Hollandish development from earlier *weer* < WGm. *ai*. We may reconstruct PGM. *waiza*- ‘seaweed’(?), whence OE wār, ME wōr ‘seashore, beach; seaweed’ (Löfstedt 1966: 56–7, Kroonen 2013: 567). The etymology as *wīra*- ‘wire’, found in earlier etymological dictionaries, is dismissed by Kroonen on the grounds that it would not explain the meaning ‘shore, beach’ in English. Besides *wier* (first attested in 1466 in Delfland), western Dutch also has the variants *woer* and *woor*, attested from the end of the sixteenth century. According to Kiliaan (1599) and Dodonaeus, *woer* is Zealandish whereas *wier* is Hollandish. Modern dialectal *ôôr, wôôr* ‘seaweed, duckweed’ on Schouwen-Duiveland, *wôôrzeise* ‘scythe for removing water plants from ditches’ (Goeree, Schouwen, Western Zeeuws Flanders) has *oo* from WGm. *au*, rather than Zealandish *œ* from *ö*. The fact that *woer* is found in Zealand, to the south of the *wier*-area, means that it is unlikely to be a borrowing from Proto-Frisian *wār* (though not impossible). In StDu. *woerd* ‘male duck’ (from PGM. *werdan-*) and *zwoerd* ‘bacon-rind’ (from *swardu-*), we find a Hollandish rounding of Early Middle Dutch -aard- to -oerd- and -oerd-. Therefore, *woer* ‘seaweed’ might reflect earlier *waar*, which could either be a loanword from Old Frisian or a local development of *ai* in unstressed syllable. Or did Zealandish *wôôr* adopt the vowel of the words *gôôr* ‘duckweed’ (StDu. *goor* ‘mud; moor’), which had become very similar in meaning?

Summary

The evidence discussed above falls into the following categories:

- Frisianisms in North Holland: 3. *ogen, 10. roop, 11. toon.*

In conclusion, only *ogen, roop* and *toon* are clear frisianisms, but we must interpret them as direct borrowings from attested Old Frisian words with ā, viz. āga, rāp and tāne, not as hypercorrect franconizations.
The regular reflex of *au in Standard Dutch is oo, except in front of WGm. *w, where we find ou (schouwen ‘to watch’, houwen ‘to hew’), cf. Schönfeld & van Loey 1970: §66, van Loon 2014: 118–21. The monophthongization to /o:/ or /ɔː:/ can be dated after 639, judging by the form Sclautis (639 copy 941) for ‘Sloten’ in East Flanders. On the basis of Gaotbertus, Werengaotus (714, North Brabant), and Rauchingus = Rohingus (726, Antwerp), van Loon (2014: 119) dates the shift to the first quarter of the eighth century. A date somewhere in the eighth century would be in line with what is found in Old High German, cf. Braune & Reiffenstein 2004 §45. After 900, when Old Dutch sources become more numerous, we find only monophthongized vowels. Some words in *au are found with a deviating reflex aa in coastal Dutch, which has been linked to Frisian substrate (§ 21.1). Small sets of forms in oe and eu must also be discussed (§ 21.2).

21.1 Dutch aa

Gysseling (1962: 9–11) claims that Flanders and all of Northern Germany sporadically display a reflex ā of the diphthong *au. Since *au > ā is the regular Old Frisian development, Gysseling surmises that ā radiated from Frisia. It is found in a number of toponyms but has also been claimed for a few appellatives. For Flanders, an earlier collection of ā-forms is provided by Mansion (1924: 114–7), who calls them ingvaeonisms. Gysseling’s collection is integrated into the discussion below, though I leave out elements of his enumeration that are obviously Old Frisian, such as words from the provinces of Groningen and Fryslân. In Old Saxon, the more usual reflex of *au is ů, but ā is found sporadically too, as in the Helian (ms. M, C, Straubing fragments), in glosses and in names; examples include bım ‘tree’ (Helian C) and brād ‘bread’ (Gallée 1993: 75–6). Krogh (1996: 283–86) offers a more elaborate collection of Old Saxon forms, and interprets the vacillation between <o> and <a> as evidence for an open vowel /ɔː:/, which seems plausible. Krogh (p. 279) also assumes that the occasional spelling of *au as <a> instead of <o> in Old Dutch points to the vowel having a more open articulation at this stage than in the present-day dialects.
1. Adinkerke in West Flanders is attested with A- and O- in Old Dutch: 1123 Adenkerka, 1132 Odecherca, 1139 Adenkerke, 1159 Odenkercha, Odenkerka. After 1500, we find 1513 Adinkerke, 1537 Aeyenkercke, 1566 Oyenkerke, 1650 Oye Kercke, modern pronunciation /ˈo.jnɛkərk/. Debrabandere et al. (2010: 26) conclude that the etymology *Audan *kirika ‘Audo’s church’ is ascertained by the vacillation between A- and O-. The form in A- has apparently prevailed in the local dialect, where /o:/ is the regular reflex of Old Dutch */a:/ before dentals. Since the names Odo, Oda, Odbertus, etc., which contain the same name *audan-, are only spelled with O- in the Old Ghent documents after 1000, it appears that Adenkerka may have been a petrified form of the name already in 1123.

2. Asthusa (12th century copy ca. 1420) ‘Oosthuizen’ (NHol.). In view of the time and place, this could be a genuine Old Frisian form, comparable to the toponyms in Ast- ‘east-’ < *austa- in the province of Fryslân. The same conclusion holds for the consistent spelling with A- of ‘Oostbroek’ near Velsen in North Holland: Astbroech, in Asbroke, in Astbroeke (all 1130–61 copy ca. 1420).

For ‘Oostdonk’ in East Flanders, the earliest certain instance is Ostdunc (1213). An attestation Asdunc (end of 9th c. copy 941) is cited for the same place by Gysseling (1980), who cautions that there are doubts whether this toponym can be identified with present-day Oostdonk.

3. Hollandish baken and beken ‘beacon’ have been discussed in § 19.3, where it was concluded that they represent a frisianism, i.e. a borrowing of Old Frisian *bāken.

4. De Bangert occurs as a toponym in West Friesland, and van Berkel & Samplonius (2006: 42) mention that bangert and bamgert already occur as toponyms in the Late Middle Ages in this region. It seems likely that they contain Old Frisian bām ‘tree’.

5. The toponym Dodeman in East Flanders is transmitted in the Liber traditio-num S. Petri Blandiniensis as (in tercio loco qui dicitur) Datnesta (820–22, copy 941), Dotnest (966), Dotnest (820–22 copy 941 copy middle 11th c.). Mansion (1924: 114) suggests that the name contains /dād-/ ‘dead’ from *dauþu-. The same adjective also occurs in ODu. Dodachre (abl.sg.) ‘Doodakker’, which suggests that ‘dead’ means ‘infertile, barren’ or ‘with stagnant water’ (ONW).206 The only other name certainly containing -nest in Gysseling’s toponymical dictionary is Odeuarsnest (1223) ‘Stork’s Nest’ in eastern East Flanders.

Tavernier-Vereecken (1968: 529) also mentions Vinxnest ‘Finch’s Nest’, which she tentatively interprets as an original name in -nesse ‘-ness’. Since Vinc

206. Also found in MDu. doo(l)lage, Early MoDu. doo(d)lage ‘marshy soil’, literally ‘dead location’, see MNW s.v. dootlage and WNT s.v. doolage.
‘finch’ is also used as a personal name in the thirteenth century in Flanders (VMNW), we might consider an alternative analysis for Dotnest, Datnesta as containing a personal name in the first member, but there is no good candidate. The name Dodo, Early MDu. Dode (see VMNW) is found in Old Dutch attestations of a number of place names, such as Dodewaard in Gelderland, Doenrade in Limburg, Dodenhauen in Hessen, and Dodenhofen and Damvillers in Lorraine. Yet the name Dodo contains WGm. *Dōd-, with a vowel that would not normally surface as <a>; nor would we expect the stem Dodon- to have lost the nasal suffix before 1000 AD, when Datnesta and Dotnest are attested. Hence, we must for now stick to the interpretation as ‘Dead Nest’.

6. Vronen, a former settlement in West Friesland, is attested in Old Dutch as Uranlo (9th c. copy 10th c. copy end 11th c.), Franlo (1083 false 12th c.) and several times as Vronlo (1063 copy 12th c.). The spelling <a> occurs in documents from the abbey of Egmond, whereas <o> is found in documents issued in Echternach (communication by Arend Quak, talk in Leiden on 12 April 2014). The name probably contains the gen.sg. *frawan ‘lord’s’ (van Haeringen 1936). In view of the place and time, Fran- probably represents a genuine Old Frisian form /frän-./

7. Noordwijk in South Holland is attested in Old Dutch as Norhtgo (9th c. copy 10th c. copy end 11th c.) and Northgo (1064 copy middle 12th c.) with /o:/ in the final syllable but also as Nordtha (889 copy 1206–26 copy 15th c.; probably an error for *Nordcha) and Nortga (1083 false 12th c.) with /a:/ Thus, the name seems to contain ‘north’ and the word *gaw, *gauj-, whence OFri. gā but ODu. gaw, gōi. The forms in *-cha and -ga then show the Old Frisian development of *au to /a:/, whereas the forms in -go represent its Franconian equivalent (Gysseling 1962: 10).

The subsequent forms show the path by which -go came to be replaced by -wijk. Around 1200, we find -ge in Nortghe (1199), Nortge (1205) and Norghe (1222), and -ke in Northeke (1168 copy ca. 1200), Nordeke (1198), and Nordeka (1220), Nodicke, Nortike (13th c.). Here, the final vowel has been reduced to e. Furthermore, an anaptyctic vowel developed between t/d and k/g and final e was dropped, giving Noirtich (1231), Noortich (15th c.). Folk etymology gave rise to Nortdijc, Nortdike (late 13th c.) and finally to Noertwijc (sporadically after 1450). The introduction of the element wijk is probably due to the pronunciation of nearby Katwijk as kattek. By means of hypercorrection, /no:r:twi:k/ (which is still the local dialectal pronunciation) could be reinterpreted as Noordwijk (Schoonheim 1992, followed by Van Berkel & Samplonius 2006: 324–5).

8. koog, kaag ‘land outside the dike’. The etymology of this western Dutch toponym as *kaig- or *kaug- is disputed; cf. Boutkan 1998a, EWN s.v. koog, and Versloot 2012: 117. Modern Westerlauwers Frisian has keech ‘land outside the
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dike; salt marsh'. On the strength of the comparison with North Hollandish *kogge* ‘land outside the dike which has been or must be reclaimed’ (MNW s.v. *cogge*) from *kugg*- (Boutkan 1998a: 116), I favour a reconstruction with internal *u*, hence *kauga-, for Koog and Kaag. The oldest attestations are ODu. *cache* (1116; location unknown), *abbatis cache* in Harragan (NHol., 1105–19), MDu. *coech* (1319), *coich* (1322), *caech* (1354). See ONW and Quak 2003: 289 for the Old Dutch evidence.

Versloot (2012: 116) provides a map of old and modern toponyms of the form *kVg* in Holland and Fryslân. *Kaag* is found around Leiden in South Holland and in West Friesland; it also used to be applied to parcels of land in Zaanstreek (cf. Boekenoogen 2004: 209). *Koog* and variants appear everywhere in North Holland; *kogge* is rarer, and occurs only in central West Friesland. The Frisian form *keech* appears in toponyms in northern Fryslân, and, according to Boekenoogen, it was also used at the end of the nineteenth century in Texel and Wieringen, although the modern dictionary of Texel (Jansen 1993) does not mention it. These data would be easiest to explain if *kaag* reflects Old Frisian *kāg*, which survived as a toponym in coastal Dutch but not further south than the Rhine estuary. At the same time, *koog* would represent the normal Franconian outcome of *kauga-. The form *keeg* in Texel and Wieringen could reflect the internal, North Hollandish raising of MDu. /a:/, compare Texel /lɛ:x/ for StDu. *laag* ‘low’.

9. Early Modern Dutch *lichte laeye* ‘red-hot flame’ (1599), *lichter-laey branden ‘to burn fiercely’ (1630), *in lichter laeye staan* ‘to be ablaze’ (1666), is a compound of *licht* ‘clear’ and the noun *laeye, laye* ‘flame’, itself attested from the middle of the fourteenth century. A denominal derivative is the verb MDu. *layen* (1460), MoDu. *laaien* ‘to be ablaze; to glow with vehemence’. MDu. *laeye* has the same meaning as OS *lōgna*, OHG *loug*, OE *lēg*, ON *leygr* ‘flame’, all from PGm. *laugi-*, so it is probably related. The expected Middle Dutch outcome of *lauga-* or *laugi- would be *loogh(e)*, which also exists: *die loghe* ‘the fire’ (Antwerp, middle of 14th c.), *an lichter looch* ‘ablaze’ (Holland, 1481), Early MoDu. *loogh* (Hooft, Witsen).207

In the absence of another likely source for *laeye*, and since the expressions *in lichter laeye* and *an lichter looch* are so similar, it might be assumed that *laeye* represents a coastal Dutch adoption of the expected Proto-Frisian reflex *lāg- or *lēj- of WGm. *laugi-*. Yet this solution is not without its problems. Firstly, already in the fifteenth century, some of the attestations for *laaie* come from Brabant. Secondly, on the basis of other coastal Dutch words in which PFri. *ē

---

207. In principle, *loghe* can also reflect *luga-*, another variant for ‘flame’ in the Germanic languages.
has given western *ie* or *ee*, PFri. *lēj- should rather have become coastal Dutch *lieje*, or, perhaps, *leeje*. The outcome *lāaie* would be unexpected.

In view of these difficulties, Franck & van Wijk 1912 propose an alternative connection of *lāeye* with *lauw* ‘lukewarm’, OHG *lāo*, from *xlēwa-*, beside which a variant *xlēja-* can be reconstructed for ON *hlær* ‘warm, mild’ (Kroonen 2013: 231). From an adjective *xlēja-*, a derived noun *xlējō- ‘fire’ or ‘flame’ would regularly lead to MDu. *lāye*, compare *zaaien ‘to sow’ from *sēan*, etc.

This solution seems preferable.

10. North Hollandish *laan(tje)* ‘trading capital’ (Boekenoogen 2004: 288). Versloot (2012: 117) considers *laan* a possible borrowing from OFri. *lān ‘salary’, the cognate of Dutch *loon* ‘id.’ < WGm. *launa-. Yet *laan(tje)* is only given in two figures of speech by Boekenoogen. The first one is *Der is ‘en hele laan toe nodig om zo’n zaak te beginnen* ‘One needs a whole laan to start such a business’. To my mind, *laan* can just be the usual word *laan* ‘avenue’, used in a figurative way. Compare the expression *een laan leggen met iemand* ‘to reach an understanding with someone’, given by Boekenoogen s.v. *laan* ‘avenue’.

11. Roomburg, nowadays an eastern suburb of Leiden, is attested as *Radenburch* (1083 false 12th c.), *Radenburgh* (1101–1200 copy ca. 1420), and *Rodanburg* (918–48 copy 10th c. copy end 11th c.). The alternation between *Rad- and Rod-* suggests that the first member contains Old Frisian *rād = Old Franconian rōd ‘red’ < *rauda-. The *Rodanburg* is situated where the Roman castellum *Matilo* was located, which is why van Loon (2000: 38, 73) suggests that -*burg may be a direct indication of the former Roman settlement. With respect to the vocalism, note that the form *Rodan-* is attested in the Utrecht Register of goods, which goes back to the ninth century, whereas *Radenburch* stems from a younger document issued in Egmond.

12. Voorschoten (South Holland), south of Leiden. The oldest attestations are *Forschate* (918–48, copy end of 11th century) and *Uorscot* (1204 copy 1208). The first element of the compound may reflect a river name *furō- (also reflected in the name of Voorburg), whereas the second member must represent *skauta- ‘higher, sandy ridge amidst marshy grounds’, which exactly fits the situation of Voorschoten. Two other places with <a> from *skauta- in Holland are *Scata ‘Schoot’, a settlement that has disappeared beneath the younger dunes, north of Noordwijk, in the same Register of Goods; and *Scatan* (1125–30 copy ca. 1420), a northern suburb of Haarlem which is usually spelled as *Scotan* in the same period.


14. Vlaming ‘Fleming’, Vlaams ‘Flemish’, Vlaanderen ‘Flanders’. Dhondt & Gysseling (1948) show that, in the oldest documents of the eighth and ninth centuries, the term ‘Flanders’ only refers to the northwestern part of West Flanders, especially the coastal plain north and west of Bruges. The same authors also provide an extensive overview of the earliest attestations of the words ‘Flemish’ and ‘Flanders’ in Dutch, other Germanic languages, Old French, Old Irish and Latin. It is clear that the earliest forms in the local language were *flāminga- for the inhabitants, *flāmiska- for the adjective ‘Flemish’, and the dat.pl. *in *flāndrum for ‘in Flanders’. In Old English, Old Norse, German, and central and eastern Dutch, regular i-mutation led to a stressed vowel /e:/ in both adjectives, as in Early MDu. vlemesch and vleming. The form *flāndr- probably goes back to *flām-dr-, since the reverse hypothesis (viz. original *flān-) would not explain the forms in flām-. Yet whether the occasional spelling vlaemdren in the late thirteenth century from Bruges and Ghent (4x in total) preserves an old m seems questionable.

Dhondt & Gysseling adopt the following reasoning to arrive at an etymology. 1. There is no Germanic etymology for a hypothetical West Germanic form *flæm- which would regularly give Old Dutch *flām-. 2. ODu. *ā can also reflect Ingvaenonic *ā from WGm. *ai or *au. 3. WGm. *ai leads to no known etymology, nor would it explain OE Fleming. 4. This leaves WGm. *flauma- or *plauxa-. 5. A preform *plauxma- is preserved in OE flēam, flæm ‘flight’, but *plauxm-inga- ‘refugee’ (and similar variants) does not explain the semantics of Vlaming. 6. This leaves PGM. *flauma- ‘stream’ (cf. ON flaumr ‘eddy’, MoE fleam ‘drainage ditch’; Kroonen 2013: 145) as the only viable alternative. 7. The word ‘stream’ may have shifted to ‘inundation’ whence ‘inundated area’, and this would have referred to the Flemish coastal plain, which was characterized by creeks and inlets of the sea. 8. WGm. *flauma- would have given Proto-Frisian *flām-, whence *flām-inga- ‘inhabitant of the inundated area’ and *flāmiska-. 9. The name of the region would contain a derivational suffix *-dra/ō-, hence *flaumdra- ‘inundation’ > *Flāndra-.

A number of objections can be made to this concatenation of hypotheses. Morphologically, the derivational step which would create *flaumdra- seems very uncertain, since *-dra- is usually added to verbs, rather than to ready-made derivatives. Philologically, there is no evidence of an interchange between <o> and <a> in the words for ‘Flanders’ and ‘Flemish’. Therefore, the starting hypothesis that we must reconstruct an Old Dutch word in /a:/ reflecting Ingvaenonic
or Proto-Frisian *ā from WGM. *ai or *au, remains an uncertain conjecture. The explanation of the suffix in *flāndrum is problematic within any theory. The closest comparandum seems to be Taxandria, from Caesar’s Texuandria. This is explained as *texswa-ndr- ‘facing the right, southern’ by ONW s.v. *Tehswandralōn ‘Tessenderlo’. One wonders if it might have been *texswan-ra-, that is, a ra-adjective to an n-stem noun or adjective ‘the right (side)’.

15. zode ‘sod, turf’ < *saþan- m. (OFri. sātha, MoWF seadde, Schiermonnikoog sāde). The noun is found in two variants in western Dutch, with oo-vocalism from *au and with aa. The oldest tokens are toponyms from North Holland: Saden near Zaandam (ca. 1180), in Sadenhorne (1130–61 copy ca. 1420). The noun appears in Flemish as dat.pl. soeden ‘meadow’ (1151–75, EFla.) but also as pl. saden (Grauw, EFla., 1260; Der Natueren Bloeme, 1287). Later, zaden appears in the accounts of Ghent (1336) and in van Maerlant’s Spieghel Historiael, derde partie (1301–25). Early modern literary attestations (e.g., 17th-century sg. soo, pl. zoom) and modern dialects (e.g., North Holland zood, Zealand zôôe) confirm etymological *au. The aa-forms are decidedly rare; if they are due to borrowing from Proto-Frisian, they represent the very last traces. But the fact that they are only found in Flanders (the North Hollandish forms can be real Old Frisian), just like Datnesta and Adinkerke, casts doubts on this scenario.

The word MDu. saddijc, saddic, zaddik ‘pit or ditch which was created by excavating the ground for the purpose of making a dike with the dug-up earth’ also contains the aa-variant. It is probably a local frisianism of North Holland, and was borrowed from OFri. sāthdīk, saddik ‘piece of land where sods were dug, pit from digging sods’ (> Late OFri. sadeke > MoWFri. saats; cf. Hoekstra 2010: 101–104). Compare, from the by-laws of Edam (1467), the different vocalism of ‘sods’ and zaddick: soo wye enighe versche zoden gebrocht hadde op sijn werf of hofstede, die sal bewisen dat zaddick waer se ghedolven sijn ‘whoever had brought some fresh sods (zoden) to his yard or farm, he shall show the zaddick where they were dug’. See Boekenoogen 2004: 440–441 for further attestations from North Holland.

Summary

It has turned out that nr. 9. lichte(r) laeye, and nr. 10 laan, are irrelevant for the present discussion, and the etymology of nr. 14. Vlaam- is unclear. The remaining evidence falls into three categories.

b. Frisianisms in North and South Holland: 3. *baken*, 7. *Northga*, 8. *kaag*, 11. *Roomburg*, 12. *Voorschoten, Scata(n)*, 13. *-Slat*. Four of these six words are place names, and *kaag* is a field name. The word *baken* is the only non-toponymical lexeme, though even this word is a denomination for a specific spot on the land.

c. Flemish words with interchange between <a> and <o>: 1. *Adinkerke*, 5. *Datnesta*, 15. *zode, zade*. Two of these words are place-names, which may explain why they could be remnants of a Proto-Frisian layer. All have a dental stop after the <a>, though this may be a coincidence. The rarity of the spelling <a> (Adinkerke next to Odenkerka, Datnesta next to Dotnest, zade next to zode) leaves room for a different explanation. West Germanic *au* first became /ao/ and then /ɔ:/ in the eighth century. It seems conceivable that this phoneme could phonetically vary in terms of rounding, and that a less rounded variant [ɑ:] would be spelled as <a>, as was surmised by Krogh (1996: 279). The same phenomenon is well known from northeastern Dutch and Westphalian, where the result of *o* with open syllable lengthening is variously spelled (and phonemicized) with <a> or <o>. In particular, before the diphthongization of ODu. *ö* to *uo*, earlier *au* > /ɔ:/ must have had a relatively low degree of opening. If this explanation holds, it implies that the vacillation between <a> and <o> can be explained internally.

### 21.2 Dutch oe and eu

A few western Dutch words allegedly have the reflex *oe* or *eu* from WGm. *au*. Of these, only the first one, *opdoemen*, might reflect a Hollandish development of *au*, but whether the vocalism was restricted to Holland is unclear.

1. *opdoemen* ‘to become visible on the horizon, to loom ahead’ is explained by *WNT* and most subsequent dictionaries as a North Hollandish variant of MDu. *opdoomen* ‘id.’, a derivative of the noun MDu. *doom* ‘steam, mist’ < WGm. *dauma-* (OHG *toum*). This explanation was already given in 1769 by the Hollandish author Berkhey:

> Deeze verandering (t.w. de omstandigheid dat een verwijderd landschap zich duidelijker dan anders vertoont) word in Noord-Holland opdoemen genaamd, waarschynlyk opdampen, opdoemen, vermits doemen in den zin van doomen moet genomen worden, en doomen juist de betekenis heeft van eene zagte damp-waaseming.208

(Berkhey, N.H. 1, 306)

---

208. “This change [viz. the fact that a far horizon shows itself more clearly than usually] is called *opdoemen* in North Holland, probably ‘to steam up, fume’, as *doemen* must be taken in the sense of ‘to fume’, and *doomen* has exactly the meaning of a weak evaporation of fume.”
The earliest instance of *opdoemen* in WNT stems from 1696 (by Salomon van Til, who grew up in North Holland), but most tokens are from the nineteenth century, again from Holland. Whereas *opdoomen* is not attested in Middle Dutch, we do find *vt domen* ‘to exhale’ in Glossarium Bernense (Limburg, 1240), and *domen* ‘to steam’, termed “antiquated” by Kiliaan (1599).

Explaining the /u:/ of *opdoemen* on the basis of the North Holland dialect is problematic, since MDu. *oo* usually comes down as /o:/ or /ou/ in this area (Heeroma 1935: 92, Pannekeet 1995: 88–93). Furthermore, an ancient form in North Holland is *opdiemen*, see § 19.3. Still, there seems to be no better solution at hand than to suppose that *opdoemen* contains a local development of *au*. Possibly, a parallel is found in the rise of *roemer* in the seventeenth century beside etymological *romer* ‘Roman glass’, see § 19.3, nr. 1. Both words would then show vowel raising before *m*.

2. *roer* ‘reed, rush; tube’, *roerdomp* ‘bittern’ (a marshland bird; MoHG *Rohrdommel*), *Roes-* in toponyms < WGM. *rauzza-* (MLG *rörr*, OHG *rörr*, ON *reyr*), *rausa-* (Got. *raus*, ODu. *rös*). Dutch preserves forms with and without the effects of Verner’s voicing. With *r* < PGm. *z*, we find MDu. *roer* ‘reed, rush’ (1426, 1429; accounts of Rotterdam), also ‘gun’ (1450). Voiceless *s* occurs in ODu. *rös* ‘reed’ (Reichenauer glosses, 8th c.), MDu. *roesdommel* (1360), *roisdommel* (1477; *Teuthonista*) ‘bittern’. The same Middle Dutch form */ro:s-/ is also presupposed by modern dialectal Central Limburgian *rosdomp* (WLD) and North Brabantish *roosdomp* ‘bittern’ (WBD). The West Frankish form *raus* > *rös* is probably also reflected in Medieval Latin *rausum* (9th c.), *rosum* (1268), *rausus*, *ros*, and in Old French *ros* whence Modern French *roseau* ‘reed’ (thus EWN, against the assumption that *ros* represents a West Gothic loanword in French). Finally, *rös-* is frequent in many place-names: northern French *Roubaix*, Flemish *Rozebeke* (both from Frankish *Rös-baki*), *Roeselare* (821 copy ac. 1300 *Roslær*), *Roosbroek* (1212–23 *Roesbroec*), North Brabant *Rosmalen* (9th c. *Rosmella*), Limburg Rosmeer (1280–90 *Roosmer*), and others.

For the Middle Dutch forms in <oe> and <oi>, it remains uncertain whether they reflect /o:/ (< WGM. *au*) or /u:/ (which would normally go back to WGM. *ö*). For Kiliaan, *roer* ‘reed’ counts as “German, Saxon, Sicambrian”, that is, eastern Dutch and German. The name of the ‘bittern’, *roerdomp*, is thought by EWN to have been borrowed from German, the original Dutch form having -ses. In view of the Middle Dutch and dialectal forms which continue /ro:s-/ (see above), this seems likely. It follows that *roerdomp* ‘bittern’ is irrelevant for the question of how WGM. *au* is reflected in Dutch.

In the meaning ‘gun’, however, *roer* is a frequent word in seventeenth-century Dutch literature, and it is never spelled with <oo>. Note that MDu. *roeder* > MoDu. *roer* ‘rudder, helm’, has a similar, stick-like form to a ‘cane’. In view of
this fact, it is conceivable that *roer* ‘gun’ does not continue the word for ‘reed’, but rather ‘rudder’. Originally, however, it was *roer* ‘reed’ which was used for ‘gun’, as shown by the Middle Dutch and Middle Low German occurrences without -d-.

3. *beus* ‘upset’. A reflex eu is not normally found in Holland for oo from WGM. *au* (cf. Van Santen 1959, Boekenoogen 1897: xxx, Heeroma 1935: 92). The adjective *beus* ‘upset, bad, cunning’ is found in some seventeenth-century authors from Holland (Roemer Visscher, Vondel, Hooft, Starter, Rotgans) beside more usual and dialectal *boos* (Boekenoogen 2004). It goes back to WGM. beusje-, as shown by OHG bōsi, Drente, Groningen beuze, beus, Veluwe beus, Campine, NE-Brabant beus. Hollandish *beus* must therefore be an imported word from Brabant, as we more often find in the writings of e.g. Vondel and Hooft; pace Verdenius 1943: 206, who regards *beus* as an indigenous Hollandish word. Similarly, the frequentative StDu. *beuzelen* ‘to talk nonsense’ is first attested in Brabant, in *boselen* ‘to talk nonsense’ (1542; Pelegromius), *beuselen* (1573; Plantin), onghebeuselt ‘unlied’ (Antwerpen, 1561). The same goes for the Early MoDu. noun *buesel* ‘nonsense, gossip’ (attested in Brabant, Flanders, Zealand, Holland), which is probably a deverbal noun.
The working hypothesis to be tested in this book was the presence of a Proto-Frisian substrate in western Dutch. The tables in 22.1 help to summarize the results by providing for each feature information on its limitation to coastal Dutch (yes, no, partly) and on its most likely origin (here called “status”) in coastal Dutch, viz. from imposition fromProto-Frisian, from the borrowing of individual words, or from internal development independent of any substratum. In Section 22.2, the evidence for direct borrowings from Frisian (Proto-Frisian, unattested Old Frisian, attested Old Frisian) will be highlighted, followed in Section 22.3 by a discussion ofthe evidence for continuity versus shift in the coastal area in the Middle Ages.

22.1 Summary of the results

a. Consonant phenomena

Table 47. Summary of the results for the consonant phenomena

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Coastal vs. inland Dutch</th>
<th>Status in coastal Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>palatalization in TK-clusters</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g \rightarrow j$ before $i, e, C$</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-Vg &gt; -Vj$</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>imposition from PFri. (possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^*j- &gt; g-$ before $i, i, e$</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^*gə- &gt; je-$</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>imposition from PFri. (possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ft &gt; xt$</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-g &gt; .f$</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h$-loss</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>imposition from PFri. (possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Vrxt &gt; rVxt$</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$xs &gt; ss$</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hp &gt; ss$ and $tt$</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether the three phenomena marked as possibly resulting from imposition of Proto-Frisian features really point to substrate influence is a matter of interpretation. The relevant allophones were not distributed in exactly the same way in Proto-Frisian and Old Franconian. Whereas in Proto-Frisian, $^*g$ had been palatalized
to /j/ after and before front vowels (OFri. dei ‘day’ < *dag, ield ‘money’ < *geld), Old Franconian retained a velar stop or fricative in these positions. This might have led to the replacement of Old Franconian /g/ or /ɣ/ with /j/ by L1-speakers of Proto-Frisian. Also, the western loss of initial h- could be explained from a mismatch between the pronunciation of *x in Proto-Frisian and Old Franconian, as we have hypothesized in Section 10.3. But all three cases remain inconclusive. The palatalization of *g found in word-final position and in the prefix *ga- is also found in inland Dutch and in Middle Franconian, viz. word-internally in the sequences *egC and *a/e/igeC (when syncope took place), so that it may be argued that coastal Dutch has merely extended this tendency a bit further than the inland dialects. As to h-loss, it is a relatively trivial change which may have been independent of any external influence on Flemish.

b.1 Short vowels (except *u)

Table 48. Summary of the results for the short vowels (except *u)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Coastal vs. inland Dutch</th>
<th>Status in coastal Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e &lt; *a in modern dialects</td>
<td>yes (North Holland)</td>
<td>imposition/borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esk &lt; *ask, esp &lt; *asp</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghetel, dek, grem, etc.</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bled(de), vek(ke), steppen</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>step, -schep</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veger-, Gent</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>imposition (possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long for lang, etc.</td>
<td>yes (Flanders)</td>
<td>imposition (possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a &gt; o plus lengthening</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>imposition (possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a &gt; o plus lengthening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 &lt; mf, *ns, *np, *nx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all- &gt;oll-</td>
<td>yes (Flanders)</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>af-of, ambacht &gt;ambocht</td>
<td>yes/partly</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasal loss before f,s,th</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>imposition (possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breaking of e to jo, ju</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>borrowing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reflex *e in North Holland may be due to more recent language shifting from Frisian to Hollandish, and in some cases we may be dealing with borrowed words. The latter is certainly true for the word *tjuch, tuch, tich, which shows the Frisian breaking of *e to ju. Of the remaining possible evidence for substrate influence, the names Veger- and Gent might be ascribed to the fronted pronunciation of /a/ in Proto-Frisian, but their isolation makes them quite uncertain. The prenasal rounding in long for lang would fit in a Proto-Frisian substrate scenario but could also be a recent local development. In *of and ambocht, we could be dealing with a local development conditioned by the labial consonants and a relatively early date.
of unstressed vowel reduction in Flanders. The latter development, in turn, might – but does not have to – be due to substrate influence (see further below).

The (rounding and) compensatory lengthening of short vowels before nasal plus voiced fricative presents the best evidence for a possible substrate layer. Still, there is no way to exclude that the coastal change took place within the Franconian dialects of the Old Dutch period themselves, and remained restricted to the coastal area for dialectgeographic reasons. Whichever population was responsible for the denasalization, its distribution in the lexicon shows that the words affected by it were relegated to the periphery of the lexicon, while the central vocabulary reintroduced or kept the anteconsonantal nasals (e.g., *kind, mond, rund, tand, andeer).

b.2 Short *u

Table 49. Summary of the results for short *u

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Coastal vs. inland Dutch</th>
<th>Status in coastal Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unrounding *ü &gt; i in CDu. ja- and jō-stems (pit, brigge, etc.)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>imposition (possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fronting of *u, *o to Dutch u and eu</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>imposition (possibly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unrounding in Flemish ip, schippe</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unrounding of *ü in open syllable (evel, knekel, etc.)</td>
<td>to a large part</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unrounded vowels of the type pit, brigge continue Old Franconian *-üCC’-, that is, these words went through a stage with a palatal geminate. They would have had an endingless nominative and accusative singular as far as they are masculine and neuter ja-stems (hil, pit, stik, rik), whereas the feminine jō-stems (brigge, etc.) would have had polysyllabic case forms throughout. Because of their palatalized consonant, they had no (analysable) umlaut factor in Old Franconian. Under the view, then, that the coastal Dutch forms with /i/ are due to a language shift, they can be explained as the result of adaptation of Old Franconian forms to the Proto-Frisian phonological system (see Table 39 in § 15.2.5).

An alternative, internal explanation for the unrounding within Old Franconian requires postulating the same early reduction of the final vowel plus the rise of a palatal geminate, at a date when the language did not yet have the front rounded vowel phoneme /y/ which later arose before preserved i- and j- endings. The coastal dialects would then have reassigned phonetic [y] in, e.g., *stükk’ to the phoneme /i/.

The unconditioned fronting of *u to /ʌ/ in closed syllables and /ø:/ in open syllables presupposes a distribution of (originally allophonic) *u and *o within western Old Dutch that to a large degree resembled the one found in Proto-Frisian and Old
Saxon, with high *u in particular before i-mutation factors, before *u, after labial consonants and before nasal consonants. This feature, and the relative chronology of developments which it presupposes, makes a Franconian-internal explanation entirely plausible. A substratum scenario is not necessary to explain the facts, although it would also not be in conflict with them: the imposition of, for instance, a Proto-Frisian allophonic distribution of *u and *o on Old Franconian would have led to the same results. In the case of an internal scenario, it is attractive to assume that the (originally Flemish) fronting of *ū to /y:/ led to the (Flemish-centred) fronting of the corresponding short rounded back vowel.

Coastal Dutch words with lengthened /ø:/ in open syllable from WGM. *u probably shared in the western fronting of *u to *ü before open syllable lengthening applied. The /ø:/ was then unrounded before or after a labial consonant (evel, krepel, peluw, etc.) or beside another consonant which can have rounding effects on a vowel in Dutch (r, k). It follows that these unroundings do not represent a substrate feature. The unrounding in Flemish ip, schippe, can easily be explained as a more recent, local process, again before a labial consonant.

c. Long vowels

A number of long-vowel phenomena (see Table 50) can be connected with the Proto-Frisian substrate along the coast or, more locally, with the Old Frisian adstrate in North Holland, but the certain cases all concern loanwords. From the Proto-Frisian layer, this applies to the words with ie from *ǣ, the three words with unrounding of *ū (hide, hidden, kies), the four or five forms with unrounded *ō (ondief, smicē, griede, Swieten, and possibly hiel, which could also be genuine Franconian), and baken and kaag with aa from *au in Holland. However, Flemish Adinkerke, Datnesta, zade with /a:/ from *au have a dental stop after the <a>/<o>, though the number of words is so low that this may be coincidental. It seems safer to interpret the vacillation between a and o in these words as reflecting phonetic variation between a greater or lesser degree of rounding of *au > /ɔ:/ than as a reflex of a Proto-Frisian substrate.

In the aa-reflexes of *ai, the frisianisms are restricted to Zealand and Holland, with the exception of vracht which became more widely spread. The terms aft, askhe, and vracht are closely related to the juridical and economical system of medieval Frisia and were probably borrowed as part of that jargon. Zwaag is a term of local toponymy. Only atter and ladder belong to the unmarked vocabulary.

Some loanwords were taken directly from Old Frisian and are restricted to North Holland: the words with ja(a) as a reflex of *eu, the three words with unrounding of *āū to ie (opdiemen, stiemen, tiemen), and the three words with *ai reflected as oo (ogen ‘to own’, roop, toon).
Table 50. Summary of the results for the long vowels and diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Applies in coastal Dutch</th>
<th>Status in coastal Dutch</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>general retention of *ū as /u(:)/ (16.1)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oe-relics in toponyms (16.2)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oe-relics in the lexicon (16.3)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>borrowing (possibly, in only 1 case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee-reflex for StDu. ie (17.1)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complementary distribution of *ō before dentals vs. labials &amp; velars (17.2.2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shortening to o before m (17.2.3)</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shortening to o before obstruents (17.2.3)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDu. eu from *ō without i-mutation (17.3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>internal development (spor.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ja, aa from *eu(17.4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>borrowing (in NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WGM. *ē yields ee or ie (18)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>borrowing (mede, mielen, triem, viel, possibly deek, Ee, mede)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unrounding of *ū (19.1)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>borrowing (hide, hiden, kies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unrounding of *ō(19.2)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>borrowing (ondief, smieë; Hol. griede, Swieten; uncertain hiel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unrounding of *ääü(19.3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>borrowing (opdiemen, stiemen, tiemen in NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unrounding of *iu(19.4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>internal development or imposition from PFri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ai reflected as Fle. ee, Holl. ie</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ai reflected as Fle.Holl. ei</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ai reflected as a (20.3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>borrowing (aft, asighe, atter, ladder, vracht in Holland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ai reflected as aa (20.3)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>internal development (unstressed, in Hol.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ai reflected as oo (20.4)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>borrowing (ogen, roop, toon in NH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*au reflected as aa (21.1)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>borrowing (in Holland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*au reflected as ODu. a/o (21.1) in 2 forms</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>borrowing (toponyms) or internal development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*au reflected as oe or eu (21.2)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unrounded reflex ie of *iu can be interpreted either as the result of imposition or as an internal Franconian development. The reflexes ee (Flemish) and ie (Hollandish) of *ai may point to an original change *ai > */e:/ across the board. The monophthong was then raised to ie in Hollandish, whereas it remained in Flanders but was pushed back from east to west by lexical diffusion of the eastern variants. The raising to ie in Holland can be interpreted as part of a chain shift from /e:/, /e:/
(continuing ODu. *ae, MDu. *e before r, OFri. ᵀ) to /i.a/, and from /aː/ (continu-
ing ODu. *ā, *a + OSL, *a before r) to /eː/, /eː/. The Hollandish and Flemish relic
forms in ei, such as vleis, may reflect a later development /eː/ > /ei/ before dental
consonants, but this does not work for teiken, heim, bleik, with ei before labials and
velars. Hence, the ei in these words ultimately remain unexplained.

Other alleged frisianisms have turned out to be irrelevant. The complementary
distribution of *ō before dentals, on the one hand, and before labials and velars, on
the other hand, is found in all of coastal Dutch, but the reflex is not the same every-
where. There is no evident link with a Proto-Frisian substrate, and the conditioned
split may be regarded as a trivial development.

Shortening of * OutOfRangeException before m is not only found in coastal Dutch, and it may be due
to a relatively recent (Middle Dutch) phonetic change /oam/ > /om/. Shortening of
* OutOfRangeException before voiceless stops is part of a general tendency in Dutch dialects.

The fronting OutOfRangeException > eu reflects the stylistically motivated importation of an east-
ern, i-mutated form in literary texts in zeut, geneugte, reukeloos and veugen, and
the adoption of eastern i-mutated forms in daily speech in beuk, breur, meui, and
teuven. The word weunsdag may have unconditioned fronting of short * OutOfRangeException plus open
syllable lengthening.

22.2 Loanwords from Frisian

These can be divided into at least three different groups, according to their geo-
graphic spread. Words found only in North Holland are likely to belong to the most
recent layer of loanwords from Old Frisian, and their borrowing can in theory be
as late as the thirteenth century, or even later if we allow for the possibility that
Old Frisian dialects continued to be spoken in North Holland in the late medieval
period. This group consists of four subsets:

– ja, aa from *eu (NH jaar, tjad, vlaar, vlaremuis)
– ie from *äü (NH opdiemen, stiemen, tiemen)
– aa from *ai (NH zwaag)
– oo from *ai (NH ogen, roop, toon)

Three further subsets are also found in South Holland down to the mouth of the
river Rhine and therefore presuppose a borrowing date before 1100. In nearly all
cases, the evidence consists of toponyms or appellatives connected with the local
landscape. Thus, they can safely be interpreted as loanwords from Early Old Frisian
spoken in the area before 1100.
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– jo, ju from *e in Hollandish tjoch, tjuch, tich
– ie from *ð (NH griede, SH Swieten)
– aa from *au (baken, Northga, kaag, Roomburg, Voorschoten, Scata(n), -Slat)

Short a for *ai is found further south, including in Zealand in the case of ladder and inland Dutch in the case of vracht, but not in Flanders. The evidence consists of appellatives rather than place-names. The terms aft, asighe, and vracht belong to the fields of law and administration and may have been borrowed and spread for political and administrative reasons beyond their original distribution. In any case, their original borrowing must precede the defrisianisation of South Holland around 1100.

– *ai reflected as a (aft, asighe, atter, ladder, vracht)

A final group consists of three small subsets of forms which are found from North Holland to Zealand and, partly, to Flanders. Their isolated position within the general vowel developments of western Dutch, and the existence of cognate words in Frisian, suggest that they were borrowed from Proto-Frisian. Here I add the regions for which <ie> is attested, with H = Holland, Z = Zealand, F = Flanders. The terms mede, wiel and hide refer to local toponymy, but the other words are normal appellatives:

– WGm. *ǣ yields ie (HZF mede, F mielen, HZF triem, HZF wiel; uncertain HF lieke)
– Unrounding of *ū (HZF hide, HF hiden, HZ kies)
– Unrounding of *ð (HF ondief, ZF smieë)

Given the distribution of these words, one might ask whether they were borrowed in situ, thus, also south of the Meuse or even the Scheldt, or whether they were borrowed in Holland and subsequently spread, via lexical diffusion, to Flanders. In view of their distribution, I think that the first answer is more likely. With one exception (kies, which was apparently replaced in Flanders by a different lexeme), all words are attested in Flanders, and mielen is even without a Hollandish counterpart. Furthermore, Flemish wiel against usual Zealandish weel shows that this word, too, cannot have been borrowed with ie from Zealandish.
This section discusses the most likely scenario that explains the linguistic facts in combination with what we know about the demographic history of the western Low Countries. Here is a list of the systematic phonological changes in coastal Dutch which, according to our preliminary conclusions, may be remnants of linguistic contact with Proto-Frisian:

a. The fronted reflex e of WGm. *a in modern dialects of North Holland stands apart. Its geographic diffusion makes it likely that it goes back to the relatively late shift from Old Frisian to Hollandish in North Holland in the thirteenth century.

b. The two isolated cases of raising of *a to e in the Old Flemish names Veger-, Feier- and Gent might reflect a fronted pronunciation of short /a/ in an erstwhile substrate, which would then have passed these words on to Flemish. Alternatively, the neighbouring consonant g, of which we know that it had a palatalizing influence on *a in the sequence *-agC-, may have fronted the vowel as part of a purely dialect-internal change.

c. The changes of word-final -Vg > -Vj and unstressed *ga- > je- are very similar and may well belong together. Proto-Frisian *g had been palatalized to /j/ after and before front vowels but Old Franconian retained a phonological velar stop or fricative, of which it is likely that it had a fronted allophone in the vicinity of front vowels. Therefore, in language contact between Proto-Frisian and Franconian, the speakers of the former may have identified Franconian [je-] with PFri. */je-/. But palatalization of *g to /j/ after front vowels (and *a) is also found in inland Dutch before dental consonants. If the dialects of coastal Dutch extended this tendency to identify fronted *g with /j/ to pretonic anlaut and to auslaut, it could be interpreted as a dialect-internal change of Franconian.

d. A trivial change, for which an internal explanation can never be excluded, is represented by the loss of initial h-. Alternatively, in a language contact scenario, h-loss may be due to a mismatch between the pronunciation of *x in Proto-Frisian and Old Franconian along the lines argued for in § 10.3.

e. Three developments involving nasals may belong together: (1) a > o before a retained nasal; (2) a > o plus lengthening before *mf, *ns, *nb, *nx; (3) nasal loss before f, s, th. The Proto-Frisian origin of the first of these is quite uncertain, since the rounding is restricted to Flanders. It may well be due to an internal development in coastal Dutch, but it would also fit with a language contact scenario. The other two phenomena are clearly linked together. In a language contact scenario, the rounding of *a before a lost nasal may be explained from phonetic rounding of */ã/ as [õ] in Proto-Frisian, which was then imposed
onto Old Franconian *ã. The nasal loss may have been regular in all instances, whilst now surviving mainly in toponyms (-muide, zuid) and in words of low frequency or without counterpart in Franconian. Words with retained n would reflect the later adoption of the core vocabulary from Franconian (e.g., kind, mond). The general nasal loss in forms in *ns as against the more frequent retention of the nasal in *nþ might be linked to a difference in the target language (Franconian) which we cannot retrieve anymore. Possibly, Franconian had more nasalization in the former sequence than in the latter.

These considerations also point to the solution in the case of a language-internal explanation within coastal Dutch. It is possible to argue that a nasal phoneme */ã/ was realized as rounded [õ] in western Dutch, and that nasal loss plus compensatory lengthening was regular before *ns and *nþ in the coastal dialects as opposed to inland Dutch.

f. The final four changes to be discussed all have, or may have, to do with the absence in coastal Dutch of i-mutation on other vowels than WGm. *a, viz.: (1) Unrounding *u > i in coastal Dutch ja- and jõ-stems; (2) Fronting of *u, *o to u in closed and eu in open syllables; (3) Unrounding of *iu; (4) *ai reflected as Flemish ee, Hollandish ie.

The absence of i-mutation, which these four phenomena have in common, has been interpreted in two ways. In Buccini’s language shift scenario, Old Franconian words with allophonic *[û], *[iû] and *[ãi] before an i-mutation factor were adopted by L1-speakers of Proto-Frisian as unfronted */u/, */iu/ and */ai/ without a following i-mutation factor. If the second syllable did not contain a synchronic umlaut factor anymore in Old Franconian (mainly because WGm. *j had been absorbed by the palatalized, geminate stem-final consonant in ja- and jõ-stems), *[û] was adopted as unrounded /i/ by speakers of Proto-Frisian. In a continuity scenario, such as that advocated by van Loon (2014), Old Franconian allophonic *[û], *[iû], and *[ãi] before an i-mutation factor were restored to unfronted */u/, */iu/, and */ai/ because of an early reduction of unstressed i-vocalism to schwa in the western dialects. The subsequent fronting of *u to short u and long eu is a secondary development in both scenarios, which was caused by internal pressure in the vowel system in the relevant period.

Nielsen (2000a: 79–81) has noted the parallellism between, on the one hand, the reduction of the system of unstressed vowels in Old English from four vowels /i, æ, a, u/ in the eighth century to three vowels /e, a, u/ in the ninth century, after a merger of unstressed *i and *æ; and, on the other hand, the triangular system of unstressed vowels in the oldest Old Frisian ms. R1 (Boutkan 1996), which has /i~e, a, u~o/, with the variants /e/ and /o/ after long or polysyllabic stems and stems with a mid vowel. It is conceivable that
the Proto-Frisian substrate in the western Low Countries had the same system of unstressed vowels, meaning that unstressed \( *i \) was not immediately reduced to schwa but had lost its \( i \)-mutating capacity after the seventh century. This scenario would thus be compatible with a language shift scenario for coastal Dutch. Alternatively, in a continuity scenario, coastal Old Franconian would have undergone this type of reduction in unstressed syllables itself (after all, it is a trivial kind of reduction) maybe as an areal feature in contact with Proto-Frisian varieties.

I conclude that the facts as we have them allow for both answers, the shift scenario and the continuity scenario. On the one hand, the discussion under (a) to (f) above can be argued to have invalidated each separate argument in favour of a substrate scenario. If no single development remains which must and can only be ascribed to a Proto-Frisian substrate, it may be argued, there remains no structural reason to assume such a substrate in the first place. This view would favour the continuity scenario. On the other hand, the possibility of a substrate origin has not been dismissed for each of the phenomena under (b) to (f) separately. Therefore, if at least (c) to (f) would apply (b being restricted to only two words), we would have a set of four phonological changes in coastal Dutch which may be explained on the basis of a Proto-Frisian substrate. They concern a tightly defined set of allophonic differences of the kind that one would not be surprised to find as a substrate phenomenon: the pronunciation of /g/ in non-prominent position, the pronunciation of /x/ or /h/, the realization of clusters of nasals plus voiceless fricatives, and the high or non-high pronunciation of posttonic vowels. This would then speak in favour of a shift scenario. The presence of a small amount of loanwords from Proto-Frisian in southern coastal Dutch, especially those with \( ee \) or \( ie \) for WGm. \( *\& \) (StDu. \( aa \)), those with short \( a \) for \( *ai \), and those with unrounded reflexes of \( *\ddot{u} \) (hide, hiden, kies) and \( *\ddot{o} \) (ondief, smieë, maybe hiel), may well confirm the erstwhile presence of a Proto-Frisian layer.

The Frisian population of the western coastal area cannot have been very numerous in the Merovingian period, and it probably did not stretch very far inland south of the Maas. There may have been a mix of Frisian speakers and Franconians along the mouths of the Rhine and Maas, judging by the toponyms. The presence of the features from (c) to (f) to an equal degree from North Holland to Flanders is

---

209. I am well aware that the retention of these vowels in R1 is strongly connected to the tonal character of Rüstringen Old Frisian, and cannot be projected back into Proto-Frisian. Nonetheless, what matters here is the possibility that unstressed \( *i \) had already ceased to cause \( i \)-mutation before all unstressed vowels had merged into schwa.
the main explanandum in the geography of the linguistic features of coastal Dutch, and has already puzzled previous scholars. I will discuss three possible answers.

1. In a language shift scenario, the equal distribution of these features presupposes either that a single substrate-superstrate shift took place at a specific moment in time in the whole coastal area, or, alternatively, that the shift took place in one part of the coastal area, which later imposed its linguistic character on the other provinces. Since North Holland is excluded (as it remained frisophone until the thirteenth century), and since South Holland is unlikely to have spread its dialect to all of Flanders before 1200 or even 1500 (because this would go against the socio-economic balance of powers at the time), only Flanders remains as the possible original area of radiation. This, indeed, is Heeroma’s solution (1965: 18–20): Flanders was the first region to lose its Proto-Frisian speech, followed by Zealand, South Holland and, eventually, North Holland. Unfortunately, we have no historical indications for the kind of demographic influence of Flanders on Holland in, say, the eleventh century, which would explain how South Holland would have adopted Flemish speech. Moreover, in Flanders we are faced with another problem. The absence of Frisian toponyms and anthroponyms and the general exclusion of the territory south of the Sincfal (the Zwin at Bruges) from any territory called “Frisian”, rules out the possibility that actual speakers of Proto-Frisian (or, for that matter, other varieties of non-Franconian speech) were settled in Flanders in any significant numbers. We might make an exception for the strip of land immediately by the sea, which was characterized by tidal flats. But this is a small, and, in the Early Middle Ages, demographically insignificant area, so it seems unlikely that its coastal population would have been able to impose its dialect on the much larger and more prosperous inland of Flanders between the sea and the Scheldt – which is what we would need to assume to explain the homogeneity of the coastal features of Flemish.

2. In a continuity scenario, we could assume that the same linguistic changes took place in the Old Franconian dialects of all of Flanders, Zealand and South Holland, including phenomena such as nasal loss before fricatives and the reduction of unstressed $i$-mutating vowels. In theory, it is conceivable that the bulk of these changes took place in Flanders, whence they spread to coastal dialects in Zealand and Holland, but, as said above, explicit evidence for demographic influence of Flanders on Holland in this period is missing.

3. A possible alternative, which may save the contact scenario but does not imply a wholesale language shift, is to assume that a mixed frisophone-francophone population existed along the coast between the Rhine and the Zwin (or even down to Calais). Their interaction caused the coastal dialects of Franconian
to lose nasal consonants before fricatives and to reduce their unstressed vowels quicker than the inland dialects, obstructing the workings of i-mutation. This novel variety then spread to large parts of Flanders (but maybe not the Dender region, where there are slight indications for erstwhile i-mutation). This would thus be a non-shift scenario but under the assumption that the coastal Franconian dialects did change their phonological make-up under the influence of Frisian-Franconian bilingualism.

Whereas options (1) and (2) are implausible for the reasons mentioned, (3) seems a more promising solution. This does not necessarily mean that it is true, but it does allow for an unforced explanation of many facts, including the presence of a number of loanwords. We may start from an Early Medieval situation in which speakers of Anglo-Frisian or (subsequently) Proto-Frisian lived along the coast, where, from the mouth of the Rhine southward, they lived in close contact with speakers of Old Franconian dialects. Even though both varieties had been separated by two to four centuries of separate linguistic innovations, they may still have been mutually understandable. In the early trade centres in the delta of the Rhine, Meuse and Scheldt, and maybe elsewhere, the Old Franconian variety was influenced in some aspects by Proto-Frisian, even though it was the latter variety which eventually (ultimately in the ninth century in Flanders, and in the late eleventh century in South Holland) disappeared from these areas. The novel variety of Franconian, which we might call Old Coastal Dutch, and which featured among other things the unrounding of *ü in Cj-stems and nasal loss before fricatives, spread across all of Flanders, Zealand and South Holland in a relatively uniform way (leaving aside small differences, such as the timbre i or e for the unrounded outcome of *ü). This agrees with the fact that the area was a dialect continuum with a relatively low demographic density, which is a favourable circumstance for the large-distance spread of innovations. The land reclamations of the High Middle Ages (eleventh to thirteenth centuries) led to a rapid demographic increase and a higher number of local linguistic developments, causing the dialects of the different regions to grow apart.

22.4 General conclusion

This study stands in a long tradition of investigations into the possible Frisian backgrounds of aspects of the Dutch language, in particular, of its western dialects. It concentrates on the phonetic and phonological aspects of the comparison, since the nature of the available Old Dutch texts, the structural and genetic similarity of early medieval Frisian and Franconian, and the nature of linguistic change in general, all make the evidence from vocabulary, derivational morphology, inflectional morphology and syntax less reliable (see §1).
Of the linguistic phenomena discussed in the earlier literature, some changes in Dutch are here dismissed as evidence for a Frisian substrate or adstrate, such as the palatalization of $k$ in diminutives, the palatalization of $g$ before consonants, the unconditioned fronting of $^*a$ to $e$ in all but a few words, the unrounding of $^*ü$ in open syllable (the type krepel), and the reflex $aa$ of $^*ai$ in unstressed syllable (the type scoutate). Some other phenomena are indeed due to contact with Frisian, viz. as lexical loanwords from an early variety of Frisian into the coastal dialects (summarized in § 22.2 above). Finally, six (sets of) changes could be due to structural contact between Proto-Frisian and Old Franconian, such as the absence of $i$-mutation on vowels other than $^*a$ (leading to unconditioned fronting of $^*u$ and unrounding of $^*iu$, among others), nasal loss before fricatives, and $h$-loss; see § 22.3.

The most likely explanation for the rise of the last group – if indeed due to language contact – is not wholesale language shift. We may assume the co-existence of frisophone and francophone speakers along the coast, leading to the gradual adoption of some Proto-Frisian features by the coastal Old Franconian dialects. The relatively uniform way in which the results of these changes spread across Flanders, Zealand, and Holland, points to an Early Medieval dialect continuum with a relatively low demographic density, favourable to a long-distance spread of innovations until the eleventh century. After that time, the economy and demography of the western Low Countries changed to such a degree that dialect change began to take on different forms, involving the creation of urban centres and the interaction between town and countryside. After 1200, the dialects of Dutch step into broad daylight.
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Floein 494
Geeze 221
Gooze 221
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Sloeg 192
Smui 222
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Teelnk 491
Tiuch 241
Tjucht 241
Tjuchum 241
Vlog(ge) 316

Gothic

Anasius 460
Andbahti 229
Andbahts 229
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Frijonds 460
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Biak/biik 453
Brag 308
Busem 220
burmanne 398
burstel 279
bus(h) 328
Bussenghem 183
buttinghe 57
Buyens 463
cae(h) 508
Calense 180
Calletiaen 125
cammighen 134
case 303
cens 120
Cerscamp 181
Cerschamp 181
chaertr(e) 120
cgens 119, 120
Cherskamp 181
cleenpitte 269
clene 468
cleppel 289
clien 471
clippet 289
clochtelike 316
clocke 330
cluft(e), klucht(e) 316
cruppel 289
cruppel, doppel 289
cneusen, cruosen 346
crokel 284
cruessen 346
cOE(n)en 365
coe(h), coich 508
Coelna 289
coeman 111
coeninc 352
coenste 107
coepman 111
coesmule 401
Coirtkene 126
coit hil 262
coker 361
Colne, Coelne 289, 354
comen 362
commen 416
commen, cammen 217
conde 319
cornighinne 112
coininc 352
coninghamne 112
connen 319, 365
const(e) 333, 337
cont 235
coostrate 411
coper 46
Coppeciaens 125
coren 355
cortgene 126
cortkeen 126
cossen 314
cote 329
Coudre Hide 442
couwe 409
couwestrate 409
coxhyde, Koxide 442
crepel 284
creupeul 284
Cric(k) 265
crichoudere 265
cricke 265
crickeman 265
croken 361
Crommenie, Cromminene 437
cronen 452
croopel 285
cropel 284
crucke 265
Cruls soen 341
csens 120
cubbe 311
cuere, coere, core 355
cunde 319
Curtelhullen 262
cust 164
czins 120
daarof 227
dachmaet 57
dachte(n) 110, 223
darst 280
De Heerst 280
deel 473
deenster 455
dester 455
deg(h)en 131
deg(h)er 131
deger 131
degerlech 131
deghe, deg 131
deghen 131
degone 170
-Dei 131
dek 204, 210
dele 201
derne 407
derst 280
Deynen 131
Dibbelmonde 259
Diddeboy 59
Diddikajen 125
die 102
Die 437
diefegge 134
dienst 107
diet 455
Dietsch 455
dievgehe 134
dievel 455
dininc 441
Dining 441
dinen 261
dinne 260
dippe 455
Dirckiaen 125
ditsch 455
diel, Diel 456
dobbe 259, 321
dober 322
dochte(n) 223, 319, 325
Dockedey 131
dodden 327
Dode 507
doder 358
doe 409
Doedetgen 125
Doedetiaen 125
doom 413
doern 108
Doeye 395
doeve 343
doeveke 283
Doeverdrecht 395
doget 237, 347
dolle 340
-dom 408
dom(p) 110
domen 451
domp 334
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gruse 444
grute 312
guldin, gulden 320
gunst 336
guode, guoder 409
gure, guere 165
ha(e)re 478
hael 481
haem 224, 482
haernesse 453
haessen 224
Haghebrooc 411
haghetissen 133
hale 481
halle 226
hals 226
hamme 483
Hamstede, Hamestede 483
Hanneboy 59
hantsoech 334
haringhe hughe pauels boye 59
harst(e), herst(e) 280
haspe 207
haspel 208
haspen 207, 208
havek 107
Havekesdreht 111
hectissen 133
he(e)rdnesse 453
he(e)re 478
he(e)rst 280
heesch 482
hec 111
heghen 137
(h)egge, ecke 135
(H)eggerik 135
heighindomme 413
heil 473
heim 473
heinen 137
held, helt 406
helech 468
hilleputte 262
hemel 110
hemleden 406
henck, heng 406
hepe 284
herbergher 106
herde 453
here 303
herebergher 106
Herst 280
Hertekiaen 124
hesp(e) 207
heulebrughe, hoebrughe 354
heusch 343
heavesch 111
heuziën 346
hevele 284
hevet 111
hevet 190
hey 464
Heynetaen 125
Heynikajes 125
heyninge 137
hicstre 136
hide 442
hiden, hyden 443
hie 470
hiete 470
hiwert, jeet 175
hiheleke 161
Hide 442
hil, hille 262, 303
hilleputte 262
Hochte 190
hoe 409
hoep 284
hoghe, houege, hueghe 347
Hoiemen 224
hole 340, 354
Hollaer 222
Holtlant 60
honech 112, 364
Honecoech 192
Honecoigh 192
honing 112
hooch 495
hoogen 495
Hoon 411
hoot 111
hope, heupe 284
hoppe 323
horst, hoerst, hurst 280
houtin 320
Houtkoich 192
hoved 190
ho vesch, hoofsch 343
hovet, hoeft 107, 111
hoe 409
Hoymanne 224
Hoymunde 267
huden, huyden 443
huele, heule 340
hucle, hoele 354
Hughegin 125
hul, hulle 262, 305
hulde 320
Hulle 262
hulten 320
Hyde 442
i- 161
iamber 416
iammer 416
ian 161
iechte 169
ieg(h)en, jeg(h)en 118
iegenwerde 119
ieghens 119
ieloven 161
ieman(t), iman(t), iemen(t) 172
ien 470
iersike, jiersike, yersike 122
iernet, jet 175
(h)iet, yet, jet, jeet 175
iewaschen 161
iewet 175
igel 134
ij(e)dsch 368
Ijoede, Jode 368
ikele, ikele 299
immer, emmer 416
inheims 469
ioget 237
iooke 348
ioken 348
iou 393
irste 407
it 175
iu 168
iucht 169
iuchtic, iuchtegh 169
iveltichede 169
iwe 168
iwent 175
ja(e)r(h)itide 161
Jan van Coelpitte 268
jbanne 161
je 167
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jechtechede 169
jeconreit 161
ejegen 117
jegewelc 172
jemete 161
jerske, jeerske 122
jerzeke, jereke 122
jhan die boie 59
jo(e)nst(e) 336
joede 368
joekte 348
joeghen 118
jonfer 325
jonkfer 325
jonkvrouwe 242, 325
jonnen 161
jonste 348
Joodsche 107
jou 393
jou, ju 392
ju 168
ju(w), jou(w) 168
jucte, joocte 170
juede 368
juch 170
juedesche 107
jung 338
jwarne 161
Kaiense 180
Kallinge 180
Kaynse 180
kegel 107, 138
Keie 138
kekene 284
Kele 289, 354
kelre wardigghen 134
kerre 171
kerse 181, 482
keteltgin 125
Keyacker 138
keyen 138
keybame 139
keylen 139
kiekin, kieken 456
kies 443
kiesetand 443
kigge 138
kind 233
kint ende kinne 266
klepel 289
kneppe 289
knippel 289
knoykkel 284
kogge 508
koken 284
kokene, kukene 348
kolve 340
konne 266
koper, kopper 357
kortekine 126
kreckstoel 265
krepel 342
kriel 139
kroos 400
kudde 305
kuepe 266
kuer, coevel(e) 357
kuevel(e) 357
kuit 457
kaken, cuken, cuyken 456
kunne 266
La[m]bret, Lambrect 198
lade 488
laden 488
ladinge 488
ladren 487
laese 111
laeye, laye 508
lake 433
lam(p) 110
Lambrecht 110
Lammerecht 110
Lammeghin 125
Lammin 248
lande ymaerke 161
landimarc 161
Langhemarc 217
lappetiaen 125
lassche 206
latten 200
Laverdei 131
laven 508
-lede 406, 495
lede 111, 488
ler, lee 495
Ledenghem 405
leeght, leecht 141
leet 141
Leeverghem 405
leg(h)et 141
leged(e) 139
legede 111
leges 140
leget 140
legher 139
leghet, leecht 142
leid 474
leidi 139
leit 128, 139, 142
leken 433
Letdiart 114
lettel 290
lettere 107
leu 107
leuen 405
leye, leie 134
Liardis 114
licht 110
lichter lade 488
lie 102
Lieart 114
lieden 406
liegarden, liegaert 459
Liegards 116
Liegart 115
Lietart 115
Lietjardis 114
Lietart 114, 115
Leyard 115
Liejardis 114
Liejardis 114
Liekeren, lieken 433
Liebetken 126
Lietgard 115
Lietgardis, Ligardis 114
Lietgart 114
Lietjardis 116
lieuwlade 488
lieve ende lede 488
lievede 107
Lifgard -a 115
Lijard 114
lijchten, lichten 458
liifocht 333
Litiardis 114
Littekensant 290
littel 290
Littiek 290
Littikenmade 290
lo(e)sen 496
locke 330
lode, lo 495, 504
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sinde 275
sinte 293
sinte ponstgens dach 125
Sirixe, Zierikshe 437
slabben 324
slaghen 164
sloet(e) 345
sloeten 345
sloetel(e) 345
smecken 178
smecken 178
smiten 178
smiten 178
snot 328
snotte 328
Sobborgh 397
soch 351
soch 334
sochte 110, 219
socke 331
somer, soemer 363
Sonderwic 236
sony 180
soog 351
sorfechtech 192
sorge 192
Sotrewold 447
Soytgens 125
spak 490
spak 490
spak 490
speeghen 489
speeken 489
spel 406
spelgen 406
speghelkine 406
speipen 463
speipen 463
spere 257
spere 257
spere 257
spere 257
speye, spi(e) 463
spieg 406
spil 111
(spin)rock(e) 331
spoeye 464
spoien 464
spoor 367
spor 367
spore 367
sport 367
spot 328
spoye, spoie 463
spoyten, spouten 463
spra 490
spresen, spraen 491
sprew 490
sprome 350
steenghewerke 161
Steenhoffle 343
steenghewerke 161
steegher, stegher 147
stein 474
stert 159
sterte 257
sterten 281
Steynkens 126
slicherman 433
stic 270
stick 270
stick 270
sticketiaen 125
sticksuygngh 461
side 234
sten 470
stieren 459
stierman 459
stirgin 125
stiet 459
stik 303
stonen 365
stont 110
stomen 451
storte, starte 360
storten 281
stove 358
straetgen 125
straetgen 125
straetgen 125
straetgen 125
strote 360
struaf 402
stu(e)ren 459
stubbe 326
stue 365
stuere 356
stuol 409
Suagh 492
subburgh 397
sucde, suckede 460
suckelen 316
Sude, sue(e)der 234
sue 366
suene 180
suet 425
Suete, Sweete 447
sugten, sucht 318
sulfer 341
sullen 276
sult, sult 278
sum 335
sundere 275
sune 460
sunich 461
sunte 293, 460
Sursele 392
sullec 237
sultwent 237
suecte, suyte 460
sued 236
sued(-) 236
Svaech 492
Swachdijc 492
sweghen 164
swette, zwette 200
swide 234
swijet 111
swijt 111
Syardis 115
t Juch 242
t(h)sgeghen 119
tac 211
taeling, taling 491
tam, tem 211
tassche 205
tay 224
te gegen 118
te- 87
t(e)n 406
tebrecan 87
tee 503
teelen 148
teeende, tiende 233
teggeworoge 122
tegen 118
togens 118
Teil 148
tellen 148
teinde, theinde 406
tek 204, 210
teken 473
tekin, tekin, tekiin 467
tellen 210
tenberman 181
tenielen 88
tesche 205
tegen 118, 122
tegenwerdeghen 122
tegenwoordig(h)en 122
tegenwoordigheid 122
tegenwoordigen 122
teghenwerdyghen 122
teghenwoerdighen 122
teghenwordeghen 118
teghenwordich 122
teghen 118, 122
teghenwordighen 122
tighghens 122
thiegen 118
thiens, thiins 120
thueghen 350
thunnen 252, 351
tich 242
Ticht 242
Tichte 242
tieg(h)ens 119
tiegere 131
tien 102
tigele, tiechle 147
tille 201
Tilrode 148
timberman 181
tins, tiins 120
tioch 242
tiegen 118
tobbe 324
tobbe, tubbe 297
tocht 271
toe 409
toge 350
togen 362	
tombe, tomme 110
toot 411
tot 408
towe, touwe 409
tram 435
trog, troch 332
troog 332
tsaers 119
tsaeter, chaerter 181
tsaertre, tsaertre 120
tsare 119
tsarmeer 119
tseghen 119
tsens 120
Tsheerscamp 181
tsegghen 119
tsjin 120
tubbe 324
tuch 242
tumnekin 336
turffboere 399
tusschen 346
tuten 402
tweer 470
twelef, twelve 107
twie 470
twintich 110
u(w), ou(w) 168
uckele 299
Ucle, Uclo 299
uder 174
uerwargte 198
ueuesen 346
ulugghe 316
unster 272
uoet sogt 334
uorgten 198
Uorscot 509
Uyterdyck 396
-vacht 229
vaen 224
vallen 226
valsch 226
van crombrugghe 269
van crombrigge 269
Van der essche 205
van subborgh 397
vander dibble 259
vangen 217
Veckeput 211
veel, viel 406
veen 473
veer-, ver- 407
veerdel, verdel 407
Veieric 137
Veieric 213
veinoot 469
vertin 407
Vekeldei 131
veken 211
velene 288
velken 288
vernetiaen 125
vercrepelt 285
verdegedingen 111
verdomde, verdomt 414
verdommenesse 414
verghien 170
verlucht 169
verkochte 110
verliejaerden 115
verloos 496
vermergen 280
vermorgen 281
versch 257
versching 183
verse 482
versmacht 229
versmoren 367
verspaken 490
вест 257
vert 257
vertich 407
verwe 281
vet 110
vieren 356
vijf 190
vijftich 190
vil 89
Vinc 506
vinger 110
vint 300
virde 407
viscoigh 192
viscoighhighe 134
viscoighhighe 192
vlaemscra 478
vlaemscra 116, 478
vlecht 333
vlees 473
vlegel 149, 351
vlegen 288
vleghel 149
vleil 49
vlamesch 510
vlemining 510
vlochten 317
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<tr>
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<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Voubrech</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
<td>vri</td>
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<tr>
<td>vriehhindomme</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vriesencop</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrint</td>
<td>110, 460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrome</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrucht</td>
<td>108, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vruchten</td>
<td>108, 198, 272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vränd, vrund</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrant</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vt domen</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vucht(e)</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vügen</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vuuren</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vugteg</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vul</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vulc</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vunte, vonte</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-wacht(e)</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wael</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wag(h)en</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waghenvrugghewe 149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wal</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walsch</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wambenis</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmond, Wermond</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmund</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wasschen</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watereg(h)el</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wateringehe</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wederseit</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weg, weghe</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weit</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weitin</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wende</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wenesdag</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wensch</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>werken</td>
<td>108, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wertel</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wertelvast</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wespe</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wester Zubbargh</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westsubborgh</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weteringehe</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weyts</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wiel</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wiisdomme, wisdomme</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wijnpheylder</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildard</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildgarth</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilravinside, Walravens yde</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>winsch</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wirte</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittetiaen</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wloemich</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wo(e)stine</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woch, woeghe</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wodensdach</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woekte</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woensdach, woendesdach</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woistinen</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfgard</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wolle</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woluiardiis</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wonighe</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woninghe</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wonnen</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wonsch</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wensen</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woonsdagheis</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woord</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wort, worte</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worte</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wortele</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waytin</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wracht(te)</td>
<td>108, 198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrijgen</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wulff</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wulle</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wallin, wullen</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wunsch</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wijts</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ychte dagh, yechte dagh</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ychtebrieve</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yele, icle</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yechte</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yechten</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yechtig</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yer</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yerske</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ygel</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ylen</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ylic</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ymene</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ynooch</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yooch</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yrugt</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yslachte</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ystade, jstade</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ystiet</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ywande, ijwande</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zaekte</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zegel, zeigel</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeghen</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeghet</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeymmen</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziarde</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziardis</td>
<td>115, 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zile</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zilinghe</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zocht</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoersle</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zoucken</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Middle English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bobles</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bristel</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chyne</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>claver</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clift</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dowel</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flyght</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gaispen</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hulle, hil</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knokel</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lodesman</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tacke</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tēl</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umbe</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wör</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle High German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ageraster</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ailster</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asch, esch</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspe</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bāht</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>besnoten</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bight, bihte</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brieder</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bunt</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bāware, buwer</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dimster</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egedehse, eidehse</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fenken</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geruofte</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geschütz(e)</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geschuzze</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>griuvel</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groot</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haspe, hespe</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haspel</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heher</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hübel</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jehen, gehen</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jest, gest</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jüde</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kām, kān(e)</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klüpfel, klopfel</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kotze</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kotze</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krüpel, krüppel</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>käz(e)</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lāze</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mulde</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mičtern</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pfoch</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ruf</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scharf(eite)</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schupfen, schüpfen</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siufen</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snaede</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sprajen, spraven</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steigel</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suf, sof</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tegel, tigel</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>top</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unzer</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vagen</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vergehen, verküpf(e)</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vermunnit</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vlügel</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vilhe</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zacke</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zeche</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zugegen, zegegen</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zullen, sollen</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle Low German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>atik</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bedüven</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blöschen</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bodel</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bole</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bōs</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>botter</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bregen, bragen</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bubbele</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bulde</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bür</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crīgel, kregel</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degel</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degel, deygel</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degen</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dogent, doget</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dövel</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dovicke</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dām(e)</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dūst</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwèle, dweile</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwelen</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egedisse, eygdisse</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egel(e), eyle, ile</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egester</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elk, elik</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elster</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>et(t)ik, etek</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fünfte, vunte, vonten</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gar(e)</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gare</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gemant, gemants</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gēn</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geschōt, geschot</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geschutte</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gespe, gaspe</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gespe, gepse</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ge)stubbe</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gremmen</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grubbe</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gruppe</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grāwel</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gycht</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hāl</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hale</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haspe, hespe</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haspel</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hegester</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heghen</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heyner</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hovel</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hull</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hül(s)</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hüp</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jader</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jōget</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jummant, jummende</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klāveren</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klever</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klüft</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klappel</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knökel</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knubbe</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kropel, krepel</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>küdde</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>künne</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bun(ne), bunt 351
bundel 319
bus 243, 313, 328
busse 313
busse, bosse 313
bussel(e) 314
but 326
Butegem 183
butter 312
buur 20, 397
buurman 398
Buyckhorn 395
Buycksloot 395
buyman, buerman 398
buylten 463
Callantsog 180
certer 120
charter 120
chij 120
cijns 120
clappege 135
clappeye 135
clemppittere 268
clempu/itte 268
cmueckelen 284
comen 416
Corthiene 126
crol 341
Croil, Krul 341
crollen 341
Crul, Krul 341
cruycke 266
cuening 352
culek, kule 340
cutte 312
daak 433
dauch 417
dak 204, 210
damp 205
dat 101
de Boer 400
degoeij 15
De Koninck 110
De Koninck, Deconinck 353
De Koning 353
De Loete 396
de Muijnck 353
de Man(c)k 353
de Munnik 353
De Smet 270
dobbe 321
dobbelten 322
dobber 322
doch 100
dochter 322
Dodemman 506
Dodewaard 507
dof 325
doef 400
domer 415
domen 451
domkracht 414
Doenrade 507
dog 325
dofer 325, 400
dof, doch 325
dol 339, 340
dolle 340
dom 334, 414
domen 513
dommekracht 414
dommelycke 414
dommen 414
domp 414
donder 336
donderdag 336
donker 338
donne 260
donst, donse 232
doo(rl)age 506
dooster 358
door 100, 328, 367
doorduvelt 282, 343
dop 322
dorre, doore, door 359
dorst 278
dorsten 280
dot, dod 327
douwen, duyen 392
draaien 83
dreht 82
dreigen 359
dreigen 468
dream 352
dremeel 352
drenen 352
breypel 310
drie 405
drijvelaar 441
drinken 88
drok 315
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geloof 326
geluk 315
(Ge)luk 315
gemet 164
Gemond 236
Gendringen 214
Gendt 214
gene 166
geneugte 422, 426
genooten 422
genoeglijk 192
genoegte 422
genot 327
Gent 213
gereed 467
Geritye 126
geromt 414
gerucht 316, 417
geschat 327
geschatut 327
gesp 207
gest, gist 101
getijde 161
geur 165
geut(e) 359
geven 88
gewoon 363
gewricht 199
gezin 233
(Ge)zond 336
gezwend 234
gheese 221
ghelvehelt 288
ghicht 169
ghichten 170
gicht 169
giemt 172
gien 473
gier 171, 172
gier 437, 474
gieren 474
(g) 101, 118, 166
ginds 166
ging 110
gippen 207
gist 169
glei 494
glooi 495
gloor 366
gloren 366
glu 494
gluwen 400
god 327
goes 221, 232
gom 335
goor 165, 366, 504
goot 359
gote 359
gouden 320
graven 88
greb(be) 261
greis, grees 444
grep(pe), grip(pe) 261
greppel 261
greun, gruun 421
Groot 423, 426
ried 446
riege 446
grippel 261
Groe(n)s- 396
Groen 37, 396, 421
groenteboer 399
Groot 422
grof 325
grond 336
Group, Groep 423
gruis 444
gruppe 261
gruppel 261
grut(te) 312
gruwel 444
gruwelijk 444
gulden 320
Galik 175
Galiker(s) 175
gum 335
gunnen 162
gunst 233
gunst 336
gut! 327
guur 456
haar 133
haai 224
Haaiman 224
haaimete 224
haar 479, 481
Haamstede 483
haas 224
haasten 482
Haarrecht 111
hadekite 443
haechdisse 133
haersch, haars 482
hagel 159
hagunman 193
hak 446
half 190
ham 483
hame 416
hangel 482
haal(e) 480
hap 207
haps, hapst 207
haspe, hapstel 207
haspen 208
-heem 45
heeft 190
Heemstede 483
heersch 482
hees 482
heug(ge) 133
hegen 137
heghen 137
heghenen 137
heide 133
heinen 137
helen 480
helft 190
helm 481
hemel 416
hengst 96
hesp 207
hespel 208
heug 347
heugen 347, 495
heul 340
heul 354
heunig 364
heuning 364
heup 284
heupe 284
heus 111, 343
hevel 263, 343, 343
Hevelink 343
Heuvelmans 343
heyninck 137
hie 443
hief 441
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kiem</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kier</td>
<td>171, 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kies</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiete</td>
<td>457, 458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kievit</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiezen</td>
<td>454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kijte</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kin noch ken</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kinderen</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kittebreur</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kladdei</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kladdig</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klapper</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klipper</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klippen</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klotten</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klotte</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klouwen</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klucht</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knekel</td>
<td>254, 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knekelhuys</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knekelvat</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kneukel</td>
<td>284, 348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kneuzen</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knippel</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knobbels</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knuffelen</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knuppel</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knuyffelen</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ko(o)ker</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kobbe</td>
<td>323, 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kober</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kocht</td>
<td>332, 417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kodde</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koet</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koeken</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kom</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>komen</td>
<td>362, 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kommen</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kond</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koning</td>
<td>110, 247, 352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konings</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koninklijk</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konnen</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koog</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kook</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kooken</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kool</td>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-koop</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koopman</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koor</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kop</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kopen</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koper</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koppel</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kort</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kortgene</td>
<td>126, 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kassen</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaste, kuste</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kosten</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koster</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kovel</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kreeen</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kregel</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krek</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krenslen</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kregel</td>
<td>244, 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kretsen</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kretten</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kreuk(el)</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kreukel</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kreukelen</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kreukan</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kreuten</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kreupel</td>
<td>284, 342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kreutel(e)</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krien</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kriendelen</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krijgen</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krijghel</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krijt</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krik</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krik(ke)</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krim</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kringen</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krinselen</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kroes</td>
<td>394, 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krok</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krom</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krooken</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroos(t), Kroos(t)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krop</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kropel</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krucie</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kruis(bes)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kruize(munt)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kruk, krik</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krul</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krum</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kub</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kubbe</td>
<td>311, 323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kud</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kudder</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuif</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuiken</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuit</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulk</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunde</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunne, kinne</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunnen</td>
<td>233, 365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kunst</td>
<td>233, 337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kussen</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kust</td>
<td>314, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(te) kust en (te) keur</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kust</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuster</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusthollands</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kustmiddelnl.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kustnederlands</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kustwestvlaams</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kut</td>
<td>312, 458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kute, kuut</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuus, kuze</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kayse, kuse</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwiek</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwispelen</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laaien</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laan(tje)</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laars</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labbei</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labben</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labbe, lubbe</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laer</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laeren, laeder</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laf</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laken</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laning</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lanis</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>las</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laten</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lauw</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lede</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leed</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leer(e), leder, lier</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leluwergem</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leger</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leggen</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leiden</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leie</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leimuiden</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lens</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lenssen, lentsen</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lenzen</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letter</td>
<td>107, 290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leugen</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leur</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leus</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexmond</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ley</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lezen</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lichaam</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>licht</td>
<td>231, 317, 458, 508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lichte laeye</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lichten</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lichter laeye</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lichter-laey</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lid</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lieden</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lief</td>
<td>405, 488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lief en leed</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lief, lieve</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liefde</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liefelijk</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liegen</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lieke</td>
<td>433, 438, 439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lienen</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liëtgen</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liever lee</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lieverlaad</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liggen</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lij</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lijklaecke</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lijftocht</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lijklaeken</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>litoraal</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lob</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lobbe</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lobberen</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loeren</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loet</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loetcamp</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lof</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logen</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logenstraffen</td>
<td>102, 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lok</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loke</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lokken</td>
<td>315, 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lomp</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loochen</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loods</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loogh</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loom</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loon</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loopt</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loor</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>los</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>losch, lochts</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lose</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lost</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lost, lust</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>losten</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loven</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lozen</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubbe, lub</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubben</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubberen</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lubberig, lobberig</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucht</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lucht, locht</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luchten</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luerer</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugg(h)en</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lugge, logge</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lui</td>
<td>459, 463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lust</td>
<td>314, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lusten</td>
<td>314, 329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutgard</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lutje</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutteke Rijn</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luttel, lilt, lettel</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luttik</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luw</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maakte</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maan</td>
<td>110, 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maand</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maarlo</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maas</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maasen</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>made, maat</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melen</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masken, maesken</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mat</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mazelen</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mede, meet</td>
<td>434, 438, 439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mees</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meesmuiten</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetjesland</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mei</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meid</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meisen</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metsje</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mekaar</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melkboer</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>melkhei</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchtem</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merf</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mergen</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meu</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meugen, meugt</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meul</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meulemans</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ruinenbroek 287
rychelen 145
sal 214
schaamte 107
schaap 431
schaar 37, 82
schamen 210
schande 210
-schap 83, 212
schapraai 488, 489
schapraat, schapra 489
schapraede 489
schapreede 489
schare, schaar 432
Scharwoude 47
scheepsdevik 283
scheiden 468
schenden 210
schette 270
scheur 355
scheuren 355
scheut 345
schiijen 67
schip 252
-schip, -scheep 212
schippe 292, 295
schippen 312
schitter 313
schobbe 312
schobbig, schubbig 312
schocht 326
shodden 313
shodderen 313
shoep 294
schof 326
schoft 326
shokken 331
schol 341
schoon 67
schoor 367
Schoorl 47
schoorstien 473
schoot 345, 360
shop 294, 324
shoppe 292
shoppe, shoppe, schippe 294
shoppen 312
shoren 356, 367
short 248
schot 327, 345
schote 345
schotel 360
schotten 313
schout 489
schouwen 505
schaal 437
Schreurs 15
schriel 437
schrobelen 324
schrobben 324
schroeben 324
schub 312
schudden 313
schrijfelen 102
schuiven 102
schuld 298, 321
schuldig 321
schup 294
schuppe(n) 312
schutte, -skitte 270
schuttel 360
schutten 313
schutter 313
schutting 270
seghene, saghene, seyne 153
-sel 82
Semmerzake 181
sende 154
sermen 179
Serskamp 181
seumer, zeumer 363
seundaaghs 338
seut, zeut 425, 426
seyl 153
seylen 153
seyne, seynet, seygene 153
seyssel 154
seyssen, seynsen 154
Sien 179
Sibbrand 150
sije, sille 154
skriebel, schriewel 437
sleuren 356
sleutel 243, 345
sleuter(e) 345
slob(be) 324
slobben 324
slobberen 324
slokkeren 327
sloabee 324
sloof 326
sloe 100
slof 326
slok 331
sloken 331
slons 337
sloot 509
slot 328
slotel 247
sluaren, sluieren 356
sluw 393
smekken 178
smetsen 178
smeu 222
smieë 447
smieg 221
smisse 105
smisse 200
smit, smet 200
smitte 200
smoel 401
smoren 367
smoren 367
smuyl 401
smuetel 345
smuel 287
smuetel(e) 345
snoet 394, 397, 401
snoetdoeken 401
snoeven 394, 397, 401
snot 328
snuit 397, 401
snuiten 328
sniven 397, 401
snudoek, snutteldoek 328
snuut(e) 401
Soerla 392
sozen 402
sok 331
sockel 316
sockel(n) 316
solf 341
som 335
sommige 335
soms 335
soo 511
sop 324
sope, zoope 357
Souburg 397
spak 489
spaceck 489
spacecke 489, 490
specce 489
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vlug(ge) 316
vluis 459
vluw 393
vocht 231, 417
vocht(e) 334
vocht(ig) 317
vocht 318
voederen 450
voegen 424
voenk 338
voeren 425
vogel 362
vol 342
vollen 287
volgen 438
volk 342
vonk 338
vonnis 111
vont, vunt 299
voottje 355
voor 371
Voorburg 509
Voorhout 44
Voorschoten 58, 509
vore 367
vos 109, 199, 329
vracht 491
vrede 108
vriend 110, 460
Vrijlegemhoek 137
vriji 417, 460
vrocht 318
Vronen 507
vroom 363
vracht 272, 318
vrand 460
vul 243, 342
vullen 321
vunzen 183
vuren 356
vauf 441
vaar 460
vuychticheit 317
wal(ips)e 208
waal 435
Wadwaai 180
waleput 436
wambuis 463
was 199
wassen 206
wateren 438
Wateringen 438
weel 435
weg 252
wei 463
weide 468
weigeren 359
Weinbrugge 149
welk 100
wens 273
wensen 273
wertel, wettel, wirtel 282
wervel 199
werven 199
wesp 208
wesp(e) 208
weteren 438
wetering 437
weensdag 419, 425, 426
wieden 166
wiel 82, 435, 439
wier 474, 504
windpeluw 286
wingerd 417
wisp(e), wips(e) 208
wisse 200
Witte Hul 264
woensdag 111, 425, 447
woer 504
woerd 82, 504
wol 342
wolf 342
wolk 342
wullen 321
wonen 363, 365
woor 504
woerd 82, 504
wortel 278
wringen 486
werken 332
Wessel 272
wul(le) 342
wulle 249
wauf 441
Yerseke 122
yl 133
yle 133
zacht 190, 231
zak 100
zal, zel 276
zerbai 151
zee 101
zege 150
zegel 107, 150
zeggenen 151
zeggen 151, 252
zeil 152
zeine 153
zeinen 151
zeis 154
zeit 152
zel 214
Zellik 111
zelte 278
zeug 249, 351
zeule, zulle, soole 366
zeulen 366
zeumer 249, 426
zeun 249, 250
zeun(e) 366
zeuning 180
zeunis 180
zeven 111
zeyn 153
zich 70
ziekte 460
ziijen 147
zijl 82, 154
Zijl 154
Zijl 154
zilt 278
zilte 278
zocht 417
zocht, zacht 218
zodde 328
zode 511
zoennen 103
Zoerle-Zuurwoude 392
Zoersel 392
zot 103, 425
Zoeterwoude 47, 447
zog 332, 351
zolder 321
zole 366
zolen 366
zomer 249, 363, 416
zon 336
zondag 337
zonde 274, 319
zonde, zoende 319
zonder 338
Zunderwijk 236
zood 511
zool 366
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>Icelandic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dübel, Döbel</td>
<td>durch</td>
<td>boos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecke</td>
<td>der, ier, eer</td>
<td>breidel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eder, eer</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egel</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eiter</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elster</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>er, er</td>
<td>83, 87</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esche</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espe</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essig</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>euch</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feucht</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finster</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisch</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flasche</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fledermaus</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flehen</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flag</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flügel</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flügel</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frosch</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuchs</td>
<td>109, 199</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Füllen</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>für</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furcht</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gären</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gegen</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geruch</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gicht</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gönnen</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosse</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gass</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hache</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Härter</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahl, Hähl</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirat</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hespe</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himmel</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Höhle</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horst</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hübsch</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ihr</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ist</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jammer</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jätten</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jeder</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jeglich</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jener</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jugend</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jülich</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jülicher, Gütlicher</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kauz</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klee</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kleie</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kliefze</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kluft</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knöchel</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>König</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kraus</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krücke</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kütte, kitte</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Länge</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lösen</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lösen</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maul</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mir</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moers</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motte</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mücke</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nüchtern</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>när, nuder</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oben</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pflücken</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pfoche</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfahl</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfütze</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfütze</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickel</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polster</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebe</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regel</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riegel</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rind</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocken</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohrdommel</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Römmer</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rübe</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rücken</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rüdiger</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruhe</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rühren</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schippe</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schlunzen</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schultheiß</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schulze</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuppe</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schürze</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuss</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schüssel</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schüttten</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwelle</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segel</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seufzen</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sohle</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sommer</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprehe</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprosse</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruch</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stück</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stunde</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stürzen</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stützen</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sülze</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sünde</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sutte</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasche</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tauber</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiegel</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toll</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tor</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tugend</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>übel</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>um</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfall</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vor</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wachs</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wespe</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wünschen</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wurz</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Würze</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagel</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zäh</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zewe</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziegel</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>züchte, ziüete</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zug</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zügel</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zwehle</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Icelandic</td>
<td>júfur, júgur 172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Low German</td>
<td>boos 220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>breidel 129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bülte 319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Damet 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
det 69
dimaat 73
Dimaat, Dimt 57
düüssel 73
eyde 129
ieder 173
ī ǝ 129
ik 69
jiddar, judder 173
klēver 484
kwerdern 73
mank 69
mûde 236
olle 69
rēp 503
särkrēnīg 452
Schuppe, Schuppe 294
süll 275
wat 69
weps 208

Mooring Frisian
buatj 494
Modern Swedish
mygg(a) 267
slunta 337
törst 280

Modern Westerlauwers Frisian
beaken 453
besauwe 179
biezem 438
boai 59
bousdoar 220
bobbel 321
boek 412
boer 399
broar 59
broer 59
bull(e) 319
bûter 358
douk 283
droech 412
dāst 232
dear 99
fiem 438
fleane 427
flear 428
flear(e)mûs 428
foet 412
foks 199
fôle 287
gasp 207
genōch 192
goes 412
groef 412
grōuwel 444
haam 481
ham(me) 481
heas 482
hel 261
hespelje 208
himpe, hompe 289
hispel, hespel, haspel 208
hoast 103
hoed 412
hinemiez 438
ingster 272
jaar 172
jaar 427
jarre 171
jier 431
joad 368
keech 507
kies 443
kneppel 289
kāt 456
kāt 456
kym, kim 451
kyn, kine 451
lea 427
leaf 427
ledder, ljedder 487
leider 487
lēste 314
ljerre 487
loft 332
lyts 290
meane 427
mich 267
miede 434
miel(j)e 434
miezels 438
mosk 314
njoggen 241
noas 347
nochteren, nofteren 317
noflik 192
oer 172, 173
opdynje 451
oter 396
otter 476
pel 286
reaf 501
reap 502
rēch, rīch 269
ried 431
rier 234
riezel, rizel 287
rjocht 241
rouwe 358
rūch 393
rūt 397
saats 511
' t Sein 179
seine 154
sille 275
sjocht 334
sjonge 241
Sjursje 241
skeppe 295
sket 270
skiep 431
skobbe 312
skriel 437
slách 192
slách 393
smeudich/smedich 221
sodde, sodze 328
speake 489
spoan 91
spoe 91
stik 270
stjonke 94
stūt, stoete 402
stymje 451
swette, sowotte 200
swiet 447
swiid 234
tak, takkel 211
task 205
tean 503
teling, teeling 491
telle 201
Tiekelan 433
tiemen 452
tiemje, tymje 452
De Tike 433
till(l)ing 201
tin 260
tjilling 491
toarst 280
toevje 412
triem, trym, trim 435
troch 197
tsj 427
tsjaf 427
tsjak 427
tsjirmje 179
tsjuster 241
tsjutsk 241
waaks 199
waps(e), weps, weeps 208
wax 199
wiel 435
wjok 241
woartel, wurtel 281
Neapolitan
fummo 413
North Germanic
ksamella 90
North Frisian
mösk, määsk 314
Norwegian
tomme 414
Old Danish
læki 433
thumae 414
Old Dutch
*andhaimi 97
*askalekawerivald 206
*askman- 206
*Butsa 183
*druxti-sátan- 328
*eogahwelika- 172
*eogalika- 172
*fétt 476
*fláminga- 510
*flámska- 510
*flándrum 510
*friskinga- 183
*fínte 300
*gaferit 97
*Giansbeke 194
*gewerftie 199
*hahtnodi 191
*(h)ruodgēr 116
*Bamestra 40
*banst 220
*beget 170
*begian 170
*begihte 170
*Belegard 115
*Belegardis 115
*Bertgarda 115
*besigela 150
*bewelen 100
*Bichengem 182
*bilette 107
*bilīthe 107
*Billeka, Belk 361
*biloke 361
*Blunde 336
*Bochurste 280
*Bodokenlo 395
*Boefgard 114
*Boltiarda 114
*Boudgard 114
*Boudiardis 114
*bowwest 393
*Boviardis 114
*bowet 393
*bowunde 393
*Bozelini 183
*Bozo 183
*branda 160
*Briel 454
*Brile 454
*Bruccia 182
*Bruciam, Brucciam 182
*brucite 96
*Bruel 454
*Bruggas 182
*Bruggensi 182
*Bruggis 182
*Bruccella 110
*Brugensis 182
*Brugis 182
*Bruzzias 182
*Bucinghem 183
*buding 57
*büedingun 57
*Bugginsela 214
*Buehtene 332
*Bulscamp 338
*Bulkeskamp 338
*Buosingaliem 408
*Buzimanni 183
Index 595

cache 508
Cactelegauer 190
Callinge 180
Cembersaca 181
chaltia 96
cham- 96
changisto 96
Channelsara 179, 453
Chintbruge 214
chrenecruda 96
Chinnelosara 179, 453
Chintbruge 214
chratis 97
chrenecruda 97
Chunna 97
Cimbersaca 181
Cimbersaca 181
Cimbresacra 181
Cimbresac 181
Cimmarsaca 181
Clapeskitte 270
cog skuld 321
Collaertshille 262
Comet 434
Cortabriga 257
Crepelfliet 284
cricwardre 265
Crumbriga 269
Crumbriga 269
Crumbrigham 269
cuman 160
cunni 266
Datmunda 236
Datnesta 506
Decchelpule, Dekkople 133
Deinard 130
Deinith 131
Dicasmutha 235
Dilentstic 270
diopithon 445
Dodachre 506
Dodo 507
Dotnest 506
drunchan 160
Duble 259
dagath, dugeth 237
Durning 442
Duno 442
Duplamonde 259
Duplamunde 236

Ecdagus 129
Edelgard 114
Edelswid 234
Egburg 129
Egericus 135
egesin 136
egeslich 136
Egibertus 129
egisliche 136
egislikes 136
egisliko 136
Eilbertus 101, 136
Eibodo 136
Eiboldus 136
Eilfridus 136
Eilofus 136
Einhardus 20
eiselika 136
eisch 136
Ekerslato 509
Ekkerslato 509
Ekerslote, Ekerslote 509
Ekmunde 236
end 10
Engel-suit 234
Engilbrehtes 198
Erlebaldi kapelle 194
Erleghem 193
Ermegardis 115
Ermengard 115
ernigaham 483
Eskmadelf, Eskendelf 206
Esphot 206
Espous 206
Ethelgard(a) 114, 115
etige 127
Fegernodus 137, 213
feitit 110
fetheron 105
Fikerdey 131
filo- 89
filoberht 198
Firsner 108
fitmi, fitme 97
Flither-, Flither- 428
fluth 333
Folgard 115
Folgarda 115
fora, fore 371
Forschate 509
Forschate 58
Frasno 507
Fresionowic 56
Fresner 108
Frethegard 115
Friesgart 115
Frigelinghem 137
Fringim 137
frisingiam 183
friund 110, 460
Frodegard 114
Fronanslat 509
fulauonon 249
fundan 160
furi, fur 371
ga- 97
gaiemuerde, gaimueierde 138
Ganda 213
Gandao, Gandaum, Gandao 213
Ganderon 214
Gannite 214
Ganth 213
Gaotbertus 505
Garbrand 477
-gards 114
gas ferit 97
gaw, goi 507
gedahte 223
gededenen 165
gegen 117
gegn 161
geginloup 117
gginuaridi 117
gginwirdi 138
geguwaun 161
goisfreda 97
geldindas 183
geldingi 183
geleget 139
gelt 183
Gend 214
Gend, Gent 213
Genderdik 194
genuman 249
gær 477
Gerlef 405
Gerlentstic 270
Gersake 122
Gerscha 122
Gersicha 122
lioht 110
Lis, Lisia, Lisa 143
Litlongest 290
liughen 458
losaboina 477
losboiat 477
Loth 495
luctika 290
lugina 349
luticon 290
luttel 290
lutticoro 290
Luttiken 290
made 434
magath, magathe 143
maget 143
māneth 107
mānoth 107
Markemunde 236
Masamuda 235
Masemunde 236
Matkerke, Madkerca 434
mede 434
Megesuindis 145
Meinardus 145
Meinburg 145
Meingaudus 145
Meinger 145
Meinoldus 145
Meinsendis 145
Meinswindis 145
Meintet 59
Meintetus 59
Meinzo 145
Meneslate 510
Metcherche, Metkerka 434
mi 87
Misnen 445
Moer 408
mōr 495
-more 45
mudde 312
Muggo 267
mund, munt 235
Matthen 235
nachot 107
Nerabache 181
nestas 9
Nordtha, Nortga 507
Norhtgo, Northgo 507
mu 10
muntforhte 198
Oda 506
Odbertus 506
Odecherca 506
Odgerus 116
Odo 506
olfant 193
ofstado 193
Ogerus 116
ohsson 100
ohsson 199
Ohtinghesale 190
olla 9, 226
Olmeremuthen 235
ortfoca 96
orthobano 97
ortobam 97
Osbraqtashem 198, 220
Osdey, Osdei 131, 220
Ose 220
Osfridus, Usfridus 220
Osfrithhem 220
Osgeresgest 220
Oslem 220
Osmundi 220
Osmundus 220
Osprehtashem 198, 220
Oswalo, Uswalus 220
ouir 370
Pagindrecht 145
Pahindrecht 145
Paindrech 145
Paindrecc, Paindreht 145
Paindrech 145
Pathem 268
pelu 286
Petheim 268
Peydreh 145
Pichen 268
Pihem 268
Puthe 268
Putte 268
Putthem 268
Quadalburg 111
Qualburg 111
quiccafe 89
Radenburch 509
Radenburgh 509
Radert 114
Ragingard 115
Ratgart 115
Rauchingus 505
regan 146
Regemardus 147
Regenbaldus 147
Regenfridus 147
regin 146
Reiboldi 147
Reimarthus 147
Reinboldus 147
Reinfridus 147
Reingart, -dis 115
Reingerd 115
reipus 97
rephwouan 97
rephus 97
Rethcheslat 510
Reynfridus 147
Ricswiit 234
Rictet 59
Rinesmuthon 235
Ripelmunda 286
Riuquardus blauot 11
rōd 58
Rodenburg 509
Rohingus 505
Rondeslo 234, 292
Roremunt 236
Rorikspit 268
rōs 513
Rosmella 513
Rothulfusashem 47
ruggi 269
rugi 269
rugki 269
Rubelmunda 286
Rupelmundam 236, 286
s(c)al 276
s(c)ule/on 276
Saden 511
Sadenhorne 511
sagen 151
saget, sagode 151
sagon 151
salfwerz 281
s(h)outhēte 489
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Bryge, Brice</th>
<th>Werengaotus</th>
<th>505</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ad</td>
<td>bryne</td>
<td>wetheringa</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æf</td>
<td>bær</td>
<td>wetheringa</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æfþunca</td>
<td>butere</td>
<td>wihsel</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ælk</td>
<td>butere</td>
<td>wildrecht</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æscman</td>
<td>bydel</td>
<td>wildebreit</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æt, ot-</td>
<td>byðne</td>
<td>wimmorasaetha</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ægu</td>
<td>byht</td>
<td>wixenemunde</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambhlit</td>
<td>byrst</td>
<td>wirthit</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>än</td>
<td>bytnne</td>
<td>witet</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrifan</td>
<td>bytt</td>
<td>wivechin</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>áte</td>
<td>cēosan</td>
<td>Wlfiardis</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagstan</td>
<td>cimm</td>
<td>Wolfgard</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bát</td>
<td>cinu, an</td>
<td>Wolfs hil</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacan</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>worthan</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bécnan</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>wouterus</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedd</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>Wuluishil</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bemesyscan</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>Wulviardis</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bir, be-</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>Wurtelam</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blyscean</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>wurzedo</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blysian</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>Ycelseka</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bósig</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>forcuð</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botm</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>fox</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brycg</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>fugel</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brycg</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>ful</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brycg</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>fulk</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brycg</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>fyrtu, fryhto</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byht</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>gadreag</td>
<td>415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>gebur</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>genan, gean-</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>geogup</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>géomor</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>gesiene</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>gesiha</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>giefan</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>giest</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>gor</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>gös</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>gremman, gremian</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>gyre</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>gyro</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>huespe</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>häs</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hela</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hérn</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hēr</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hērmes</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>higora</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hlot</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hōcēde</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hōh</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hōhsinu</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hrider</td>
<td>234, 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>brodhund</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>brycg</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hrydēr</td>
<td>234, 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hūd</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hunig</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hwet</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hwōsan</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hyd</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hydan</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hyll</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hype</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>hyrst</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>igil</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>il</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>lād</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>lād</td>
<td>495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>læce</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>lægon</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrst</td>
<td>cinu, cinu</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lēg 508
lof 89
lond 91
lātan 396
lyft 332
lyt 290
lýtel 290
māgas 91
mirth 280
moþþe 327
mycg(e) 267
mydd 312
myl 320
mynet 267
myrgan 280
myri(g)e 280
of 227
offrian 326
ofþýnċan 229
pocc 331
pocca 331
pyle 286
pytt 268
rāp 502
regol 145
rohha 331
rysel 287
ryþþa 345
sāwon 91
scernicge 134
scutel 360
scylhdéta, scultheta 489
scyte 345
scytha 313
sealtícge 134
secg 303
segl 88, 153
segnian 151
sēofian 318
smeþe, smeþe 221
smorian 367
smōp 221
sopa 357
spāca 489
spec 490
stepe, stepe 210
“stègle 147
stän 91
stōd 234
stieman 451
stycce 270
sugu 88, 351
suht 334
sulh 366
sumer 245, 246
sunor 180
swōðe 234
swōp 234
syl(le) 275
sype 357
tā 503
tiegld 148
temman 212
teh(h) 241
thrum 352
thuner 246
thurst, dyrst 280
tigele 148
tōh 224
tōp 91
tyht 271
üder 172
ungedēfe 445
ūs 91
ūtor 397
ūp-, op- 229
weps, wesp, wefs 208
wär 474, 504
wōda 448
Wōden 447
wōdnésdrei 447
wēl 435
wulf 245, 246
wallhnappa 323
wunat 246
wāsc 273
wyrt 281
wyrtwalu, wyrtwala 281
wīyscana 273
yfel 283
ymbe 318
þech 102
þéma 414
þunor 245
þus 329
þyncan 260
þynne 260
Old French
Batel 477
blond, bland 336
bousson 319
Broilo, Bruila, Bruilo 454
Cabresque 181
coissin 314
cople 323
coste 329
costre 314
crinier 183
doble 322
estophe 326
fornaise 463
frésange 183
gli, glai 494
grēs 444
houx 320
Kimbreseca 181
loche 396
louze 396
mostarde 329
nombre 335
nonne 336
provost 111
ros 513
sot 328
soulfre, soufre 341
tonne 336
wambais 463
Old Frisian
āch 93
acht(e) 224
achtta 91
āft, eft 57, 475
āga 495
Age 59
Aget 59
(h)àgon 93
Ait 59
Aite 59
Altet 59
Aje 59
ãlda 95
all 226
alsà 226
Altet 59
ambacht, amb(e)t 229
ammon, éman 172
āseg 56
āsega, -siga, -syga
Aspanmora
-ath 91, 237
āthom 93
bāken 453
bām 93, 506
bed 304
befta 83
bēken 453
bēn 93
berd 432
Berghem 104
berna 94
biāda 94
Birghem 104
biath 94
bodthing 57
bösdure, böser 220
*bottling 57
brast 104
bregge, brigge 94, 257, 308
breke 94
bretze 94, 104
briast 104
brids 94
Briocht 197
brits 104
broar 59
brōder 59
brōr 59
brōther 94
bult 319
būr 399
Burnu�d 104
butera, botera 358
buttink 57
dēd(e) 92
dei 91
dei 92
deimeth 57
*dēmen 451
dī 73
dīap 94
dīär 94
Diedet 59
digere, diger, deger 131
*dimēth 57
diupte 94
diüre 94
draga 91
drega 91
drīva 99
dugethe 237
dwā 95
edēn 94, 165
-eles 82
Elte 59
enōch 165
-er 87
eskēpin 165
estat 94
evel 283
evelgung 283
fā 94
falla 91
fara 91
fek 211
fēng 92
fersk 104
fīr 104
fether 99
fif 91
first 104
fiucht 94, 241
fiūr 460
flax 91
flecht 333
flīan 427
flucht, flucht 104
fola 287
friūnd, friūnd 460
fruchte 272
funt, font 299
gā 507
Galtet 59
gān 432
gār 116
gāra 477
gēr 477
gers 94
gōs 91
grēde 446
h(w)at 204
h(w)et 204
hāh 93
half 91
hals 91
hās 482
*hās(k) 482
Hee, Heed 442
hēl 93
hēl-, heila 446
hēm 483
hēra 445
hli 102
hona 95
hoxne, hoxene 224
hrēk 269
hrēra 423
Hriade 104
Hriadi 104
britcher 234
hrithr 292
hugia 347
(h)want 204
(h)went 204
ia 170
il 133
*jēder 172, 427
jef 169
jēn 117
jēr 92
jere 171
jern 92
jogethe 237
jön 177
juda, jotha 368
ked 312
*kēme 451
kenn 266
Kerst 94
kēse 443
kest 314
kleft 316
kleppa 289
knē 104
kneppel 289
knī 104
kniucht 94, 241
kömen 91
kreppel 284
krōnia 452
kūth 235
lān 509
lang/long 217
lästa 495
latte 94
lēda 94
lendza 92
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>leśa</td>
<td>453, 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lēt</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lētzas</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lāf</td>
<td>99, 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>līk</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-līva, -leva</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lōf</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longommor</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lūtik</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mākia</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>man, mon</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsfliata</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mēde</td>
<td>92, 434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meldke</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mēlia</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mente, menote, menete, munte</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miān</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mon</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mōna</td>
<td>91, 432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nacht</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanna</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nēdthref</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nigunspāte</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nigunspète</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niugun</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nōmen</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nox, nōs</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notheringtiochi</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of, af</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ōlle</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ōlsā</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ōne</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oterfletun</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ōther</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottarfliatan</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pett</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rād</td>
<td>58, 509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rāf</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*rāp</td>
<td>502, 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rīda</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riucht</td>
<td>94, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sātha</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sāthdik, saddik</td>
<td>511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sechte, siochte</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seine, sein</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sēna</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sende, sind</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si(u)</td>
<td>gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siā</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siucht</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siunga</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skāt</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skedda</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skeltata, skelta</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skēp</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skete</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skolta, skulta</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skrēf</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slā</td>
<td>91, 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slāt</td>
<td>509, 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sōn</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sōn(e)</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spiucht</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stap</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sted, stēd</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stepe</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stēta</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stīrta</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stīth</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*swēga</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swāger</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swart</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swēte</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swēten</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sw(e)th</td>
<td>he, -swi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swe</td>
<td>tte, switte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swithe</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tāna</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tāne</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tegotha</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*telinge</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thanne, danne</td>
<td>99, 204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thenne</td>
<td>99, 204, 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thinza</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thiūkke</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*th(h)iuksel</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>threft</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thretza</td>
<td>94, 104, 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thrina</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thrizta</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thiach</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thruch</td>
<td>94, 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thūma</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thus</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tilla</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tille</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiochi</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiucha</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiuchu</td>
<td>94, 241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiuchga</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tocht, tucht</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tōth</td>
<td>91, 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treck</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>triāwe</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*tēze</td>
<td>432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsetel</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsiis</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tziakē</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tider</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umbe</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unberne</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unbidlēd</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unedēve</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unewis</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unegfal</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unidēld</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>üs</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>üter</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ütsiane, ütsione</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warm</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wax</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wednesdei, wernsdei</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wei</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wël</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weter, water</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weynbritse, Wymbritse</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willen, wollen</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wirtel</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wortel</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wōnsdei</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrichta</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiellet</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ālde</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Old High German**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ab, abā, abec</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ābulgi, ābulgi</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adalberth</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aga</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agalstra</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agistrast, agestra</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āhta</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambah</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anst</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aragēr</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arbeiten</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arbeitōn</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arzatwurze</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Index 603

aspə 207
āz 497
betti 303
betti, beti 304
bia 102
bijht, bight 170
bora 366
bōsi 514
bouhhan 453
bouken 453
brucka 257
Brunihilt 136
Brunnahilt 136
bā(w)āri 399
bian 399
buocha 419
bār, pār 398
burst 279
butera 358
butil 344
c(h)roñ 452
chiot 458
corter 453
deot 89
diutisk 89
dohter 98
dona 363
dāhta 223
dāmo 414
dunken 260
dunni 260
darst, thurst 280
dwahal 132
dwehila 132
Eburnand 106
Ecuuinus 129
egala 133
egbertus 129
Eggihart 136
egidehsa 133
Egihart 136
ēhaft 475
ēo-, eowiht 175
eohlwedar 172
ezzan 97
ezzih 127
fagar 137
fagar 213
fah 211
flu 89
frihtig 169
flucki 316
for(a)hta 272
fotahta, fortta 199
frēht 491
Fridurih 106
frisking 183
frivunt 460
fuhs 329
fulihha 288
fulin 287
gagan 117
gagenwerti, gagenwurti 138
gamuogida 422
gast 251
geban 98
gegban 161
gegin 117
gelza 96
gibār 398
gibāro 398
ginuht 422
giscoz 327
gold 246
gremmen 212
hāhal 481
hāhala 481
hāhila, hāhala 446
hāhlsen 224
hala 481
harst 280
haspil 208
heis 482
heisar 482
heriberga 106
hilfu 89
hogēn 347
holzmuoia 423
HORTA 106
(h)rind 234, 292
hrucci 304
hruf 358
hrukki, rucki 269
hubil 284
huf 284
hul(s)(a), huliso 320
humbal 323
huosto 103
hwaz 97
iētan 165
ih 97
ir 166
iugēn 160
jāmar 416
jehan 170
jener 166
jesan, gesan 165
jētan, getan 165
jude 368
jugund 237
kan 246
Karleman 106
karlman 106
kepan 97
kleo 483
kliwa 484
kuft 316
knussan 346
konda 246
koufo 192
krucka 265
Kunigund 106
kunni 266
kuonheit 106
kust 314
kutti 312
ladōn 488
lāthi 433
lāo 509
lāz 97
leisten 495
lob 89
loug 508
lāzēn 396
luzi 290
luzzig 290
luzzil 290
mālōn, mālēn 434
masala 438
miltherzi 106
mucka 267
mugun 361
muniz, munizza 267
mutti 312
mēita 106
mēlin, mālēn 343
nesten 212
nezzi 304
nimu 89
nuohturn, nuohtern 317
nuz 344
obasa 111
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>offan</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peti</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pfulwiä, pfulwo</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pfuzzi, pfuza</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quec</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rāza</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regile</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulu</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rigil</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rocko</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rör</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rudio, rudo</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruodgēr</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruodigēr</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salbwurz</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sconfreita</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schuldheizo</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schuop(e)</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scuz</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scuzzila</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scuzzo</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibigelt</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sibun</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sichur</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigobold</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*sigu-</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skif</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slag</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smilan</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spahha</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spahho</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speihha</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sporo</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spot</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sprāa, sprēa</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stapfo, stapf</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stat</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>steigal</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stepfen</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sticki</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stupfula, stupfila</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stuppi</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>starzen</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-stuzzen</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>süfton, süfseon</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suht</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sulza</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sumar, sumur</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suniperht</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnihill</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sunta</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suoz</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweiga</td>
<td>492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swella</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swelli</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swind-</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swuozi</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tagamuos</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tegel</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tohter</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolu</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toum</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toumen</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>troppo</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trum</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tubili</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tugant</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ubar, ubiri</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ubil</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>umbi, umbe</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ûtar(o)</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ûzar</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verchunnan</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wafsa, wefsa</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weti</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wunsc</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wunsen</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wuotan</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*wuoto</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wurt</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wurzala</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zagal</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>záhi</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zëha</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zemmen</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ziegala, zialgal</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ziohan</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zopf</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zuht</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zur-</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Irish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Wallonian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groisse</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Norse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ár</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bás</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beit</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digr</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dufa</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dygð</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fēl</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-fili</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flaumr</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geispa</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grýla</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hêll</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hámót</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hásin</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>háss</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hespa</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hler</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrara</td>
<td>423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrufa</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hrygr</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jôstr</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jâr, jûgr</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kâm</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knykil</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koddi</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>krypill</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kvâmu</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knyn</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leygr</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lîtil</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lôd</td>
<td>488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>màla</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-moldi</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mý</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öðinn</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>òðinsdagr</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Öðonn</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ósk</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reifa</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reyr</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skrä</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snaudr</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>snoðinn</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sopi</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spotti</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stinnr, stîdr</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stûr</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stykki</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tâ</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>té</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tigl</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>útar</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vápn</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ýskja</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þēl</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Old Saxon
af, of 227
agastria, agistra 136
ambah 229
apl 88
arsithon 237
ät 497
-ath 91, 237
bam 505
bifelhan 100
biugongen 217
bokan 453
bökniarn 453
bräd 505
brähta 110
bregian 223
brid 443
bruggia 257
cust 314
cúth 235
dagus, -dac 132
-deg, -dech 132
dodro 358
dömian 451
dröm 334
dröm 415
dropo 322
ecid 127
egela 133
eggia 135
Egilbertus 128
egithassa 133
Eilbold 136
Ekbertus 129
Ekbrand 129
ékild 129
éo-, ewiht 175
eoman 172
eosago 56, 476
etan 97
fac 211
fogar 137, 213
fili 89
Fladarłoh 428
fohs 329
fordwelan 340
fortha 272
fruht 460
fáht 317
ful 251
fulin 287
gedan 165
gederun 172
gegin 117
gehan 170
gendra 166
gi, ge 166
gibada 165
gibu 89
gibund 319
gibar 398
gilegd 140
gisiði 233
git 166
giwuno 363
háhal 481
Hirafeld 89
heo 102
hnuț 249
hors 280
hringodi 82
hríth 234, 292
hruggi 269
hulis 320
hund 251
hwat 97
-iat(h) 237
ik 97
judeo, jutheo 368
jugūd 237
klé 483
krukka 265
krupel 284
kunni 266
lagda, lagdua 140
läki 433
Langon, Longon 217
lathian 488
leggian 140
léstian 495
ligid 140
lof 89
lōnna 508
lōsian 453
lōsian 496
lut 290
luttik 290
luttif 290
makon 97
masala 438
Meginleus 145
Meginrickesdorf 128
Meginulfus 145
Meynburghun 128
muddi 312
muggia 267
munita 267
nabugêr 478
nigun 88
nodthurft 198
offron 326
õht 224
opan 97
pulvi 286
putti 268
quik 89
Regin-, Rein- 128
Reginberti 147
Reinbrat 147
rusal, rusli 287
sáfo 110
sagit, sagid, sagat 152
segnon 151
ses 199
Sigi- 150
Siard 150
skip 97
skuddian 313
skudžétio 489
skutala 360
smúthi 221
sóhta 110
spēka 489
spot 328
stukki 270
suga 88
suht 334
sulta 278
sumar 251
sundia 274
sunu 249
swið(i) 234
swōti 103
tebrikus 89
tēgala 148
tehando 233
Thahsbeki 199
The Dawn of Dutch

Proto-Romance

*thàhta 110
*Thasbiki 199
*thegán 131
*Thègainradus 131
*Thegenhard 131
*Thegenhardus 131
*Theinrad 131
*thona 363
* thrumi 352
* thunkian 260
* thunni 260
* thurst 280
*thurstein 280
*thuruði 199
*thus 329
*thwerh 100
*tuht 271
*twéntiæ 110
*åder 172
*åhta 110
*umbi 318
*-útar 397
*uvil 283
*waspa 208
*Wöðan 447
*wulf 251
*wunon 251
*wurt 281
*wurtia 281

Old Swedish

krúkkia 265
*Öðun 447
*thum 414
*þumi 414

Runic Frisian

adugislu 95
*ainwulufu 95
*gisuhldu 95
*habuku 95
*jibeda 164
*kabu 95
*skanomodu 93, 95
*weladu 95

Saterfrisian

Gäise 221
time 452

Scots

boose 220

Sylt Frisian

jiigel 88
teeki 433

Terschelling

sien 179

Wangeroog Frisian

hiil 446
jiigel 88
kiit 456
mäzük 314
Westphalian
hiskster 137
jeier 173
süp 357

West Germanic

*ab 227
*abunstí 233
*abó 227
*adíka 127
*éla- 478
*éta- 497
*éémna 102
*egan- 136
*agn- 136
*agila- 129, 136
*agisan- 136
*agislik- 136
*agisön- 136
*agistrjón- 136
*agí- 136
*agij- 129, 135
*agjór- 129, 135
*agjón- 134
*agla- 136
*agliströñ- 136
*aglu- 136
*agó- 136
*agspahs(j)ón- 133
*agspahsön- 133
*aimalika- 111
*ainbar- 110
*ainlif(an) 111
*aitra- 476
*arni- 476
*arisdan- 214
*all- 226
*ambaxti- 229
*andjur- 214
*ann 12
*ansu- 220, 232
*anxtó- 224
*-anp 237
*anhr 222
*anhrara- 217
*-apa 289
*ara(n)gair- 106
*askina- 206
*asperú- 206
*atika- 127
*aadan- 506
*austa- 506
*axwô- 436
*añhaberxta- 106
*áémna- 201
*baita- 477, 494
*baki 180, 181
*baldgær 116
*balla/u- 226
*bansa- 220, 232
*bansti- 220
*banxta- 332
*baukna- 453
*bauknjan- 453
*bauna- 363
*bauusa- 514
*bahjan 105, 200
*bahjan 200
*berxta- 197
*besman 101
*bi 83
*bi- 160
*biluka- 361
*biubuna 357
*bixroftiða- 316
*bian(j)ó- 102
*bijexan 170
*bijixti- 170
*bilifikja- 303
*biraiðja- 467
*bítan 494
*blakjian- 182
*blukka- 330
*blusa- 360
*blusjan- 360
*blusön 360

Proco-Romance

*amputa 329
*anxta- 317
*pilukkare 315
costata 329

Runic Frisian

adugislu 95
*ainwulufu 95
*gisuhldu 95
*habuku 95
*jibeda 164
*kabu 95
*skanomodu 93, 95
*weladu 95

Saterfrisian

Gäise 221
time 452

Scots

boose 220

Sylt Frisian

jiigel 88
teeki 433

Terschelling

sien 179

Wangeroog Frisian

hiil 446
jiigel 88
kiit 456
mäzük 314
Westphalian
hiskster 137
jeier 173
süp 357

West Germanic

*ab 227
*abunstí 233
*abó 227
*adíka 127
*éla- 478
*éta- 497
*éémna 102
*egan- 136
*agn- 136
*agila- 129, 136
*agisan- 136
*agislik- 136
*agisön- 136
*agistrjón- 136
*agí- 136
*agij- 129, 135
*agjór- 129, 135
*agjón- 134
*agla- 136
*agliströñ- 136
*aglu- 136
*agó- 136
*agspahs(j)ón- 133
*agspahsön- 133
*aimalika- 111
*ainbar- 110
*ainlif(an) 111
*aitra- 476
*arni- 476
*arisdan- 214
*all- 226
*ambaxti- 229
*andjur- 214
*ann 12
*ansu- 220, 232
*anxtó- 224
*-anp 237
*anhr 222
*anhrara- 217
*-apa 289
*ara(n)gair- 106
*askina- 206
*asperú- 206
*atika- 127
*aadan- 506
*austa- 506
*axwô- 436
*añhaberxta- 106
*áémna- 201
*baita- 477, 494
*baki 180, 181
*baldgær 116
*balla/u- 226
*bansa- 220, 232
*bansti- 220
*banxta- 332
*baukna- 453
*bauknjan- 453
*bauna- 363
*bauusa- 514
*bahjan 105, 200
*bahjan 200
*berxta- 197
*besman 101
*bi 83
*bi- 160
*biluka- 361
*biubuna 357
*bixroftiða- 316
*bian(j)ó- 102
*bijexan 170
*bijixti- 170
*bilifikja- 303
*biraiðja- 467
*bítan 494
*blakjian- 182
*blukka- 330
*blusa- 360
*blusjan- 360
*blusön 360

Old Swedish

krúkkia 265
*Öðun 447
*thum 414
*þumi 414

Proto-Romance

*amputa 329
*anxta- 317
*pilukkare 315
costata 329
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| *skuri- | 355 |
| *skurjan- | 355 |
| *skurō(jan)- | 356 |
| *skuta- | 327, 345, 360 |
| *skutalō- | 360 |
| *skuti- | 345 |
| *skutlan- | 313 |
| *-sla(n)- | 82 |
| *-slaxan | 91, 94 |
| *-slōx | 100 |
| *-sluba- | 326 |
| *-sludd- | 327 |
| *-slukkōn- | 331 |
| *-slūran- | 356 |
| *-slurjan- | 356 |
| *-sluta- | 328 |
| *-slutila- | 345 |
| *-stapā(n)- | 210 |
| *-stappan- | 324 |
| *-stappa(n)- | 210 |
| *-staumjan- | 451 |
| *-staurjan- | 402 |
| *-stautan | 402 |
| *-stauti- | 402 |
| *-staujan- | 94 |
| *-stīgan- | 147 |
| *-stikka- | 147 |
| *-stiphja- | 234 |
| *-stirjan- | 459 |
| *-stują- | 459 |
| *-strāba- | 402 |
| *-struppan- | 324 |
| *-struppōn- | 324 |
| *-strutō- | 324 |
| *-stupa- | 326 |
| *-stubbja- | 326 |
| *-stubō-/-an- | 324 |
| *-stugja- | 316 |
| *-stukja- | 270 |
| *-stukka- | 331 |
| *-stukōjan- | 367 |
| *-stumma- | 335 |
| *-stumpa- | 335 |
| *-stundō- | 337 |
| *-stunōjan | 365 |
| *-stuptan | 324 |
| *-sturjan- | 356 |
| *-sturtjan- | 281 |
| *-stūg- | 459 |
| *-stujan- | 313 |
| *-stūdō- | 402 |
| *-studdō- | 328 |
| *-suddō- | 328 |
| *-sug- | 332 |
| *-sugu- | 351 |
| *-sukkilōn- | 316 |
| *-suljō- | 275 |
| *-suljō- | 278 |
| *-sulix- | 366 |
| *-sุมa- | 335 |
| *-sumara- | 416 |
| *-sumara- | 363 |
| *-sundar | 338 |
| *-sundjō- | 399 |
| *-sundjō- | 339 |
| *-sundjō- | 274 |
| *-sunjō- | 136 |
| *-sunnu(n)- | 336 |
| *-sunu- | 366 |
| *-sun(wa)ra- | 236 |
| *-sunpa- | 236 |
| *-sunpan- | 236 |
| *-sunpā- | 324 |
| *-supan- | 357 |
| *-suppi- | 324 |
| *-suppō- | 324 |
| *-suppōn- | 324 |
| *-sūra- | 392 |
| *-sunva- | 351 |
| *-sunvan | 88 |
| *-suxt- | 334 |
| *-sūhb- | 397 |
| *-sūbra- | 392 |
| *-swajō- | 492 |
| *-swallja- | 275 |
| *-swardal | 504 |
| *-swajpa- | 200 |
| *-swajpō(n)- | 200 |
| *-swelk- | 340 |
| *-swestar | 340 |
| *-swinna- | 234 |
| *-swola- | 103 |
| *-swonjan | 103, 180 |
| *-swonō- | 180 |
| *-swōti- | 58, 447 |
| *-tāl- | 491 |
| *-tālga- | 184 |
| *-Taglingja- | 149 |
| *-taitō- | 503 |
| *-taixō- | 503 |
| *-takka- | 211 |
| *-takkan- | 211 |
| *-tanxi- | 224 |
| *-tanxa- | 224 |
| *-tanp- | 217 |
| *-taumjan- | 459 |
| *-tēgulō- | 452 |
| *-teuxan- | 452 |
| *-texu- | 102 |
| *-texuni- | 233 |
| *-texwa- | 241 |
| *-texvō- | 241 |
| *-texvō- | 241 |
| *-tigula- | 130 |
| *-tigulō- | 146, 147, 148 |
| *-tōbyan- | 424 |
| *-tōma- | 97 |
| *-trēman- | 435 |
| *-tramu- | 435 |
| *-truga- | 332 |
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*tubbVN- 324
*tugi- 350
*tugila- 350
*tugōjan- 362
*tungō(rn)- 338
*tuppa- 324
*tütō- 402
*tuxti- 271, 333
*tuznixwal 96
*twisk- 340
*tubari 370
*tubila- 231, 283, 343
*tubis(w)ō- 346
*tōder- 173
*tōdra- 172
*tōdraz 172
*tōfna- 358
*tumbi 318
*tuns 233
*tuxtwōn- 231
*tupana 357
*tup(a/e) 291
*tutara- 396
*tātara- 396, 397
*tutra- 327
*tusar- 329
*táxt(w)ō- 317, 333
*tuz- 397
*tutōmjan- 97
*wabso- 208
*wagn- 149
*wagnabrugjō 149
*waiza- 474, 504
*walla- 226
*warxt- 198
*wegina- 149
*welka- 100
*werdan- 504
*werfer- 198
*werk- 94
*wejšōn- 200
*wōda- 448
*Wōdanas’dag 447
*Wōdin’as’dag 447
*weul- 435
*wruka- 332
*wulba- 342
*wulkan 342
*wulkō- 342
*wullina- 321
*wullō- 342
*wunēn- 365
*wunskā- 273
*wunskjan- 273
*wurt- 281
*wurtiwalu- 281
*wurtjō- 281
*xagīnōn- 137
*xagla- 159
*xagōn- 137
*xaima- 483
*xairiran- 478
*xaisa- 482
*xais(s)ka- 482
*xaisa- 482
*xaisra- 482
*xallō- 226
*xalō- 481
*xam(mn)ō- 483
*xanxsinuwō- 224
*xanxa- 224
*xanxamuljō- 224
*xanxalō- 481
*xanxam- 224, 481
*xanxila(rn)- 446
*xanxila- 224, 446, 481
*xanxu- 224
*xaspjō- 207, 208
*xaspsō- 208
*xaurjan- 96
*xaurjan 356, 453
*xauxa- 100
*ximal- 134
*xinjān 442
*xlādrō- 487
*xlejja- 509
*xlējō- 509
*xlew- 102
*xlew- 509
*xlewja- 102
*xlid- 100
*xluta- 327
*xnungjan- 349
*xnungpi- 323
*xnut- 344
*xrētō- 97
*xrīma- 100
*xrinj- 234
*xrinjaz- 292
*xröfta- 316
*xröftja- 316
*xröjsjan 423
*xrōpig’aiza- 116
*xruđa- 397
*xrujf/bōn- 358
*xruji- 358
*xrujga- 269
*xrunp- 234
*xrunf- 292
*xruṣjan- 345
*xsuša- 284, 343
*xsunbka- 343
*xūdjan 442, 443
*xuṇg- 347
*xuṇji/u- 347
*xuṇjan- 347
*xuṇja- 463
*xuṇa- 340
*xuṇi- 340, 354
*xuṇisa- 320
*xuṇjan- 320
*xuṇjō- 305, 320
*xuṇi- 261
*xuṇō- 354
*xuṇtina- 320
*xuṇṭin- 320
*xunmpa- 289
*xunntaka- 364
*xundrada- 337
*xunda- 337
*xungru- 338
*xunpjō- 442
*xupi- 284
*xupppjan- 311
*xunppōn- 311
*xurjan- 445
*xuŋjō- 442
*xwaja- 405
*xalka- 100
*xanxta- 223
*xēka- 433
*xaka- 210
*xakja- 210
*xankjan- 223
*xanxtē 223
*xaux- 100
*xenxa- 130
*xenxta- 231
*xenxta- 231
*xevu- 427
*xeda- 427
*xevu- 102, 427
*xewernō- 407
*þiljōn- 201, 427
*þiudiska- 455
*þiustria- 455
*þiubjan 455
*þrēman- 435
*þnalla- 226
*þrukjan- 315
*þrēman- 435
*þrukki- 315
*þrukken 94, 104
*þrumi- 334, 352, 415
*þrumila- 352
*þufō- 325
*þuldjan- 315
*þulla- 340
*þuma- 414
*þumala- 414
*þuman- 414
*þuuman- 415
*þu/u- 363
*þunkjan- 223, 260, 319
*þunja- 260, 280
*þunnu- 260
*þunra- 336
*þunxta- 223
*þunxtē 223
*þurfti- 94
*þuri 367
*þursti- 279
*þurstjan- 280
*þuruh- 110
*þurx 94, 197, 367
*þus 329
*þwagila- 132
*þwagilō- 132
*þwahlō- 132
*þwaxan 132
*þwaxilō- 132
*þāxta 106

Zealandish

donne 363
eupe 284
gōôr 504
hoot 500
ival 231, 441
ivallig 231, 441
ruē, reu 397
smieē 221
smieig 221
smoeē 221
smoeg 221
ulster, unsel 272
uus 233
vekke 211
vloe 393
The Low Countries are famous for their radically changing landscape over the last 1,000 years. Like the landscape, the linguistic situation has also undergone major changes. In Holland, an early form of Frisian was spoken until, very roughly, 1100, and in parts of North Holland it disappeared even later. The hunt for traces of Frisian or Ingvaeonic in the dialects of the western Low Countries has been going on for around 150 years, but a synthesis of the available evidence has never appeared. The main aim of this book is to fill that gap. It follows the lead of many recent studies on the nature and effects of language contact situations in the past. The topic is approached from two different angles: Dutch dialectology, in all its geographic and diachronic variation, and comparative Germanic linguistics. In the end, the minute details and the bigger picture merge into one possible account of the early and high medieval processes that determined the make-up of western Dutch.